

University of Twente

Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences (BMS)

M.Sc. Thesis

**A safe space for everyone? Relationship between the making
of judgment errors and Secondary Victimization in interviews
with victims of sexual assault in Peru**

Psychology of Conflict, Risk & Safety

Maria Luisa Fernanda Rispa Hoyos

First Supervisor: Dr. Miriam S. D. Oostinga

Second Supervisor: Dr. Steven J. Watson

*I would like to thank Miriam for believing in this research since day one,
her patience and support;
to Steven for his invaluable input and trust.*

To my family and friends.

*Finally, to all the participants in this investigation, and
the police officers I interviewed for this project.*

**“Rape is the only crime where the victim becomes the accused”
(Frada Adler)**

Abstract

The main objective of this research is to study the effect of judgment errors on Secondary Victimization, Willingness to provide information, Rapport, and Trust in the police in victims of sexual violence when filing a report, as well as seeking to understand the role that apologizing had on the same variables. For this purpose, we took into consideration three experimental conditions: control group, judgment error without apology, and judgment error with apology. The participants (N = 90) were randomly divided into one of those three groups and were asked to imagine being a victim of sexual assault. Next, they had to pretend to file a report with a police officer and fill out a survey. Twelve participants were interviewed to study the relationship between the constructs. The results indicated that making judgment errors negatively affected the Willingness to provide information, Rapport, and Trust in the police, whereas participants reported more Secondary Victimization. Concerning the response strategy, an apology diminishes the effect of the error on Rapport, trust, and Secondary Victimization, except for Willingness to provide information. Finally, the results suggest that words, in the form of an error and an apology, affect the dynamic between a victim and the police.

Keywords: errors of judgment, Secondary Victimization, sexual violence.

Resumen

El objetivo principal de esta investigación es estudiar el efecto de los *errores de juicio* sobre la Victimización Secundaria, la Disposición a proporcionar información, el Rapport y la Confianza en la policía en las víctimas de violencia sexual a la hora de presentar una denuncia, así como tratar de entender el papel que tuvo pedir disculpas sobre las mismas variables. Para ello, se tuvieron en cuenta tres condiciones experimentales: grupo de control, error de juicio sin disculpa y error de juicio con disculpa. Los participantes (N = 90) fueron divididos aleatoriamente y se les pidió que imaginaran ser víctimas de una agresión sexual. A continuación, tuvieron que simular que presentaban una denuncia ante un agente de policía y rellenar una encuesta. Se entrevistó a doce participantes para estudiar la relación entre los constructos. Los resultados indicaron que cometer errores de juicio afectaba negativamente la disposición a proporcionar información, el rapport y la confianza en la policía, mientras que los participantes informaron una mayor victimización secundaria. En cuanto a la estrategia de respuesta, una disculpa disminuye el efecto del error en el rapport, la confianza y la victimización secundaria, excepto en la disposición a proporcionar información. Por último, los resultados sugieren que las palabras, en forma de error y de disculpa, afectan a la dinámica entre la víctima y la policía.

Palabras clave: errores de juicio, victimización secundaria, violencia sexual.

Introduction

Women are victims of different forms of violence. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) (2018), approximately 1 in 3 women globally has been a victim of sexual or physical violence at least once in their lifetime. Global prevalence figures indicate that Latin America and the Caribbean is the region with the fourth highest number of rapes per 100,000 inhabitants (Jaitman et al., 2017). Specifically, in the case of Peru (Instituto Nacional Penitenciario [National Penitentiary Institute], 2021), the second most common crime among men in prison is rape of a minor (11.4%), which, added to 'basic' rape (4.7%), felony against modesty (1.5%), and felony against modesty against children (3.0%), results in 20.7% of incarcerated men being serving their sentence for committing a crime against sexual freedom..

Another type of violence women face may occur at the time of filing a complaint, sometimes victims are exposed to symbolic violence perpetrated by those who should ensure their safety (i.e., the police officer). For example, victims can experience violence when they are being exposed to exhaustive assessment or intense physical examinations to collect evidence if it is done poorly or involuntary; in other words, if the gathering process is done in a harmful way it could lead to a sense of discomfort in the victim (NSVR, 2012). Secondary Victimization refers to the poor or inadequate care a victim receives from the criminal justice system, that results in additional trauma to survivors of a crime (Campbell & Raja, 1999; García-Pablos, 1993). Exposing victims to such situations may result in post-traumatic stress symptoms and physical discomfort and may lead to risky sexual behaviors (Campbell et al., 2004; Campbell et al., 2001). Several studies (Koss, 2000; Orth, 2002; Symonds, 1975) indicate that victims' encounters with the justice system could lead to Secondary Victimization, especially encounters with police. In the case of sex offenses, Logan et al. (2005) noted that some officers threatened victims who reported being sexually abused, if their stories were not consistent, the police would prosecute them instead. Other victims say that their experience was upsetting because it was characterized by stigmatization, sexist comments, and they felt they were being blamed for what happened (Filipas & Ullman, 2001; Monroe et al., 2005).

It should be noted that for some years now, the focus of sexual assault research has been on women (Lowe, 2018), mainly because of the negative stereotypes surrounding male rape, such as believing that they cannot be raped or that it is not as severe as in women (Groth & Burgess, 1980). However, recent research (Weare, 2018;

Weiss, 2010) indicates that male rape has significant negative consequences on their mental health, such as experiencing higher levels of humiliation, shame or episodes of depression, anxiety, and suicidal thoughts and attempts.

In addition, men are reluctant to go to the police to file a report, because (1) they think no one would believe them, (2) the sense of shame, (3) not knowing they could do it (McDonald & Tijerino, 2013) or (4) the thought that “real” men do not get raped (Davies, 2002). On the other hand, studies of Secondary Victimization in men focus on sexual minorities and point out that this plays a determining role in the victim-blaming attitude of police officers; that is, police tend to blame the victims’ sexual orientation for the abuse (Jackson et al., 2017).

Thus, the phenomenon of Secondary Victimization results in people who should ensure the safety of the victims, unintentionally or on purpose, replicating situations of discomfort for the victim. This may be due to the police interpreting the situation differently from the victim, having different values, or a lack of knowledge on the subject. Oostinga et al. (2018a) proposed that subjective errors, meaning a misrepresentation of the situation, made in the communication by police are referred to as judgment errors. They found that such errors have a negative impact when interviewing suspects, but they did not assess the effect of errors when interviewing victims.

From what was mentioned above, the research question of this study is: *To what extent does making judgment errors while interviewing victims of sexual assault affect Secondary Victimization?* The relevance of the research lies on several levels. First, from a theoretical point of view, it would generate new knowledge, since no literature delves into the relationship between judgment errors and Secondary Victimization from the victim's perspective. Secondly, it seeks to be a starting point to promote further research on the subject. In this sense, it contributes to the reflection of the people in charge of interviewing the victims, and how they impact the victims' decision to continue the reporting process. Finally, this research can provide a better understanding of how to create a safe space for people who want to report such crimes.

Theoretical framework

Secondary Victimization

Campbell and Raja (2005) point out that Secondary Victimization refers to the inadequate treatment of justice operators, or those in charge of providing protection and assistance to the victims (Beristain, 1998). Secondary Victimization may be due to a lack of understanding of the physical and psychological suffering caused to the victim by the

crime, and how it affects their well-being (Kreuter, 2006). Albertin (2006) also points out that this phenomenon can occur indirectly. For example, the excessive use of legal technicalities that the victim does not understand, slowness in the judicial process, lack of information, or confusion about the legal process that the people need to follow if they want to report. All these circumstances lead the victim to lose confidence in the authorities (Gutierrez de Piñeres et al., 2009), which increases the feeling of insecurity and abandonment, eventually leading to the total loss of credibility of the system (Soria, 1998; Garcia-Pablos, 1988).

Tamarit (2013) points out that society attributes specific characteristics to the victim, inherent to the condition of being one, which leads to generating a profile on how the “ideal victim” should be. In the case of sexual exploitation, this assumption means that the victim is expected to respond with a certain level of passivity to justify having been a victim of sexual exploitation or abuse (Jabiles, 2017). By romanticizing this “ideal victim” condition, people who do not fit this vision are depreciated. For example, women who at the time of sexual assault were under the influence of a substance, or wearing clothing considered “provocative”, are more likely to be victims of mistreatment by authorities, because they do not fit the stereotype of the “ideal victim”. To establish an unbiased and horizontal relationship with the victim, the police must put aside the ideas they have about how the victim “should” have behaved, in order not to fall into bias at the time of the interviews (United States Department of Justice, 2015).

Communication Errors

Communication errors can happen in law enforcement interactions even if the police want to avoid them. Oostinga et al. (2018a, 2020) have studied these errors and found that when made by the officers, they can affect the effectiveness of the interview, mainly depending on how they are handled. In other words, the suspect's response to the error will depend on two factors: the error itself, and the response strategy that the law enforcement officer uses.

Oostinga et al. (2018a) proposed three types of errors: Firstly, *factual errors* are mistakes made concerning an objective fact, for example, confusing the name of the interviewee. Secondly, *judgment errors* occur when the officer does not interpret the feelings or thoughts of the other person correctly, it is a subjective mistake. To illustrate this, some police officers might use inappropriate jokes when the victim values formality more. Finally, *contextual errors* happen when there is an error related to police procedures. For instance, when the officer uses police or technical terminology, or says

things the suspect is not supposed to know regarding the procedure. For this research, the focus will be on judgment errors, since it was found that they are more negatively experienced by the receiver than with other types of errors (Oostinga et al., 2018b).

Based on the above, it can be hypothesized that making a judgment error when interviewing a victim could cause Secondary Victimization. When an officer misjudges the situation and tries to put their ideal-victim-stereotype on the person who is going to present the complaint, in other words, commits a judgment error, then it might lead to more Secondary Victimization.

Response Strategies

After a communication error occurs in a police interaction, the interviewers' response strategy will depend on how they recognize their errors (Weiner, 1985); in this sense, the handling of the error varies from person to person. In the context of crisis negotiations, Oostinga et al. (2018b) noted four types of response strategies: (1) *contradicts*, where the police do not accept the error, therefore, do not take responsibility for it; (2) *attribute*, when they hold someone else responsible for the error, it may be by saying "*This is what someone else told me*"; (3) *apologize*, which refers to the act of responsibility and empathy that the police officer shows by apologizing; and (4) *accept*, where the police officer not only accepts their error but assures that it will not happen again (Oostinga et al., 2018a).

Such response strategies may influence the other person on three levels: affective trust; rapport and willingness to provide information to the officer (Oostinga et al., 2018a). For this research, the central focus will be on the apology strategy, because it appeared to be the most effective one to repair trust and Rapport, and it also plays a relevant role in the interview (Oostinga, 2018b).

Compared to an interview with the suspect, a victim has other needs that have to be addressed by the police, since they are in a vulnerable position. Being a victim of any crime impacts mental health, since it is considered a stressful situation; therefore, victims need to fulfill their need for attention and care, in order to feel better and safer (Archambault & Lonsway, 2020), and a judgment error might negatively affect them.

Previous research showed that an apology addresses the person's need of belonging and meaningful existence (Oostinga, 2018b). For the present research, it is hypothesized that the apology, given the positive connotation of such a response strategy on the victim, might make amends for the error and would address their victim's need of

attention and care. As such, it would repair the Willingness to provide information, Trust in the officer and, Rapport.

Willingness to provide information

One way to obtain information in a criminal investigation is to interview the actors involved in the criminal event, such as the suspects, witnesses, and victims, to get detailed and accurate information about the event (Oxburgh et al., 2010). In this sense, there are several techniques used by the police to obtain information depending on whom they interview (Memon et al., 2010; Fisher et al., 2011). How the interviewer behaves toward the interviewee will determine the path of the interview. In the case of victims, if they believe the police are failing in their investigative task, and feel that they are being mistreated, it directly affects their Willingness to provide information and reduces cooperation (Tyler, 2011). In addition, how open to listen the person perceives the police to be, is another reason to cooperate or not to (Goudriaan et al., 2005; Hawdon & Ryan, 2011). In other words, negative experiences with the police directly affect the willingness to share information with them (Koster et al., 2020); the interaction between the police officer and the victim will be determined by the behavior of the police officers (Beune et al., 2009).

In the case of the present research, judgment error is expected to negatively impact the participant's evaluation of the interviewer and the interview setting, causing them to be less willing to provide information. On the other hand, it is projected to replicate what was proposed by Oostinga et al. (2018b, 2020), that an apology is the most effective response strategy to handle a communication error in terms of information gathering. In this case, apologizing can have a restorative effect, since it allows for addressing the needs of attention and care the victims have (Archambault & Lonsway, 2020).

