



Analysis of Victim Blaming Culture in Indonesia

Nadhira Putri Maharani

Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

Email: nadhira-maharani@stu.mmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The culture of victim blaming in sexual violence cases is a significant problem in Indonesia, influenced by patriarchal culture and traditional norms. This study aims to analyze the influence of belief in the Just World Assumption, acceptance of Modern Rape Myths, individual moral foundations, and views on the culture of honor on victim blaming tendencies. This study used an experimental quantitative approach involving 155 participants who were selected through valid questionnaires such as the Global Belief of Just World Scale, Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale, and Moral Foundation Questionnaire. Regression analysis showed that acceptance of Modern Rape Myths and Fairness/Reciprocity in Moral Foundation were the main predictors of victim blaming in Indonesia, while factors such as Authority/Subversion, Purity/Sanctity, and honor culture had no significant influence. The results of this study confirm the importance of a culture-based approach to reduce victim blaming culture in Indonesia, involving stakeholders such as religious leaders and the media to effectively change people's perceptions.

Keywords: Victim blaming, Indonesia, Acceptance of Modern Rape Myths, Moral Foundation Theory.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia continuously faces a significant issue of sexual harassment. According to the Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, approximately 338,496 sexual harassment incidents were recorded in 2021, marking a 50% increase from 2020 (Perempuan, 2021). Indonesians often more focus on blaming the victim rather than the perpetrator. Komnas Perempuan claimed that the 10-year delay in the ratification of The Law on Sexual Violence Crimes also perpetuated a continuous culture of victim blaming due to the lack of a legal framework for victim protection (Perempuan, 2021).

Victim blaming stems from the rape myth, a false belief about rapists, victims, and the assault itself (Burt, 1980). This phenomenon happens when victims are held accountable for their misfortune and becomes a common reaction to sexual harassment cases. In Indonesia, a link was found between the rise in victim blaming and a patriarchal culture due to power imbalances and traditional gender roles (Hamdy & Hudri, 2022). In the patriarchal gender role, women are forced

to be good wives and mothers within a male-dominated household while protecting their dignity. When women fail to meet these expectations, including becoming victims of rape, they will be stigmatised and judged due to an assumed inability to take care of themselves. Consequently, this culture makes many victims refrain from reporting incidents due to fear of shame and social stigma.

Since victim blaming culture has been normalised, numerous factors are recognised as significant determinants of victim blaming. In Europe and the United States, The Just World Belief, the Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA), the Moral Foundation Theory and the Honour Culture are known to be the common predictor (Canto et al., 2017). Despite extensive research has explored the correlation between these predictors with victim blaming tendencies, there is still very limited finding on this issue in the Indonesian context. Given the differences in traditional gender roles, for example how females, including rape victims, are perceived as vulnerable in Indonesian culture (Hamdy & Hudri, 2022) whereas in Western contexts, female victims are expected to show strength by resisting harassment (Milesi & Alberici, 2019), makes this study aims to investigate this phenomenon in depth by examining these variables within Indonesia context.

Just World Belief and Victim Blaming

The Just World Belief (JWB) emerges as one of the stronger predictors of victim blaming culture. The Just World Belief (JWB) concept posits that the world is just and fair and encompasses the idea that "people get what they deserve and deserve what they get" (Lerner & Simmons, 1966). An innocent victim is considered an alarming threat to people who believe in this assumption, thus they will reshape their perception towards a tragedy to convince themselves that the victims deserve to be attacked or violated. As a result, JWB becomes a justification for witnesses to belittle the harassment that the victim experienced, leading to denial behaviour towards the victim's suffering which then perpetuates continuous unjust behaviour (Lerner & Simmons, 1966). Due to this damaging nature to the victim, this assumption needs to be addressed meticulously.

Just World Belief (JWB) can be demonstrated in various contexts of victim blaming; in the case of revenge porn, it was argued that victims are often blamed for the non-consensual publication of their inappropriate images, with the assertion that they should not have carelessly engaged in sexual activity in the first place (Aborisade, 2022