Trust in the officer

Beune et al. (2011) propose that trust is an essential aspect in a legal context. Trust is understood as the decision a person makes to accept their vulnerability in front of someone else, without believing that the latter will take advantage and that in the future, this decision may imply a benefit for them (Alarcon et al., 2018). For example, deciding to trust the police because of the belief that they can help catch the suspect. Furthermore, trust depends on people's previous experiences and how similar they believe their values to be (Twyman et al., 2008).

Mayer et al. (1995) propose that trust has three factors: (1) *ability*, which refers to a person's skills and capability that make them specialized in an area. For instance, if

someone presents themselves a gender specialist investigator, I will trust that person more for tasks related to gender cases. In the case of victims, if they perceive justice actors as inefficient, after being a victim of an interpersonal violence crime, such as sexual assault, they may lose trust in the police (Laxminarayan, 2015; New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 2021).

The next factor is (2) *benevolence*, which is related to how much an individual believes that the interviewer will not look out for their welfare but will be more concerned about their own benefit (the interviewer's benefit); finally, (3) *integrity*, based on the acceptance that the interviewer is honest. In both cases, if victims perceive they are being mistreated by different instances of the justice system, they are more likely to lose trust in authorities (Berthelot et al., 2018; Singer et al., 2019).

Oostinga et al (2018a) stated that errors negatively impact the trust between suspect and negotiators. In that sense, it is expected that making a judgment error during the interview might break the trust established with the victim. It might be that if a person decided to file a report, when encountering a comment that generates emotional discomfort, such as using inappropriate jokes, can break the bond with the officer, especially if the statement is tinged with prejudice. However, the apology is also expected to repair trust, because by taking responsibility for their actions, the interviewer can be seen as someone willing to improve and be trustworthy.

Rapport

Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1990) defined Rapport as that feeling experienced in a bond between interlocutors, and manifested through signs of mutual attention, positivity, and synchrony or coordination. To establish Rapport, especially with victims, the relationship must be genuine; those involved need to pay attention to what the other says, be empathetic, and thus build a relationship based on a caring interaction and good communication (St-Yves, 2006). Establishing Rapport also stimulates cooperation and provides individuals with a sense of well-being (Vanderhallen et al., 2011).

Sometimes in police scenarios, investigators focus more on asking questions and fail to establish a proper Rapport first, so the victim feels uncomfortable and rushed (Patterson, 2011). This leads to police being seen as intimidating, cold, and unsupportive (Konradi, 2007; Maier, 2008), rather than caring and responsive (Patterson, 2011). Therefore, this could impact how the interviewee will act; for example, avoid giving details, not to tell the whole story, etc.

The present research hypothesizes that Rapport will be negatively affected after a judgment error. Oostinga et al (2018a) found that especially judgment errors affect the Rapport established between suspects and interviewers. In this case, victims might see the police officer as unempathetic (Maddox et al., 2011), making it difficult for them to continue bonding with the officer. On the other hand, the apology is expected to help repair the connection, since people may believe that with this reparative action, the interviewer has become aware of the importance of listening without judging, and therefore cares about their feelings.

The present study

From the theoretical review and due to the lack of bibliography about the impact of judgment errors on victims, it can be concluded that mixed research needs to be conducted with an experimental and qualitative approach. Mainly because the rigor of the setting in this experimental research provides a better internal validity, since it excludes confounding variables and allows us to establish cause-effect relationships. Whereas with a qualitative approach, we can better understand how participants process the errors and the impact the repairing behavior, the apology, had on them.

Based on the theoretical consideration previously discussed, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Victims will experience more Secondary Victimization in an interview in which a judgment error is made by the interviewer, in comparison to an interview where no error is made.

H2: Victims will be less willing to provide information in an interview in which a judgment error is made by the interviewer, in comparison to an interview where no error is made.

H3: Victims will experience less trust in the interviewer in an interview in which a judgment error is made by the interviewer, in comparison to an interview where no error is made.

H4: Victims will experience less Rapport in an interview in which a judgment error is made by the interviewer, in comparison to an interview where no error is made.

H5: Victims will experience less Secondary Victimization in an interview in which the interviewer apologizes for the judgment error, in comparison to one where no apology is made.

H6: Victims will be more willing to provide information in an interview in which the interviewer apologizes for the judgment error, in comparison to one where no apology is made.

H7: Victims will experience more trust in the officer in an interview in which the interviewer apologizes for the judgment error, in comparison to one where no apology is made.

H8: Victims will experience more Rapport in an interview in which the interviewer apologizes for the judgment error, in comparison to where no apology is made.

Method

Design

The experiment had three groups: The control group, where no judgment errors were made, which resulted in no apologies; group one, where the interviewer made a judgment error and did not apologize to the participants, and in group two, where the interviewer made a judgment error and apologized after. The participants were randomly divided into one of the three experimental conditions. After that, we measured their experienced Secondary Victimization, Willingness to provide information, Trust in the officer, and Rapport.

Participants

Participants were recruited using snowball sampling, and with the assistance from professors at the Pontifical Catholic University of Perú (PUCP). The inclusion criteria were being Peruvian, over 18 years old, and being a Spanish speaker. The sample consisted of 90 individuals, 30 per experimental condition, since it was the logistically feasible to achieve due resources constraints the researcher had to faced, such as time difference, technical and recruitment constraints (Lakens, 2022).

The age of the participants was between 18 and 41 years old, with a mean age of 27.84 ($SD = 4.05$). Regarding the gender, 45 participants were males (50.0%), 44 were females (48.9%), and one participant preferred not to say.

Measures

A sociodemographic online questionnaire was constructed to collect data concerning gender identity, nationality, age, level of education, occupation, and participation in a feminist organization to assess if being an activist and having knowledge

about gender issues plays a role on how people respond to errors (Appendix A).

Independent Variables

Judgment Errors. To mimic real life as much as possible, interviews were conducted with four police officers who work in the *Dirección de investigación criminal de la Policía Nacional del Perú* [Direction of Criminal Investigation of the Peruvian National Police] (DIRINCRI), who had on average five years of experience working there, to have a better understanding of what examples of judgment errors are usually done when interviewing victims of sexual assault at police stations in Peru. In other words, they helped determine the research's judgment errors (Appendix B). In the case of females, the clothing they were wearing was the focus: *“Oh well, you exposed yourself, you should have avoided dressing like that”*. This is a judgment error because the comment is based on a subjectively wrong information, it is not an objective fact.

Initially, it was proposed to use the same judgment error for males and females; however, after testing it in a pilot test with one male, it was opted to have another interview with the officers to determine another type of error specific to them. They proposed to refer to their manliness: *“But if you're a man, how could anyone do that to you?”*, in this case, it is a judgment error because the officers fail to behave according to the situation and do not consider the other party's feelings. In addition, the officers also gave their feedback on how to make the fictitious scenario more realistic and which questions we should use for when the victim would file the report.

Response strategy. It was measured through the apologies or the absence of them after the judgment error made by the interviewer (Appendix B). In the apology scenario for both females and males, the comment was: *“What I said was not the most appropriate thing to say. I should not have said that, I am sorry”*. Meanwhile, no apology was made in the control condition (no apology, no error); and another comment was added in the experimental group one (error, no apology): *“Look at you, you are man enough to be able to defend yourself, right?”* in the case of males, and *“You have to be careful with how you dress”*, for females.

Dependent Variables

Secondary Victimization. For the present research, the Instrumento para Evaluar victimización judicial en víctimas durante la etapa de denuncia [Instrument to Evaluate Judicial Victimization in Victims during the reporting stage] (Mantilla & Avendaño, 2020) was used. It has 18 items, which are divided into three factors corresponding to the three types of judicial processes that a victim undergoes at the time of reporting a crime:

Attention (procedural justice), information (justifies information), and organization (intrapersonal justice). However, we only used the first factor consisting of 8 items (Appendix C). This decision was made due to this factor being related to the victim's treatment by the justice operators and the dynamics between these two actors. In other words, it directly measures how the person feels after interacting with the police at the time of filing the complaint.

In addition, the items were modified grammatically to be consistent with this research. For example, instead of “paralegal,” the word was changed to “police officer” in every item. In addition, item 11, *“The paralegal got angry when you told them that you did not understand what they were asking about”*, and item 14, *“The paralegal implied that you wanted to take advantage of the situation”*, were deleted. The decision to delete item number 11 was due to the interviewer not getting angry if the participant indicated that they did not understand a question. Concerning item 14, the interviewer's comments do not imply that the participant wants to take advantage of the situation.

Finally, it was decided to change the original way of correcting the test to a 5-point Likert Scale (TD= strongly disagree to TA = strongly agree), since this scoring is an ordinal psychometric measure that allows to assess the extent of agreement instead of using a dichotomous one, that only measures the presence or absence of a construct. To create a full scale, the items were averaged, and a high score indicated more Secondary Victimization.

Willingness to provide information. Following how Beune et al. (2011) measured this variable, participants were asked to answer to what extent they will give further information to the interviewer, to what extent the information they will provide is truthful, and to what extent they will tell everything to the interviewer, and their answers were measured with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). To create a full scale, the items were averaged, and a high score indicated that the participant was more willing to give information to the interviewer.

Trust in the interviewer. An adaptation of Mayer and Davis (1999) was done to measure trust. This questionnaire was designed in an organizational setting, it had 17 items and they found three factors regarding trustworthiness: 6 items for Ability; for example: *“Top management is very capable of performing its job.”*, 5 items measure benevolence, such as: *“Top management is very concerned about my welfare.”* and integrity had 6 items: *“Top management has a strong sense of justice”*. They are measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1= disagree strongly to 5= agree strongly).

It was necessary to change the setting to an interview scenario for this research. Therefore, some items were modified. For example, instead of “*top management*”, for the study, it said “police officer”. In addition, for the ability factor, three items were removed, leaving 3 items for the subscale, because the participant did not have the knowledge to answer the items that discussed the interviewer's expertise regarding the matter: “*Top management is known to be successful at the things it tries to do*”, “*Top management has specialized capabilities that can increase our performance*” and “*Top management has much knowledge about the work that needs done*”. To create a full scale, the items were averaged, and a high score indicated that the participant had more trust in the interviewer.

Rapport. To measure Rapport, the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews, and Interrogations (RS3i) Interviewee Version (Duke et al., 2018) was administered to the participants (Appendix E). It has 21 items measured with a 5-point Likert Scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree). The questionnaire consists of 5 scales of Rapport (Attentiveness, Trust/Respect, Expertise, Cultural Similarity, Connected to Flow) and the Commitment to communication scale. No further changes were done. To create a full scale, the items were averaged, and a high score indicated that the participant experienced higher levels of Rapport.

Qualitative part

Qualitative research generates knowledge about constructs that cannot be studied only numerically due to their complexity (Hernández et al., 2010). For the present research, a theoretical thematic analysis approach was used to process the data, and the information obtained allowed to establish common patterns of answers based on the dependent variables of the study (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Pistrang & Barker, 2012). The decision to use the dependent variables as the starting point for the analysis was made because the aim was to contextualize the quantitative results and thus have a global analysis.

In addition, the semi-structured interview technique was used, since it allows the base questions to be modified as the evaluator considers pertinent and thus, achieve the objective of the research (Díaz et al., 2013; Hernández et al., 2010). Furthermore, as Pistrang and Barker (2012) point out, in this type of interview, the researcher's participation is limited to encouraging and stimulating the interlocutor to express themselves more freely. In that sense, the first questions of the topic guide for the interview (Appendix I) were to know how the person felt after the roleplay and later

different questions were asked depending on the experimental condition in which they were and thus contextualize the answers. For example, in the error - no apology scenario, the main point was to discuss how this error affected the dynamics in the relationship, whereas in the apology condition, the focus was if this apology played an essential role in repairing the relationship. The aim is to inquire into the subjective experiences of the interviewee, the interpretations they make of their context, their expectations, feelings, and perceptions (Corbetta, 2007; Pedraz, 2014; Patton, 2002).

The interviews were recorded and transcribed immediately after being conducted, trying to be as literal as possible; this process was done in the original language of the participants (Spanish), then the researcher translated data fragments into English. The coding was done using Atlas Ti 7.0 and manually using Microsoft Excel. For the analyses, we used the theoretical thematic analysis, to perform the analyses and creation of the categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006); which means that in this case, the coding frames were around the dependent variables of the study (Appendix J). The thematic analysis technique was applied; the emphasis was on identifying, examining, and recording patterns (or themes) within the raw data. These themes were already proposed in the topic guide and are directly associated with the research question (Maguire & Delahunto, 2017); for this, it was necessary to recognize the relevance in the identification of implicit and explicit meanings within the data, and not just its frequency (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Finally, to meet the criteria of transparency and systematicity (Meyrick, 2006), the entire research process was detailed as precisely as possible, and each action was justified in this report.

Procedure

Quantitative part

First, an emotional support protocol was created in case any of the participants experienced discomfort during the interview. This protocol details the indications for the interviewer if any interviewees experience distress due to the questions (Appendix F).

Participants were asked to read the consent form (Appendix G), which explained that the research aimed to study how people interact in an interview scenario. In addition, it would emphasize that participation is voluntary, and the confidentiality of individuals will be respected at all times. On the other hand, it is made explicit that if the person does not wish to answer any question, they have the right to communicate this to the researcher, to not answer it, and, if they want, to conclude the interview. Finally, we asked for their permission to record the interview for the analysis.

After reading and agreeing to the consent form, all participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire to collect sociodemographic information (Appendix A) regarding their gender, age, nationality, higher education, and whether they were part of a feminist group or not. Subsequently, they read a scenario (Appendix H) and were asked to imagine as vividly as possible that they were victims of sexual assault: after going to a party with their friends and getting drunk, they started kissing someone, and then that person wanted to have sex. They did not give consent for this, but when facing a negative response, the person took advantage of the situation and started rubbing against them. After days of analyzing the situation, they are willing to file charges against the offender.

Participants were randomly divided into one of the three conditions (control group, judgment error-apology, judgment error-no apology). The researcher followed the script (Appendix B), which was written from the interview with the DIRINCRI officers about what questions are asked at the police station when a complaint is presented. Regarding the manipulation of the variables, the three interview scripts have the same information and the same number of questions from the interviewer. The questions were asked in the same order each time, so that the three experimental conditions were as similar as possible. Also, the scripts begin with a welcome from the police officer, then proceed with routine questions, and conclude with the police saying she will notify the participant about the complaint process. In the two experimental groups, the manipulation of the judgment error in the case of females was related to the victim's clothing (the description of the dress could be found in the scenario); regarding males, the judgment error alluded to their (lack) of manhood. The apology response manipulation was given by the phrase, *“What I said was not the most appropriate thing to say. I should not have said that, I’m sorry”* Meanwhile, no apology is made in the other conditions.

Finally, participants were asked to complete the online questionnaires to measure Willingness to provide information, Trust in the interviewer, Rapport, and Secondary Victimization.

Qualitative part

Finally, 12 participants were randomly selected to answer an interview regarding how they felt during the interview (Appendix I). The number of participants for this last part was determined by the saturation criterion used in qualitative research. The entire experiment was estimated to take approximately 25-30 minutes, after which participants were thanked for their cooperation and debriefed. The BMS Ethical Committee of the University of Twente approved the present study (Reference Nr. 220068).

Results

Quantitative part

Scales and their relationships

To obtain a general overview and the relationship between the constructs, we calculated the mean scores, standard deviations, Cronbach's Alphas, and correlations among all dependent variables (see Table 1). In the first place, all variables ranged from 'high' to 'excellent' reliability (Taber, 2018).

The Pearson correlation obtained reveals 'moderate' to 'very strong' correlations between the variables (Schober et al., 2018). In addition, as expected, Secondary Victimization correlated negatively with the rest of the variables. In other words, the higher the person scores in Secondary Victimization, the lower the Willingness to provide information, Trust in the interviewer, and Rapport.

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alpha, and inter-correlations among variables (N = 90)

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	1	2	3
1. Willingness to provide information	3.71	0.98	.79			
2. Trust in the interviewer	2.77	1.12	.97	.59**		
3. Rapport	3.05	1.13	.98	.62**	.94** ¹	
4. Secondary Victimization	3.08	0.93	.73	-.48**	-.81**	-.82**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis testing. A post-hoc test with the least significance difference was performed to compare the three experimental groups (control group, errors without apology, and errors with apology) with each other to get more information about the

¹ To verify that there is no overlap between the questions of the Rapport questionnaire and the Trust scale, we run again the analyses without the questions of the 'trust' subscale on the Rapport questionnaire. The erased items were: "I think the Interviewer is generally honest with me", "The Interviewer respects my knowledge", "I think the Interviewer can generally be trusted to keep her word" and "I feel I can trust the Interviewer to keep her word with me". However, correlation between the variables stayed the same (.94).

differences between the study variables. First, Levene's test showed that homogeneity of variances could be assumed between groups ($p > .05$). In the second place, the ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference for Willingness to provide information $F(2,87) = 6.70, p = .002$; Trust in the interviewer $F(2,87) = 41.48, p < .001$, Rapport $F(2,87) = 44.38, p < .001$ and Secondary Victimization $F(2,87) = 61.07, p < .001$. Therefore, a post-hoc test was conducted to map out specific differences between groups and test the research hypotheses, Table 2 shows the differences found at the descriptive level between the dependent variables according to the experimental group.

Error without apology vs. no error (control). The test revealed statistically significant differences for all dependent variables. That is, after making a judgment error and not apologizing to the victim, the Willingness to provide information, $t(87) = 3.55, p = .001$, Trust in the interviewer, $t(87) = 3.47, p = .001$, and Rapport $t(87) = 9.17, p < .001$, were lower in comparison to a situation where no error was made. In contrast, after making a judgment error and not apologizing to the victim, the feelings of Secondary Victimization were higher in comparison to when no error was made, $t(87) = -10.52, p < .001$.

Error with apology vs. no error (control). The test showed statistically significant differences for all dependent variables. Relative to the group where no error is made, participants in the error with apology condition had lower scores on Willingness to provide information, $t(87) = 2.57, p = .012$, Trust in the interviewer, $t(87) = 5.51, p < .001$, and Rapport $t(87) = 6.46, p < .001$. After making a judgment error and apologizing to the victim, Secondary Victimization had higher scores in comparison to when no error was made, $t(87) = -8.20, p < .001$.

In this sense, hypotheses from 1 to 4 were confirmed; victims experienced less Willingness to provide information, less Trust in the interviewer, less Rapport, and more Secondary Victimization in an interview in which a judgment error is made, regardless of the presence of the apology, in comparison to an interview in which no error is made.

Error with apology vs. error without apology. The post hoc showed significant differences for 3 out of 4 dependent variables. Contrary to what was believed, the test revealed that the difference between the erring with an apology to erring without an apology did not statistically affect the Willingness to provide information, $t(87) = -.98, p = .330$. However, participants in the group where no apology was made after the judgment error had lower scores on Trust in the interviewer, $t(87) = -3.53, p = .001$, and Rapport, $t(87) = -2.71, p = .008$, compared to the groups where the apology was made.

Therefore, the apology seemed to affect those variables. Finally, as expected, after an apology, participants had lower scores in Secondary Victimization in comparison to a situation where no apology was made, $t(87) = 2.32, p = .023$.

Hypotheses 5, 7, and 8 were met. Victims experienced more Trust in the officer, more Rapport, and less Secondary Victimization in an interview where the interviewer apologized for the judgment error, compared to where no apology is made. Regarding hypothesis 6, there is no significant statistical difference between the Willingness to provide information scores between participants in the judgment error without apology, and participants in the judgment error with apology condition.

Table 2

Means and standard deviations for the dependent variables depending on the experimental condition

	Experimental condition					
	Control group (<i>n</i> = 30)		Error without apology (<i>n</i> = 30)		Error with apology (<i>n</i> = 30)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.Willingness to provide information	4.20	0.86	3.36 ^a	1.02	3.59 ^a	0.88
2.Trust in the interviewer	3.79	0.87	1.89 ^a	0.64	2.63 ^{a,b}	0.90
3.Rapport	4.13	0.79	2.23 ^a	0.70	2.79 ^{a,b}	0.91
4.Secondary Victimization	2.11	0.64	3.75 ^a	0.63	3.39 ^{a,b}	0.54

^a Differs significantly from control, $p < .05$

^b Differs significantly from experimental condition Error without apology, $p < .05$

Qualitative part

The focus of the theoretical thematic analysis was on the impact the judgment error had on Willingness to provide information, Trust in the interviewer, Rapport, and Secondary Victimization (Appendix K). Next to that, we focused on how the participant perceived the apologies made by the researcher. Lastly, we found some specific comments about the method that are relevant for improving future studies.

To talk more or to stop talking

The interviewees' responses were divided into two categories regarding the judgment error's impact on their willingness to provide information to the interviewer. On the one hand, the participants, mainly women, indicated the importance of continuing

to provide the information requested by the police despite the error. The reasoning behind this was that the police can catch the suspect and that no other women will go through what they went through; there is a feeling of wanting the perpetrator to be punished and go to jail. This behavior could be related to the idea of sorority (*sororidad in Spanish*), which is understood as an implicit strategy among women to confront machista behaviors, and which helps create safe spaces and support networks in situations of violence (Lagarde, 1992; Torcuato et al., 2007). In contrast, there were participants that pointed out how the error directly affected their willingness to share information: “*Completely unnecessary that comment about my clothes, after that, I didn't want to continue talking. If it had been in real life, I probably would have gotten up and walked out of the police station²*”. In other words, after the error was made, they did not want to keep talking. This finding is in line with Koster et al. (2020) research, who pointed out that a negative experience with law enforcement officers, such as the feeling of being questioned, directly impacts the willingness to share information with the police (Beune et al., 2009).

I (don't) trust you

Participants have indicated that, after the judgment error, they did not trust the interviewer in general. They did not think the person would do anything for them (e.g., try to catch the suspect, talk to the police officer in charge), and participants started to question the interviewer's actions because they felt the interviewer did not care about what happened to them. In other words, they felt despair at the time of the interview, since they believed that the police officer would not help the complainant proceed. This negative feeling made the participants question the interviewer's benevolence and integrity, which are two factors of trust (Mayer et al., 1995): the interviewer came across as someone who only protects her own interests, with questionable morals.

In addition, most participants said that after a judgment error, the distrust towards the authority figure increased: “*I do not trust her at all; I think she focused on getting answers; it was as if she did not care about what I said, maybe she is not even going to file a complaint to her boss to do something*”. A study carried out in Peru (Santos, 2020), pointed out that police officers having *machista* comments toward people who report a crime of sexual violence made them lose confidence in the police authorities, which leads to victims not wanting to continue with the complaint process.

Failing in bonding

² The answers have been translated to English by the researcher since the study was conducted in a Spanish-speaking country.

All participants indicated that a judgment error had a negative impact on establishing Rapport. They pointed out three main reasons why it happened: after the error, (1) they perceived the interviewer as a person with little empathy, (2) cold and distant from what was happening to them, and (3) since a sexual assault crime is not like "any other crime" it adds stressor to the participants by itself. In the first case, "little empathy" refers to the interviewer's limited ability to put herself in other people's shoes, and the impact it has on the way participants approached the interviewer: *"The truth is that I would expect more empathy from the agent, that she would know how to treat a victim and what to say, she should have been more prepared"*. Previous research (Baker et al., 2020, Holmberg & Christianson, 2002) pointed out that showing empathy is a prerequisite in a police interview to establish Rapport with victims, and committing a judgment error jeopardized its establishing, since the interviewer is perceived as heartless and distant.

Along the same lines, the participants indicated that the emotional distance they perceived from the interviewer made it challenging to establish Rapport. The negative comments regarding their clothing and manhood did not allow them to have a fluent conversation, as participants felt they were talking to someone without emotions, which impacted how they felt during the interview. Davis (1980) proposed that every party involved needs to appreciate each other's feelings to establish Rapport. Which, in this case, did not happen; participants perceived the interviewer as only wanting to complete a checklist; they did not feel that the interviewer was valuing their feelings.

Finally, for the participants, being a victim of sexual violence is more "difficult" than being a victim of other types of crime, because the body is directly affected: *"It's not that I was telling her that I was robbed, I was telling her that I have been a victim of sexual assault!"*. It can be hypothesized that hearing a judgment error minimized the experience and compromised the establishment of Rapport, because the victims were talking about a traumatic personal experience and by not showing consideration towards it, it made even harder for them to feel like they were establishing a close and safe relationship with the interviewer.

Pointing the finger at the victim

When discussing Secondary Victimization, three emotions were the most mentioned among the participants regarding how they felt after the interview in which errors were made: guilt, humiliation, and shame. Guilt being the most mentioned: *"The truth is that this comment about my clothes is something I saw coming, this is how the*

police blame the victim for what happened...the worst thing is that they really make you doubt, I feel that the mistake is mine". Generally, victims of sexual violence experience feelings of guilt because, socially, it is believed that the person could have done more to prevent the crime (Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1980), or victims blame themselves for the clothing they were wearing (Campbell & Raja, 2005). Negative comments from the police, such as *"Oh well, you exposed yourself, you should have avoided dressing like that. You have to be careful with how you dress"*, like in the present investigation, acerbated this negative feeling.

In the case of men, almost all of them reported feeling humiliated after the judgment error: *"Sometimes as men we feel that we can't go to the police station to report these types of incidents because they will make fun of us...after a comment like that, you feel even more humiliated, you feel like you don't want to go back"*. Lisak (1994) proposed that the feeling of humiliation experienced by men when they are victims of a sexual crime, goes hand in hand with predatory emotions, as their masculinity is put at stake. In this case, their masculinity was put into play by the comment made from the police, which would explain why men experienced humiliation.

Finally, participants also said they felt embarrassed after the judgment error, because they talked to the interviewer about something private and intimate, such as being a victim of a sexual violence crime, and they believed that the interviewer was judging them for what had happened. Thus, the interaction after the error became more difficult for them and made them feel embarrassed about being victims of such a crime.

How much an apology makes amends?

Some interviewed participants reported that the apology did not repair the situation: *"That comment completely jeopardized the interview. I would recommend that the interviewer be more assertive from the beginning rather than apologizing at the end"*. Oostinga (2018b) noted that apologies are a reasonable response strategy after making a judgment error in situations of crisis negotiation and suspect interviews. However, in contrast, this strategy was not enough in a victim interview scenario for some participants. They stated that the effect of the apology depended on how it was said: *"A person does not change their belief system overnight, but I believe that if their apology is from the heart, then it does help repair the damage that was done"*. On this, Bonensteffen et al. (2020) pointed out that an apology must reflect the person's regret in order to be considered sincere. It is also noteworthy that most men (5 out the 6 male interviewees) indicated that apologies are sufficient to repair the bond between them and the

interviewer, compared to women, who did not refer to apologies as a reasonable response strategy.

Finetuning the method

Finally, regarding the method, the interviewer's routine question, "*What were you wearing?*" already resulted in mixed feelings for the participants. On the one hand, it symbolizes an offense for some people: "*I don't understand the need to ask about my clothes. I think it is more relevant to ask me about the boy who assaulted me*". In contrast, for other participants, this did not necessarily have a negative connotation: "*Despite the question, I did not feel uncomfortable; I understand that it is part of what they have to ask you when you go to report... it is just to know the details*". This distinction may be because previous experiences determine the subjective experience of an event, perceptions of reality, and the meaning each person gives to the same event (Castro, 2000; Zumalabe, 1990), which causes the same stimulus to be perceived in different ways. Such is the case of the participants regarding how they interpret the question made.

Exploratory Quantitative analysis

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of manipulation and gender³ on the dependent variables from the qualitative analysis. Both men and women responded similarly in each experimental group, and there was no significant interaction effect on the variables Willingness to provide information $F(2,83) = 1.946, p=.149$; Trust $F(2,83) = 1.307, p=.276$; Rapport $F(2,83) = 1.593, p=.209$, and Secondary victimization $F(2,83) = .943, p=.394$.

Table 3 shows that at a descriptive level, the manipulation error did affect females and males, but there is a pattern, in females the effect is more pronounced for each variable than in males. In a study by Scribner et al. (2021) that evaluated women's responses to sexist comments, they indicated that although in their context such remarks are accepted and normalized, only 49.9% of females had a direct response to defend themselves; while 30.7% remained silent, 20.3% felt they should have said something, 13.3% just laughed and 6.5% felt guilty, angry, and ashamed. In addition to that, Greenwood & Isbell (2002) reported that men, in their research, found sexist jokes less offensive, less harmful, and more amusing than women. Further research could aim to explain how culture and personal differences impacts on such distinction between genders.

³ The participant who filled out "Do not want to share" was removed from the analysis.

Table 3

Means and standard deviations for the dependent variables depending on the experimental condition and gender

Independent Variables			Dependent Variables			
Experimental condition	Gender Identity		Willingness to provide information	Trust in the interviewer	Rapport	Secondary Victimization
Control group	Male (<i>n</i> = 14)	<i>M</i>	3.92	3.75	4.07	2.04
		<i>SD</i>	.89	.77	.79	.58
	Female (<i>n</i> = 15)	<i>M</i>	4.53	3.90	4.27	2.11
		<i>SD</i>	.68	.97	.74	.67
Error without apology	Male (<i>n</i> = 17)	<i>M</i>	3.47	2.12	2.41	3.54
		<i>SD</i>	.99	.65	.71	.72
	Female (<i>n</i> = 13)	<i>M</i>	3.20	1.58	1.97	4.01
		<i>SD</i>	1.08	.48	.61	.35
Error with apology	Male (<i>n</i> = 14)	<i>M</i>	3.66	2.72	3.02	3.19
		<i>SD</i>	.69	.80	.67	.52
	Female (<i>n</i> = 16)	<i>M</i>	3.52	2.55	2.58	3.56
		<i>SD</i>	1.03	1.01	1.05	.50

Discussion

The main objective of this research was to investigate the impact of judgment errors on four dependent variables: Willingness to provide information, Rapport, Trust in the interviewer, Secondary Victimization, and the impact of apologies as a response strategy on these variables. As predicted, the analysis shows that making a judgment error when interviewing victims of sexual violence negatively impacts their Willingness to provide information, the establishment of Rapport between the interviewer and the victim and decreases the trust in the interviewer. Also, participants experience more Secondary Victimization. Regarding the response strategy, apologies seem to lessen this effect: compared to a situation where the interviewer has not apologized after the error, apologizing leads to more Trust in the interviewer and Rapport, and less feelings of Secondary Victimization. However, apologies did not have an impact on Willingness to provide information.

Judgment errors

Perceiving the judgment error directly affects the participants' Willingness to share information, which aligns with what has been found in previous research (Gudjonsson; 2003; Milne et al., 2007). However, this result may be more nuanced because some participants indicated they were willing to continue providing information

to the police to catch the suspect, even after the judgment error. This desire that some people still had to continue providing information, even if they felt negative feelings during the interview, might be because, in collectivist cultures like that in Peru, the sense of justice shapes the behavior of the individuals (Jasso, 2005). It would be relevant to conduct research to test how culture impacts victims' reporting behavior, we will elaborate this in the limitation section.

We replicated the results found in the studies conducted by Oostinga et al. (2018b) and Rossi et al. (2017), where an error negatively affected the Trust in the interviewer. After making a judgment error, the figure of the police is perceived by the victim as incompetent, since it is expected that the officers should know how to address the needs of the interviewees, which decreases their trust in them (Laxminarayan, 2015; New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 2021). In addition, comments understood negatively by the victim directly affect their trust in the legal system and their perception of obtaining justice (Tyler & Smith, 1998). In this case, the participants agreed that a judgment error is related to the idea that the police do not care enough about the crime and will not do anything in the future to help them; therefore, they do not trust the interviewer in general. This finding is in line with what Goldsmith (2005) proposed: establishing trust with the police is complicated, even more so in lost-trust settings when the police replicate victim-blaming attitudes of the organization of which they are a part of (Martín-Fernández et al., 2018).

Regarding Rapport, results were found in line with what the literature proposes. After an error by the police officer, the ability to establish Rapport between both parties decreases (Oostinga et al., 2018b; Walsh & Bull, 2012). It can be hypothesized that after a judgment error, the police officer is perceived as unsupportive and cold (Konradi, 2007; Maier, 2008), which leads to a failure to establish an empathic relationship from the beginning (St-Yves, 2006). In addition, failure to establish adequate Rapport with the victim directly harms the possibility of obtaining truthful and complete answers from them (Griffiths & Milne, 2006; Milne and Powell, 2010). In this case, the participants pointed out that after the police officer made the error, they perceived her as not very empathetic and emotionally distant; especially since the crime of sexual violence is not conceived as an "ordinary crime", and therefore requires more empathy on the part of the interviewer. It is worth to mention that the focus of this study was on sexual assault, but there is research that states that Secondary Victimization can also happen in different types of crimes (Berril & Herek, 1992; Orth, 2002), further research needs to be done to

understand how the establishing of rapport, judgment errors and other types of crime interact with one another.

Finally, there is a direct relationship between communication errors and Secondary Victimization. Campbell and Raja (1999) propose that making comments to the victim about the woman's dress or commenting about the lack of manhood (Idriss, 2021) in the case of men impacts the well-being of the person who reports (Kreuster, 2006). Different studies indicate that in victims of sexual violence, experiencing Secondary Victimization by community service providers is related to post-traumatic stress symptoms, physical health distress, and loss of credibility in the justice system (Campbell et al., 1999; Soria, 1998; Garcia-Pablos, 1988). In this research, participants experienced three emotions after the judgment error: guilt, humiliation, and shame. Females said they experienced more guilt and shame, whereas most males also experienced humiliation, which goes in line with previous studies (Campbell et al., 2004; Weare, 2018; Weiss, 2010). Further research can explore this difference and discuss how to measure these, and study whether these emotions are the ones addressed with the apology and that is why it had a repairing effect.

Response strategy

The apology helped to repair the Trust in the officer, the Rapport and reduced the Secondary Victimization. We confirmed what was found by Oostinga et al. (2018a), who point out that an apology, as a response strategy, is the most effective one in restoring trust and Rapport in a crisis negotiation scenario. In victim-offender-mediation research, it has been found that an apology that is perceived as genuine is interpreted as the most important compensatory event between the suspect and the victim (Nugent et al., 2001; Umbreit et al., 2005). In the present research, it can be hypothesized that the same occurred. Participants pointed out that for an apology to positively impact them, it must be considered sincere and not scripted. For the apology to be accepted and repair the harm caused by the error, the victim must perceive the apology as complete, and feel that the other person experiences remorse (Bonensteffen et al., 2020; Choi & Severson, 2009, Shnabel & Nadler, 2015). However, further research needs to be conducted to explain why apologizing had such an effect in those variables.

Finally, it can be hypothesized that the reason why we did not find a statistically significant effect of the apology on the Willingness to provide information, is that regardless of the presence or absence of the apology, some people were still going to provide information, as they have a greater purpose of wanting to catch the criminal so

that nobody goes through the same experience. Culture influences people's values, behavior, and cognition (Cronk, 2016), and it also shapes the sense of justice (Jasso, 2005). Therefore, it might be that participants acknowledged the importance of collaborating with the police, despite a mistreatment, to try to obtain justice in some way or another. However, there were other participants who wanted to withdraw their cooperation and felt like the working relationship could not be salvaged, might be that personality traits also plays a role on how people decide to act, regardless their culture. Future research should explore both hypotheses to have a better understating on how they interact.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

Although seven of the eight proposed hypotheses were met, and the research has yielded significant results for police practice and academia, some limitations and recommendations should be discussed for future research.

In the first place, the entire sample is Peruvian. Hence, participants had characteristics of more collectivist countries, which could explain why some people were still willing to provide information to prevent someone else from going through the same thing even after the judgment error. This sample was chosen because Peru is one of the countries with more sexual violence crimes worldwide, and it was of special interest to the researcher since it is her homeland. In addition, it provides new information on a sample that it is not usually seen in psychological research. Notwithstanding, it would be relevant to know the effect of judgment error and apologies as a response strategy in more individualistic cultures, to have more conclusive results and understand this phenomenon globally. For example, it could be that the results are replicated, but the apology has a positive impact in Willingness to provide information.

Secondly, another factor to consider is that the gender of the interviewer may have biased the participants' responses to some extent. It is possible that, in the case of the men, the answers would have varied if it were a man who took the report, because being a victim of sexual assault and having a female police officer who mocks them could lead to greater negative feelings towards the situation. One of the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity is that a man's virility cannot be put at stake, especially by someone that portrays what they reject (femininity) (Bourdieu, 1998), a belief that is still prevalent in many Latin American countries. Further research needs to be done to understand how the gender difference in police officer impacts the victim's behavior and feelings.

Thirdly, regarding the method, we worked with a specific type of judgment error. Yet, these are not the only errors that can be made when interviewing victims; future research could focus on the impact of factual errors, which can also lead to Secondary Victimization and could replicate what we found. Different types of errors should be studied to be able to make assumptions about how judgment errors and the role they play in victim-police interactions. Along the same lines, concerning the response strategy, the focus was on apologies, as it was hypothesized that these were the ones that would have a restorative character in the interview with victims. Alternative research could focus on knowing what types of strategies the Peruvian police use when a communication error occurs, and study that particular response. It might be that they use a contradict strategy, and it would not have a repairing effect, since no responsibility was taken after the error.

Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of making judgment errors on victims of sexual violence when reporting the crime, and the apology's effect as a response strategy. The analyses showed that after making a judgment error, it negatively affected all variables drastically: people reported less Willingness to provide information, Rapport, and Trust in the interviewer, and experienced more Secondary Victimization, compared to a situation where no error was made. Regarding the apology as a strategy to handle the error, it had a reparative effect on the participants in terms of Rapport and Trust, but not for Willingness to provide information.

This research contributes to the study of victimology and provides a first step in understanding the psychological impact of being double victimized by the police when presenting a complaint. The research that has been done on communication errors is mainly focused on the suspects (Oostinga et al., 2018a; 2018b). For this reason, focusing on the victim gives a twist on the object of study, and allows understanding of the phenomena of error making in a different setting, given that the victim's needs are different from those of the suspect at the time of reporting. Victim-centered studies help to contextualize the criminological phenomenon, which benefits the victims themselves and society in general because by placing them at the center of the analysis, the knowledge to understand crime and the justice system comes from their needs.

In addition, the results provide direct input on practices of how the police approach victims of sexual violence. It is crucial for law enforcement officers to understand and realize the impact they might have on the victims by what they say during an interview.

It is necessary to rethink practices that do not ensure the well-being of victims, and do not contribute to increasing their psychological comfort after experiencing a traumatic situation. For example, in the first instance, officers should be trained to avoid making judgment errors, since it affects the relationship with the victim at different levels and if they occur, apologizing seems to have a repairing effect; therefore, creating awareness about it could help reduce the distress. In this sense, knowing the impact that words have, both in the form of error and repair, allows for promoting practices that establish the creation of a safe space at the time of establishing the complaint for victims of sexual violence.

References

- Albertín, P. (2006). Psicología de la victimización criminal [Psychology of criminal victimization]. *Psicología Criminal* (pp. 245-276). Madrid: Pearson Educación
- Alarcon, G. M., Lyons, J. B., Christensen, J. C., Bowers, M. A., Klosterman, S. L., & Capiola, A. (2018). The role of propensity to trust and the five factor model across the trust process. *Journal of Research in Personality, 75*, 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.05.006>
- Archambault, J., Lonsway, K.A. (2020). *Interviewing the Victim: Techniques Based on the Realistic Dynamics of Sexual Assault*. End Violence Against Women International.
- Ariza, L. J., & Iturralde, M. (2015). *Una perspectiva general sobre mujeres y prisiones en América Latina y Colombia* [An Overview of Women and Prisons in Latin America and Colombia]. *Revista de Derecho Público* (35), 15. doi:10.15425/redepub.35.2015.10
- Baker, Z. G., Watlington, E. M., & Knee, C. R. (2020). The role of rapport in satisfying one's basic psychological needs. *Motivation and Emotion, 44*(2), 329–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-020-09819-5>
- Beristain, A. (1998). *Criminología y victimología: Alternativas recreadoras al delito* [Criminology and victimology: recreational alternatives to crime]. Colombia: Grupo Editorial Leyer.
- Berril, K. T., & Herek G. M. (1990). Primary and Secondary Victimization in Anti-Gay Hate Crimes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*(3), 401–413. doi:10.1177/088626090005003012
- Berthelot, E. R., McNeal, B. A., & Baldwin, J. M. (2018). Relationships between Agency-Specific Contact, Victimization Type, and Trust and Confidence in the Police and Courts. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 43*(4), 768–791. doi:10.1007/s12103-018-9434-x
- Beune, K., Giebels, E., Adair, W. L., Fennis, B. M., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2011). Strategic sequences in police interviews and the importance of order and cultural fit. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38* (9), 934–954. doi:10.1177/0093854811412170
- Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Sanders, K. (2009). Are you talking to me? Influencing behaviour and culture in police interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*(7), 597–617. doi:10.1080/10683160802442835

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). La dominación masculina [Male dominance]. Editorial Anagrama.
- Bonensteffen, F. , Zebel, S. , & Giebels, E. (2020). Sincerity Is in the Eye of the Beholder: Using Eye Tracking to Understand How Victims Interpret an Offender's Apology in a Simulation of Victim–Offender Mediation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 835. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00835>
- Campaniello, N., & Gavrilova, E. (2018). Uncovering the gender participation gap in crime. *European Economic Review, 109*, 289–304. doi:10.1016/j.eurocorev.2018.03.014
- Campbell, R. (1998). The Community Response to Rape: Victims' Experiences with the Legal, Medical, and Mental Health Systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*(3), 355–379. doi:10.1023/a:1022155003633
- Campbell, R., & Raja, S. (1999). Secondary Victimization of Rape Victims: Insights From Mental Health Professionals Who Treat Survivors of Violence. *Violence and Victims, 14*(3), 261–275. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.14.3.261>
- Campbell, R., Sefl, T., & Ahrens, C. E. (2004). The Impact of Rape on Women's Sexual Health Risk Behaviors. *Health Psychology, 23*(1), 67-74. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.23.1.67
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00171.x
- Campbell, R., Wasco, S.M., Ahrens, C.E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H.E. (2001). Preventing the “second rape”: Rape survivors' experiences with community service providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(12), 1239-1259. doi:10.1177/088626001016012002
- Castro, V., & del Carmen, M. (2002). La vida en la adversidad: el significado de la salud y la reproducción en la pobreza [Life in adversity: the meaning of health and reproduction in poverty]. *Región y sociedad, 14*(25), 257-269.
- Cappella, J. N. (1990). On Defining Conversational Coordination and Rapport. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*(4), 303–305. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli0104_5

- Corbacho, A., Philipp, J., & Ruiz-Vega, M. (2015). Crime and Erosion of Trust: Evidence for Latin America. *World Development*, 70, 400–415. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.04.013
- Creswell, J., Hanson, W., Clark Plano, V., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and Implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236–264. doi:10.1177/0011000006287390
- Corbetta, P. (2007). Metodología y técnicas de Investigación Social [Methodology and techniques of Social Research]. McGrawHill: Madrid
- Cronk, L. (2017). Culture's influence on behavior: Steps toward a theory. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 11(1), 36–52. doi:10.1037/ebs0000069
- Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: a selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(3), 203–214. doi:10.1016/s1359-1789(00)00043-4
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85-104.
- Díaz, L., Torruco, U., Martínez, M. y Varela, M. (2013). La entrevista, recurso flexible y dinámico [The interview, a flexible and dynamic resource]. *Investigación en educación médica* 2(7), 162- 167.
- Duke, M. C., Wood, J. M., Bollin, B., Scullin, M., & LaBianca, J. (2018). Development of the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations (RS3i), Interviewee Version. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 24(1), 64–79. doi:10.1037/law0000147
- D'Anniballe, J. (2010, February). *Understanding the neurobiology of trauma: The impact on children and adults*. Presentation at the Deepening Our Roots: Growing Meaningful & Sustainable Sexual Assault Services in Rural Communities conference, San Diego, CA.
- England Ministry of Justice (2013). *An overview of Sexual Offending in England and Wales: Statistics bulletin*. Home Office & Office of National Statistics
- Filipas, H. H., & Ullman, S. E. (2001). Social reactions to sexual assault victims from various support sources. *Violence and Victims*, 16(6), 673–692.
- Fisher, A., Boyle, J. M., Paton, J. Y., Tomporowski, P., Watson, C., McColl, J. H., & Reilly, J. J. (2011). Effects of a physical education intervention on cognitive function in young children: randomized controlled pilot study. *BMC Pediatrics*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2431-11-97>

- García-Pablos, A. (1988). *Manual de Criminología. Introducción y Teorías de la Criminalidad [Handbook of Criminology. Introduction and Theories of Criminality]*. Spain: Espasa
- Goldsmith, A. (2005). Police reform and the problem of trust. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(4), 443–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480605057727>
- Goudriaan, H., Wittebrood, K., & Nieuwebeerta, P. (2005). Neighbourhood Characteristics and Reporting Crime. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), 719–742. doi:10.1093/bjc/azi096
- Choi, J. J., and Severson, M. (2009). Children and youth services review “ what! what kind of apology is this”?: the nature of apology in victim offender mediation. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* 31, 813–820. doi: 10.1016/j.chilyouth.2009. 03.003
- Griffiths, A., & Milne, B. (2006). Will it all end in tiers? Police interviews with suspects in Britain. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research, regulation* (pp. 167–189). Willan Publishing.
- Greenwood, D., & Isbell, L. M. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism and the Dumb Blonde: Men’s and Women’s Reactions to Sexist Jokes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 341–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-2-00073>
- Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 137, 806– 81
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- Gutiérrez de Piñeres, C., Coronel, E., & Andrés Pérez, C. (2009). Revisión teórica del concepto de victimización secundaria [Theoretical review of the concept of Secondary Victimization]. *Liberabit*, 15(1), 49-58.
- Hawdon, J., & Ryan, J. (2011). Neighborhood Organizations and Resident Assistance to Police1. *Sociological Forum*, 26(4), 897–920. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2011.01289.x
- Helfferich, C., Kavemann, B., & Rabe, H. (2011). Determinants of the willingness to make a statement of victims of human trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation in the triangle offender–police–victim. *Trends in Organized Crime*, 14(2–3), 125–147. doi:10.1007/s12117-011-9125-1
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C. & Baptista, P. (2010). *Metodologías de la investigación [Research Methodologies]*. México, D.F.: McHill Graw

- Holmberg, U., & Christianson, S. K. (2002). Murderers' and sexual offenders' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to admit or deny crimes. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 20(1–2), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.470>
- Hough, M., & Roberts, J. (2005). *Understanding public attitudes to criminal justice*. McGraw-Hill Education:UnitedKingdom.
- Idriss, M. M. (2021). Abused by the Patriarchy: Male Victims, Masculinity, “Honor”-Based Abuse and Forced Marriages. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 088626052199792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260521997928>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (2017). *Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud Familiar 2016 Nacional y Regional 2016* [National and Regional Demographic and Family Health Survey].
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Información (2019). *Perú: Indicadores de Violencia Familiar y Sexual (2012-2019)*. [Peru: Family and Sexual Violence Indicators (2012-2019)]
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (2020). *Encuesta Nacional de Seguridad Pública Urbana* [National Urban Public Safety Survey],
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Información (2021). *Perú: Femicidio y Violencia contra la mujer (2015-2019)*. [Peru: Femicide and violence against women]
- Instituto Nacional Penitenciario (2021). *Informe Estadístico Penitenciario – Agosto* [Prison Statistical Report – August]
- Jabiles, J. (2017). “Victimas ideales” y discurso victimológicos en la persecución de delito de trata de personas en la ciudad de Lima. ["Ideal victims" and victimological discourse in the prosecution of the crime of human trafficking in the city of Lima.]
- Jackson, M. A., Valentine, S. E., Woodward, E. N., & Pantalone, D. W. (2016). Secondary Victimization of Sexual Minority Men Following Disclosure of Sexual Assault: “Victimizing Me All Over Again. . .” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 14(3), 275–288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-016-0249-6>
- Jaitman, L., Capriolo, D., Granguillhome Ochoa, R., Keefer, P., Leggett, T., Lewis, J. A., Mejía-Guerra, J. A., Mello, M., Sutton, H., & Torres, I. (2017). The Costs of Crime and Violence: New Evidence and Insights in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Inter-American Development Bank*. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0000615>
- Jansen, H. (2012). La lógica de la investigación por encuesta cualitativa y su posición en el campo de los métodos de investigación social [The logic of qualitative survey

- research and its position in the field of social research methods]. *Paradigmas*, (5)1, 39-72
- Jasso, G. (2005). Culture and the Sense of Justice. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(1), 14–47. doi:10.1177/0022022104271425
- Jones, J. S., Alexander, C., Wynn, B. N., Rossman, L., & Dunnuck, C. (2009). Why Women Don't Report Sexual Assault to the Police: The Influence of Psychosocial Variables and Traumatic Injury. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 36(4), 417–424. doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2007.10.077
- Kim, D., Park, K., Park, Y., & Ahn, J. H. (2019). Willingness to provide personal information: Perspective of privacy calculus in IoT services. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 92, 273–281. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.022
- Konradi, A. (2007). *Taking the stand: Rape survivors and the prosecution of rapists*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Koss, M. P. (2000). Blame, shame, and community: Justice responses to violence against women. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1332–1343. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.11.1332
- Koster, N. S. N., van der Leun, J. P., & Kunst, M. J. J. (2020). Crime victims' evaluations of procedural justice and police performance in relation to cooperation: a qualitative study in the Netherlands. *Policing and Society*, 30(3), 225–240. doi:10.1080/10439463.2018.1502290
- Kreuter, E. A. (2006). *Victim vulnerability: An existential-humanistic interpretation of a single case study*. United States: Nova Publishers.
- Lakens, D. (2022). Sample Size Justification. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.3326>
- Lagarde, M. (1992). Enemistad y sororidad: hacia una nueva cultura feminista [Enmity and sorority: towards a new feminist culture]. *Isis Internacional, Ediciones de las mujeres* (17), pp. 55-81
- Laxminarayan, M. (2015). Enhancing trust in the legal system through victims' rights mechanisms. *International Review of Victimology*, 21(3), 273–286. doi:10.1177/0269758015591721
- Lisak, D. (1994). The psychological impact of sexual abuse: Content analysis of interviews with male survivors. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 7(4), 525–548. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.2490070403>

- 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. doi:10.1177/0886260504272899
- Lowe, M. (2018), "Male sexual assault survivors: lessons for UK services", *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-07-2017-0308>
- Maier, S. L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories . . .": Rape victim advocates' perception of the revictimization of rape victims by the legal and medical systems. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 786-808 doi: 10.1177/1077801208320245.
- Maddox, L., Lee, D., & Barker, C. (2011). Police empathy and victim PTSD as potential factors in rape case attrition. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 26*, 112-117. doi:10.1007/s11896-010-9075-6
- Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a Thematic Analysis: A Practical, Step-by-Step Guide for Learning and Teaching Scholars. *AISHE-J, 9*, 3351.
- Mantilla, S.L. y Avendaño, B.L. (2020). Diseño y análisis psicométrico de un instrumento para evaluar victimización judicial en víctimas durante la etapa de denuncia. *Revista Jurídicas, 17*(2), 106-125. doi:10.17151/jurid.2020.17.2.6
- Martín-Fernández, M., Gracia, E., & Lila, M. (2018). Assessing Victim-Blaming Attitudes in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence against Women: Development and Validation of the VB-IPVAW Scale. *Psychosocial Intervention, 27*(3), 133-143. <https://doi.org/10.5093/pi2018a18>
- Mastrofski, S., & Parks, R. B. (1990). Improving observational studies of police. *Criminology, 28*(3), 475-496. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1990.tb01335.x
- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(1), 123-136. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.123
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- McDonald, S. & Tijerino, A. (2013). *Male survivors of sexual abuse assault: their experiences*. Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada
- Meyrick, J. (2006). What is good qualitative research?: A first step towards a comprehensive approach to judging rigour/quality. *Journal of Health Psychology, 11*(5), 799-808. doi:10.1177/1359105306066643.

- Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The Cognitive Interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16(4), 340–372. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020518>
- Milne, B., & Powell, M. (2010). Investigative interviewing. In J. M. Brown & E. A. Campbell (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of forensic psychology* (pp. 208–214). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511730290.026>
- Milne, B., Shaw, G., & Bull, R. (2007). Investigative Interviewing: The Role of Research. *Applying Psychology to Criminal Justice*, 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470713068.ch4>
- Ministerio de la Mujer y Poblaciones Vulnerables (2021). *Cartilla estadística julio 2021: Cifras de violencia contra las mujeres* [Statistical report July 2021: Data on violence against women]. AURORA. <https://portalestadistico.aurora.gob.pe/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Cartilla-Estadistica-AURORA-Julio-2021.pdf>
- Monroe, L. M., Kinney, L. M., Weist M., Dafeamekpor D., Dantzer, J. & Reynolds, M. (2005). The Experiences of Sexual Assault: Findings from a Statewide Victim Needs Assessment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(7), 767-776. doi:10.1177/0886260505277100
- Mujica, J. (2011). *Violaciones sexuales en el Perú 2000-2009. Un informe sobre el estado de la situación* [Rape in Peru 2000-2009. A report of the situation]. Lima: Promsex; ONU Mujeres; UNFPA
- Mujica, J. (2015). *Patrones de victimización en casos de violación sexual a mujeres adolescentes en el Perú*. [Patterns of victimization in cases of rape of adolescent women in Peru.]. Lima, Perú: Promsex, OMS, OPS.
- Myerscough, S., Lowe, B., & Alpert, F. (2006). Willingness to Provide Personal Information Online: The Role of Perceived Privacy Risk, Privacy Statements and Brand Strength. *Journal of Website Promotion*, 2(1–2), 115–140. doi:10.1080/15533610802104182
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2012). *The Impact of Sexual Violence*.
- New Zealand (2021). *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. Victims' trust and confidence in the criminal justice system*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice

- Nugent, W. R., Umbreit, M. S., Wiinamaki, L., and Paddock, J. (2001). Participation in victim-offender mediation and reoffense: successful replications? *Res. Soci. Work Pract.* 11, 5–23. doi: 10.1177/104973150101100101
- Oostinga, M. S. D., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2018-a). ‘An error is feedback’: The experience of communication error management in crisis negotiations. *Police Practice and Research*, 19(1), 17-30. doi:10.1080/15614263.2017.1326007
- Oostinga, M. S. D., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2018-b). Communication error management in law enforcement interactions: A receiver’s perspective. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 24(2), 134-155. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2017.1390112
- Oostinga, M. S. D., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2020). Communication error management in law enforcement interactions: A sender’s perspective. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(1), 39-60. doi:10.1177/0093854819870856
- Orth, U. (2002). Secondary Victimization of crime victims by criminal proceedings. *Social justice research*, 15(4), 313-325. doi:10.1023/A:1021210323461
- O’hear, M. (2019). Third-Class Citizenship: The Escalating Legal Consequences of Committing a “Violent” Crime. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 109(2), 165–235
- Oxburgh, G. E., Myklebust, T., & Grant, T. (2010). The question of question types in police interviews: A review of the literature from a psychological and linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijssl.v17i1.45>
- Patterson, D. (2011). The impact of detectives’ manner of questioning on rape victims’ disclosure. *Violence Against Women*, 17, 1349–1373. doi:10.1177/1077801211434725
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. California: Sage
- Pedraz, A. (2014). *Investigación cualitativa [Qualitative research]*. El Sevier: Barcelona.
- Pistrang, N., & Barker, C. (2012). Varieties of qualitative research: A pragmatic approach to selecting methods. *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology, Vol 2: Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, Neuropsychological, and Biological.*, 5–18. doi:10.1037/13620-001
- Reidy, D., Shirk, S., Sloan, C., & Zeichner, A. (2009). Men Who Aggress Against Women: Effects of Feminine Gender Role Violation on Physical Aggression in Hypermasculine Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. 10(1), 1–12. doi:10.1037/a0014794

- Rennison, C. A. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000* [NCJ 194530]. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Rossi, A., Dautenhahn, K., Koay, K. L., & Walters, M. L. (2017). How the timing and magnitude of robot errors influence peoples' trust of robots in an emergency scenario. In *International Conference on Social Robotics* (pp. 42-52). Springer, Cham. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-70022-9_5
- Rowe, D. (1995). Sex Differences in Crime: Do Means and Within-Sex Variation Have Similar Causes?. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 32(1), 84-100. doi: 10.1177/0022427895032001004
- Santos, L. (2020, July). *Nunca más tendrán la comodidad de nuestro silencio: Análisis de la respuesta institucional de la PUCP ante casos de acoso sexual*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation Coefficients. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 126(5), 1763–1768. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ane.0000000000002864>
- Schoenbachler, D. D., & Gordon, G. L. (2002). Trust and customer willingness to provide information in database-driven relationship marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 16(3), 2–16. doi:10.1002/dir.10033
- Schwendinger, J., & Schwendinger, H. (1980). Rape victims and the false sense of guilt. *Crime and Social Justice*, (13), 4-17.
- Scribner, R., Madsen, R., Townsend, A. (2021). Sexist comments & responses: Study Introduction and Overview. *Women & Leadership Project*, 38.
- Segato, R. L. (2003). *Las estructuras elementales de la violencia: Ensayos sobre género entre la antropología, el psicoanálisis y los derechos humanos* [The elemental frames of violence: Essays on gender between anthropology, psychoanalysis and human rights]. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes
- Shnabel, N., and Nadler, A. (2015). The role of agency and morality in reconciliation processes: the perspective of the needs-based model. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 24, 477–483. doi: 10.1177/0963721415601625
- Singer, A. J., Chouhy, C., Lehmann, P. S., Walzak, J. N., Gertz, M., & Biglin, S. (2019). Victimization, fear of crime, and trust in criminal justice institutions: A cross-national analysis. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(6), 822-844. doi:10.1177/0011128718787513

- Soria, M. Á. (1998). *Psicología y práctica jurídica* [Psychology and legal practice]. Spain: Editorial Ariel.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22(1), 459–487. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.459
- St-Yves, M. (2006). The psychology of Rapport: Five basic rules. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research, regulation* (pp. 87–106). Willan Publishing.
- Symonds, M. (1975). Victims of violence: Psychological effects and aftereffects. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35(1), 19-26. doi:10.1007/BF01248422
- Tamarit, J. (2013). Paradojas y patologías en la construcción social, política y jurídica de la victimidad [Paradoxes and pathologies in the social, political and legal construction of victimhood]. *INDRET: Revista para el Análisis del Derecho*, 1, 1-13
- Taber, K. (2018). The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The Nature of Rapport and Its Nonverbal Correlates. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(4), 285–293. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0104_1
- The Backbone Collective (2020). Victim-survivor perspectives on longer-term support after experiencing violence and abuse. *Ministry of Social Development* (New Zealand)
- Thomson Reuters Foundation (2017) The world's most dangerous megacities for women. England, United Kingdom, Thomson Reuters Foundation Website. <http://poll2017.trust.org/>
- Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1998). Social justice and social movements. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 595–629). McGraw-Hill.
- Tyler, T. R. (2011). Why people cooperate: the role of social motivation. *Policing*, 7(1), 109–112. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pas035>
- Torcuato, C., Alberti, M., Zapata Martelo, E., Pérez Nasser, E., y González Molotla, R. (2017). Género y sororidad en el desarrollo rural de mujeres en Libres, Puebla, México [Gender and sorority in the rural development of women in Libres, Puebla, Mexico]. *Intersticios. Revista sociológica de pensamiento crítico*, 11(2)

- Twyman, M., Harvey, N., & Harries, C. (2008). Trust in motives, trust in competence: Separate factors determining the effectiveness of risk communication. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 3(1), 111–120.
- United States Department of Justice (2015, December 15). Identifying and Preventing Gender Bias in Law Enforcement Response to Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence. <https://evawintl.org/wp-content/uploads/IdentifyingandPreventingGenderBiasinLawEnforcementResponseToSexualAssaultandDomesticViolence.pdf>
- Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., Coates, R. B., and Lightfoot, E. (2005). Restorative justice in the twenty-first century: a social movement full of opportunities and pitfalls. *Marquette Law Rev.* 89, 251–304
- Vanderhallen, M., Vervaeke, G., & Holmberg, U. (2011). Witness and Suspect Perceptions of Working Alliance and Interviewing Style. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 8(2), 110–130. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.138>
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (1996). *The color of justice: Race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. United States: Cengage Learning.
- Walsh, D., & Bull, R. (2011). Examining Rapport in Investigative Interviews with Suspects: Does its Building and Maintenance Work? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 27(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-011-9087-x>
- Weare, S. (2018). “I Feel Permanently Traumatized By It”: Physical and Emotional Impacts Reported by Men Forced to Penetrate Women in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(13–14), 6621–6646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518820815>
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychology Review*, 92, 548–573. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.92.4.548
- Weiss, K. G. (2008). Male Sexual Victimization. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(3), 275–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x08322632>
- World Health Organization (2018). Intimate partner violence against women in the Americas: An infographic. Violence against women is a human rights violation and a public health problem. Washington DC, United States. https://www3.paho.org/hq/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&slug=intimate-partner-violence-against-women-in-the-americas-2018&Itemid=270&lang=en

- Yeh, C. H., Wang, Y. S., Lin, S. J., Tseng, T. H., Lin, H. H., Shih, Y. W., & Lai, Y. H. (2018). What drives internet users' willingness to provide personal information? *Online Information Review*, 42(6), 923–939. doi:10.1108/oir-09-2016-0264
- Zimmer, S. (2021). Sex Differences in Crime. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.
- Zumalabe. (1990). La importancia de la experiencia subjetiva en el estudio de la personalidad. Un enfoque enomenológico-cognitivo [The importance of subjective experience in the study of personality. An enomenological-cognitive approach]. *The UB Journal of psychology*, 23-42.

Appendix A

Sociodemographic Data *English Version*

1. Gender Identity:

Female

Male

Non-binary

Other: _____.

2. Nationality:

Peruvian

Venezuelan

Other: _____.

3. Age: _____.

4. What's your highest level of education?

None/Early education

Elementary school

Highschool

Technic school

University

Postgraduate complete

5. Do you belong/do you volunteer in any organization or group related to feminist or gender issues? _____.

Información Sociodemográfica
Versión en español

1. Identidad de género: _____.
2. Nacionalidad: _____.
3. Edad: _____.
4. Nivel de instrucción más alto:

Ninguna/Educación Inicial
Primaria completa
Secundaria completa
Superior técnica completa
Superior universitaria completa
Posgrado completo
5. Ocupación: _____.
6. Ciudad de origen: _____.
7. ¿Pertenece/ es voluntario en alguna organización o grupo afín a temas feministas o de género? _____.

Appendix B

Interview Script *English Version*

Control Group

- Good morning/afternoon. My name is Maria Luisa Rispa, and I am the police officer in charge of this shift. Tell me, what brings you to the police station today?
- I understand; I need you to tell me a little more about it. When was the day of the incident?
- Do you remember what time it was?
- Now I will ask you a few routine questions, which are necessary to know more about the context.
- Who were you with?
- What were you doing?
- What were you wearing?
- I see, so you were doing _____, you were wearing _____, you were with _____.
- Ok, I got everything, we can proceed.
- Now I am going to ask you to tell me about the event as you remember it best.
- Is there anything else you would like to add?
- Thank you very much; we will keep you informed on how the case will proceed.

Experimental Group 1: Judgment error without an apology as a response

- Good morning/afternoon. My name is Maria Luisa Rispa, and I am the police officer in charge of this shift. Tell me, what brings you to the police station today?
- I understand; I need you to tell me a little more about it. When was the day of the incident?
- Do you remember what time it was?
- Now I will ask you a few routine questions, which are necessary to know more about the context.
- Who were you with?
- What were you doing?
- What were you wearing?
- *For females: Oh well, you exposed yourself, you should have avoided dressing like that. You have to be careful with how you dress – Judgment Error*
- *For males: But if you are a man, how could anyone do that to you? Look at you, you are man enough to be able to defend yourself, right?” – Judgment Error*
- Now I am going to ask you to tell me about the event as you remember it best.
- Is there anything else you would like to add?
- Thank you very much; we will keep you informed on how the case will proceed.

Experimental Group 2: Judgment error with an apology as a response

- Good morning/afternoon. My name is Maria Luisa Rispa, and I am the police officer in charge of this shift. Tell me, what brings you to the police station today?
- I understand; I need you to tell me a little more about it. When was the day of the incident?
- Do you remember what time it was?
- Now I will ask you a few routine questions, which are necessary to know more about the context.
- Who were you with?
- What were you doing?
- What were you wearing?
- *For females: Oh well, you exposed yourself, you should have avoided dressing like that – Judgment Error*
- *For males: But if you are a man, how could anyone do that to you? - Judgment error*
- *What I said was not the most appropriate thing to say. I shouldn't have said that, I'm sorry – Response strategy*
- Now I am going to ask you to tell me about the event as you remember it best.
- Is there anything else you would like to add?
- Thank you very much; we will keep you informed on how the case will proceed.

Appendix C

Guión de la Entrevista *Versión en Español*

Grupo de control

- Buenos días/tardes. Mi nombre es María Luisa Rispa, y soy la policía encargada de este turno. Dígame, ¿qué le trae hoy a la comisaría?
- Entiendo; necesito que me cuente un poco más. ¿Cuándo fue el día del incidente?
- ¿Recuerda qué hora era?
- Ahora le hare algunas preguntas de rutina, que son necesarias para conocer más del contexto ¿Dónde estaba usted?
- ¿Con quién estaba?
- ¿Qué estabas haciendo?
- ¿Qué llevaba puesto?
- Entiendo, entonces estabas haciendo _____, llevabas puesto _____, estabas con _____
- Lo tengo anotado, podemos proceder
- Ahora te voy a pedir que me cuentes el suceso como mejor lo recuerdes.
- ¿Hay algo más que quieras añadir?
- Muchas gracias; le mantendremos informado sobre el desarrollo del caso.

Grupo experimental 1: Error de juicio sin una disculpa como respuesta.

- Buenos días/tardes. Mi nombre es María Luisa Rispa y soy la policía encargada de este turno. Dígame, ¿qué le trae hoy a la comisaría?
- Entiendo; necesito que me cuente un poco más. ¿Cuándo fue el día del incidente?
- ¿Recuerda qué hora era?
- Ahora le hare algunas preguntas de rutina, que son necesarias para conocer más del contexto ¿Dónde estaba usted?
- ¿Con quién estaba?
- ¿Qué estabas haciendo?
- ¿Qué llevaba puesto?
- *Para mujeres: Bueno, tú te expusiste a que te pase eso, hubieras evitado vestirse de esa forma. Ten cuidado con cómo te vistes.*
- *Para hombres: Pero, si eres un hombre ¿cómo alguien te puede hacer eso? Mírate, eres lo suficientemente hombre para poder haberte defendido ¿no?*
- Ahora te voy a pedir que me cuentes el suceso como mejor lo recuerdes
- ¿Hay algo más que quieras añadir?
- Muchas gracias; le mantendremos informado sobre el desarrollo del caso.

Grupo experimental 2: Error de juicio con una disculpa como respuesta.

- Buenos días/tardes. Mi nombre es María Luisa Rispa y soy la policía encargada de este turno. Dígame, ¿qué le trae hoy a la comisaría?
- Entiendo; necesito que me cuente un poco más. ¿Cuándo fue el día del incidente?
- ¿Recuerda qué hora era?
- Ahora le hare algunas preguntas de rutina, que son necesarias para conocer más del contexto ¿Dónde estaba usted?
- ¿Con quién estaba?
- ¿Qué estabas haciendo?
- ¿Qué llevaba puesto?
- *Para mujeres: Bueno, tú te expusiste a que te pase eso, hubieras evitado vestirse de esa forma.*
- *Para hombres: Pero, si eres un hombre ¿cómo alguien te puede hacer eso?*
- *Lo que dije no fue la más apropiado. No debí haber dicho eso, lo siento. – Response Strategy*
- Ahora te voy a pedir que me cuentes el suceso como mejor lo recuerdes
- ¿Hay algo más que quieras añadir?
- Muchas gracias; le mantendremos informado sobre el desarrollo del caso.

Appendix D

Items

Versión Original - Español

N. de ítem	Ítem
2	El auxiliar judicial lo trato con respeto
9	El auxiliar judicial insinuó que lo sucedido fue por su culpa
11	El auxiliar judicial se enojó cuando usted le dijo que no comprendía lo que estaba preguntando
13	La persona que lo atendió lo hizo sentir ignorante
14	El auxiliar judicial le dio a entender que usted quería sacar provecho de la situación
15	Sintió discriminación por parte del auxiliar judicial
16	Se sintió humillado (a) por la forma como lo atendieron
22	Se sintió incomodo por la forma en que el auxiliar judicial le habló

Versión Adaptada – Español

N. de ítem	Ítem
2	La policía lo(a) trato con respeto
9	La policía insinuó que lo sucedido fue por su culpa
13	La policía que le atendió lo hizo sentir ignorante
15	Sintió discriminación por parte de la policía
16	Se sintió humillado(a) por la forma como lo(a) atendieron
22	Se sintió incomodo(a) por la forma en que la policía le habló

Items
Original Version - English

N of Item	Ítem
2	The paralegal treated you with respect
9	The paralegal insinuated that what happened was your fault.
11	The paralegal got angry when you told them that you did not understand what they were asking about.
13	The person who assessed you made you feel ignorant
14	The paralegal implied that you wanted to take advantage of the situation.
15	You felt discriminated by the paralegal
16	You felt humiliated because of the way you were treated
22	You felt uncomfortable because of the way the paralegal spoke to you

Adapted Version – English

N of Item	Ítem
2	The interviewer treated you with respect
9	The interviewer insinuated that what happened was your fault.
13	The person who assessed you made you feel ignorant
15	You felt discriminated by the interviewer.
16	You felt humiliated because of the way you were treated
22	You felt uncomfortable because of the way the interviewer spoke to you

Appendix E

Measures of trust, trustworthiness and performance Appraisal Perceptions *Original - English Version*

Ability
Top management is very capable of performing its job.
Top management is known to be successful at the things it tries to do.
Top management has much knowledge about the work that needs done.
I feel very confident about top management's skills.
Top management has specialized capabilities that can increase our performance.
Top management is well qualified
Benevolence
Top management is very concerned about my welfare.
My needs and desires are very important to top management.
Top management would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.
Top management really looks out for what is important to me.
Top management will go out of its way to help me.
Integrity
Top management has a strong sense of justice
I never have to wonder whether top management will stick to its word.
Top management tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.
Top management's actions and behaviors are not very consistent.*
I like top management's values.
Sound principles seem to guide top management's behavior.

Adapted - English Version

Ability
The police officer is very capable of performing its job.
I feel very confident about the police officer's skills.
The police officer is well qualified
Benevolence
The police officer is very concerned about my welfare.
My needs and desires are very important to the police officer
The police officer would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.
The police officer really looks out for what is important to me.
The police officer will go out of its way to help me.
Integrity
The police officer has a strong sense of justice
The police officer tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.
The police officer's actions and behaviors are not very consistent.*
I like the police officer's values.
Sound principles seem to guide the police officer's behavior.

Medidas de confianza, fiabilidad y valoración del rendimiento Percepciones
Original – Versión en Español

Capacidad
La alta dirección es muy capaz de realizar su trabajo.
Se sabe que la alta dirección tiene éxito en las cosas que intenta hacer.
La alta dirección tiene muchos conocimientos sobre el trabajo que hay que hacer.
Me siento muy seguro de las habilidades de la alta dirección.
La alta dirección tiene capacidades especializadas que pueden aumentar nuestro rendimiento.
La alta dirección está bien cualificada
Benevolencia
La alta dirección se preocupa mucho por mi bienestar.
Mis necesidades y deseos son muy importantes para la alta dirección.
La alta dirección no haría nada a sabiendas para perjudicarme.
La alta dirección se preocupa de verdad por lo que es importante para mí.
La alta dirección se desvive por ayudarme.
Integridad
La alta dirección tiene un gran sentido de la justicia
Nunca tengo que preguntarme si la alta dirección cumplirá su palabra.
La alta dirección se esfuerza por ser justa en el trato con los demás.
Las acciones y comportamientos de la alta dirección no son muy coherentes.
Me gustan los valores de la alta dirección.
Los principios sólidos parecen guiar el comportamiento de la alta dirección.

Adaptado - Version en Español

Habilidad
El agente de policía es muy capaz de realizar su trabajo.
Me siento muy seguro de las habilidades del agente de policía.
El agente de policía está bien cualificado
Benevolencia
El agente de policía se preocupa mucho por mi bienestar.
Mis necesidades y deseos son muy importantes para el agente de policía
El agente de policía no haría nada a sabiendas para hacerme daño.
El agente de policía se preocupa de verdad por lo que es importante para mí.
El agente de policía se desvive por ayudarme.
Integridad
El agente de policía tiene un gran sentido de la justicia
El agente de policía se esfuerza por ser justo en el trato con los demás.
Las acciones y comportamientos del agente de policía no son muy coherentes.
Me gustan los valores del policía.
Los principios sólidos parecen guiar el comportamiento del policía.

Appendix E
Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations 2 (RS3i) Interviewee
Version
English Version

N of Item	Statement
1	I think the Interviewer is generally honest with me.
2	The Interviewer did his/her job with skill during the interview.
3	The Interviewer respects my knowledge.
4	The Interviewer and I have our culture in common.
5	The Interviewer performed expertly during the interview.
6	I think that the Interviewer can generally be trusted to keep his/her word.
7	The Interviewer and I probably share the same ethnicity.
8	The Interviewer really listened to what I had to say.
9	I was motivated to perform well during the interview.
10	I feel I can trust the Interviewer to keep his/her word to me.
11	The Interviewer made an effort to do a good job.
12	The Interviewer acted like a professional.
13	The Interviewer paid careful attention to my opinion.
14	The Interviewer and I got along well during the interview.
15	The Interviewer and I worked well together as a team.
16	The Interviewer probably shares my culture.
17	I wanted to do a good job during the interview.
18	The Interviewer was attentive to me.
19	Communication went smoothly between the Interviewer and me.
20	The Interviewer was interested in my point of view.
21	I felt committed to accomplishing the goals of the interview.

Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations 2 (RS3i) Interviewee
Version
Versión Español

N de Item	Statement
1	Creo que la entrevistadora es generalmente honesta conmigo.
2	La entrevistadora hizo su trabajo con habilidad durante la entrevista.
3	La entrevistadora respeta mis conocimientos.
4	La entrevistadora y yo tenemos nuestra cultura en común.
5	La entrevistadora se desempeñó con expertise durante la entrevista.
6	Creo que en general se puede confiar en que la entrevistadora cumpla su palabra.
7	La entrevistadora y yo probablemente compartimos la misma etnia.
8	La entrevistadora escuchó realmente lo que tenía que decir.
9	Me sentí motivado/a para actuar bien durante la entrevista.
10	Creo que puedo confiar en que el entrevistador mantendrá su palabra.
11	El entrevistador se esforzó por hacer un buen trabajo.
12	El Entrevistador se comportó como un profesional.
13	La entrevistadora prestó mucha atención a mi opinión.
14	La entrevistadora y yo nos llevamos bien durante la entrevista.
15	La entrevistadora y yo trabajamos bien en equipo.
16	La entrevistadora probablemente comparte mi cultura.
17	Quise hacer un buen trabajo durante la entrevista.
18	La entrevistadora estuvo atenta a mí.
19	La comunicación entre la entrevistadora y yo fue fluida.
20	La entrevistadora se interesó por mi punto de vista.
21	Me sentí comprometido con el cumplimiento de los objetivos de la entrevista.

Appendix F

Emotional Support Protocol

This protocol is proposed within the framework of ethical care considerations to avoid any harm to the participants or any other process that could lead to re-victimization. The following procedures will be applied in situations in which they are considered pertinent; their objective is to provide emotional support in the case of a negative reaction in the participant to the topics addressed in the study.

The following procedures are proposed according to possible critical situations:

Upon the appearance of a significant degree of anxiety on the part of the participant:

- Make eye contact with the participant: place them in the present and encourage a sense of companionship to make her perceive a safe environment and feel that they can trust someone.
- Perform breathing exercises: inhale and exhale with the interviewer for a few minutes until the participant feels confident to continue the interview. Otherwise, offer to terminate her participation.

In the face of the participant's crying:

- Stop the interview and provide emotional support to calm the crying.
- Indicate that there will be a pause in the interview.
- Start the relaxation exercise with assisted breathing.
- Wait until the participants calm down. In the end, ask her how she feels and propose, once again, to end her participation.

In the event of excessive discomfort when saying the fundamental judgment errors:

- Pause the interview and ask if they want to keep with the study

Appendix G

Consent Form *English Version*

Welcome to this study on police interviewing! Please read the information on this page carefully.

Consent to Participate in Research. You are invited to participate in a research study. I am interested in understanding the dynamics of the interaction between police officers and the claimant. The data will be kept anonymous and confidential.

Duration. The study should last approximately 25-30 minutes.

Risks. There are no or minimal foreseeable physical or emotional risks involved. If you have already experienced something with any type of offense such as sexual assault, murder, or robbery, or feel uncomfortable with this topic, you might not want to engage in this study. You will encounter a fictitious scenario about being a victim of one of those crimes, and then you are asked to fill out a questionnaire. Once you have filled out the questionnaire, the study is completed.

Confidentiality. To ensure confidentiality, your responses will be anonymous (i.e., personal identifying information cannot be matched with your answers), and we only analyze group averages (i.e., individual performances will not be analyzed). The interview will be recorded with audio, so the researcher can analyze the information and write a report.

Recordings will be listened

Your rights. Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate in the study or stop participating at any time, for any reason, without consequences. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions or perform any task. In addition, your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from this study.

Contact. The present study is guided by Dr Miriam Oostinga and Dr Steven Watson. For further information or questions about this study, please contact Maria Luisa Rispa at m.l.f.rispahoyos@student.utwente.nl. For questions about the ethical approval and your rights you can reach ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl. This study is approved by the ethical committee of the Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences (BMS) of the University of Twente.

Have you read the above information and agreed to participate in this study?

Consentimiento Informado
Versión en español

Bienvenido/a/e a este estudio sobre la entrevista policial. Por favor, lea atentamente la información de esta página.

Consentimiento para participar en la investigación. Se le invita a participar en un estudio. Me interesa comprender la dinámica de la interacción entre los agentes de policía y la persona quien realiza una denuncia. Los datos se mantendrán anónimos y confidenciales.

Duración. El estudio debe durar aproximadamente 25-30 minutos.

Riesgos. No hay riesgos físicos o emocionales previsibles o son mínimos. Si has sido víctima o conoces a alguien que haya sido víctima de algún tipo de delito violento (agresión sexual, asesinato o robo) o se siente incómodo/a/e con este tema, es posible que no vaya a querer participar de este estudio. Se encontrará con un escenario ficticio donde se le pedirá que imagine ser víctima de un delito violento y luego se le pedirá que complete un cuestionario. Una vez que haya completado el cuestionario, el estudio habrá concluido.

Confidencialidad. Para garantizar la confidencialidad, sus respuestas serán anónimas (es decir, la información de identificación personal no puede cotejarse con sus respuestas) y sólo analizaremos las medias del grupo (es decir, no se analizarán las actuaciones individuales). La entrevista será grabada con audio para que la investigadora pueda analizar la información y escribir un reporte.

Sus derechos. Su participación es completamente voluntaria. Puede decidir no ser parte del estudio o dejar de participar en cualquier momento, por cualquier motivo, sin consecuencia alguna. Tiene derecho a negarse a responder a determinadas preguntas o a realizar cualquier tarea. Además, se mantendrá su privacidad en todos los datos publicados y escritos resultantes de este estudio.

Contacto. El presente estudio está siendo guiado por Dr. Miriam Oostinga y Dr. Steven Watson. Para más información o preguntas sobre el estudio, puede contactar a Maria Luisa Rispa al correo m.l.f.rispahoyos@student.utwente.nl. Por preguntas sobre la aprobación ética de la investigación y sus derechos, puede enviar un email a ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl. Este estudio fue aprobado por el comité de ética de la facultad de Comportamiento, Administración y Ciencias Sociales (BMS – siglas en inglés) de la Universidad de Twente.

¿Ha leído la información anterior y está de acuerdo en participar en este estudio?

Appendix H

Case *English Version*

For the present investigation, you are asked to imagine the following situation:

Last week you went out with your friends to a party, to your best friend's house. Since it was the first one after a long time without going out because of the COVID pandemic, you make an effort on your look; you put on the clothes that fit you best and that make you feel sexy and good about yourself. After dancing and singing, you start drinking. After a couple of hours, around 3:00 am, you start to feel dizzy after several shots and cannot walk well, so you sit down on the couch. Someone comes up to you, you talked for a while and kissed, this person tells you to go somewhere else, and you accept, so you end up away from your friends. Once in the room, this person asks you to have sex, and you do not want to, so s/he insists more and starts touching you. You keep refusing, and the other person takes advantage of their strength and starts groping you, grabbing you in your private parts. After struggling for a few minutes, the other person hears someone walking up and leaves. You are left alone in that place, and because of the tiredness of the day, the alcohol in your system and the discomfort, you fall asleep in bed. The next day, you wake up with bruises on your arms.

After several days of reflection, you decide to tell what happened to the person you trust the most. You then decide to go to the police station to file a complaint against the person who groped you.

You are now about to file the complaint with the police officer at the police station.

Caso
Versión en español

Para la presente investigación, se le pide que imagine la siguiente situación:

La semana pasada saliste con tus amigos/as a una fiesta, a la casa de tu mejor amigo/a. Como era la primera después de mucho tiempo sin salir a causa de la pandemia de COVID, te esfuerzas por estar bien arreglada/o; te pusiste la ropa que mejor te queda y que te hace sentir sexy y bien contigo mismo/a. Después de bailar y cantar, empiezas a beber. Al cabo de un par de horas, como a las 3:00 am, empiezas a sentirte mareado/a después de varios shots y no puedes caminar bien, así que te sientas en el sofá. Alguien se te acerca, hablaron un rato y se besaron, esta persona te dice para ir a otro sitio, y tú aceptas, así que acabas lejos de todos tus amigos que se encontraban en la sala. Una vez en el cuarto, esta persona te pide tener sexo, y tú no quieres, así que insiste más y empieza a tocarte. Te sigues negando, y la otra persona aprovecha su fuerza y empieza a manosearte, te agarra en tus partes íntimas. Después de forcejear durante unos minutos, la otra persona oye a alguien que se acerca caminando y se va. Tú te quedas solo/a en ese lugar, y por el cansancio del día, el alcohol en tu organismo y el malestar, te quedas dormido/a en la cama. Al día siguiente, te despiertas con moretones en los brazos.

Tras varios días de reflexión, decides contar lo sucedido a la persona en la que más confías. Entonces, decides ir a la comisaría para presentar una denuncia contra la persona que te manoseó.

Ahora estás a punto de presentar la denuncia ante el agente de policía de la comisaría.

Appendix I
Final Interview
English Version

Questions for all conditions

- How did you feel during the interview?
- Do you think the questions were adequate? Why?
- Would you go to the police again if a similar situation occurs? Why?
- Do you feel you could trust the police officer?
- Are you willing to give more information to the police officer if she would ask?
- Is there any suggestion to improve?

Questions for the scenarios

- In the control scenario: Do you think the interview would have been different if the police made a mistake?
- In the experimental scenario: Do you think the interview would have been different if no errors were made?
- In no apology scenario: Would it have helped if the interviewer apologized for the situation? How?
- In apology scenario: Do you think the apology helped you regain confidence in the interviewer? How? Why?

Entrevista Final
Versión en Español

Preguntas para todas las condiciones

- ¿Cómo te sentiste durante la entrevista?
- ¿Crees que las preguntas fueron las adecuadas? ¿Por qué?
- ¿Volverías a ir a la policía si una situación similar ocurre? ¿Por qué?
- ¿Sientes que puedes confiar en la agente de policía? ¿Por qué?
- ¿Estarías dispuesto/a a dar más información a la agente de policía si te la pidiera? ¿Por qué?
- ¿Tienes alguna sugerencia para mejorar?

Preguntas para las condiciones experimentales:

- En el escenario de control ¿Crees que la entrevista habría sido diferente si la policía hubiera cometido un error?
- En el escenario experimental sin disculpa: ¿Cree que la entrevista habría sido diferente si no se hubiera cometido ningún error?
- En el escenario con disculpas: ¿Crees que la disculpa te ha ayudado a recuperar la confianza en el entrevistador? ¿Cómo? ¿Por qué?

Appendix J

Overview of the Main Categories and underlying Categories with Example Quotes from participants

Main Category	Category	Definition of the category	Example Quotes
Impact on Willingness to provide information	Sense of justice	Decide to provide information, so it doesn't happen to someone else	“He's out there; what happened to me can happen to someone else. That's why I will continue to answer everything if she needs more information”
	Better not to say something	Decide not to provide information	“It makes no sense to give more information; after that comment, I felt that I better stay quiet”
Impact in Rapport	Lack of empathy	Feeling like the other person does not understand what they are going through	“The interviewer did not have much empathy. When you go to report, it sometimes seems that you bump into a wall...it seems like they do not understand what you are telling”
	Coldness	The more distant they perceived the interviewer, the less Rapport	“I felt like I was being asked what burger I wanted to buy, like a checklist”
	Not like a regular crime	Sexual assault is not like any other crime	“This is not just any crime; I was not telling her that my wallet had been stolen. It is a crime that threatens my body; I would have wanted more decency”
Impact on Trust in the interviewer	Do not care	Believing that the interviewer does not care enough about the criminal act	“Honestly expected more interest in what was happening to me; I felt that it almost didn't matter”

	Will not help	Believing that the interviewer will do nothing to help	“I felt it was useless to tell her what was going on because I knew she wouldn't do anything to help me”
Impact on Secondary Victimization	Guilt	Self-blame for the criminal act	“By going to the police and telling this kind of thing, you feel vulnerable, and when you come across those comments, they make you feel that what happened was your fault, and you start to think if you could have done something to avoid it”
	Humiliation	A feeling of loss of honor	“It's hard to tell these things, and it's harder when you talk to someone that doesn't look out for your interests; that kind of comment humiliates you a little bit”
	Embarrassment	Loss of dignity	“If I already felt ashamed to report that a woman had done something to me. The question regarding my manhood completely dislocated me; I felt embarrassed”
Apology's Impact	None	Believing that an apology does not improve the situation	“What am I supposed to do the apologies? When you are already in that situation of vulnerability, apologies are not something you can just say to repair. It's better not to say anything wrong from the start”
	Genuine	To have a positive effect, the apology must feel genuine.	“The apology can only repair the situation if it is not for wanting to look good with you, but it must be genuine. From the heart, not a protocolar one”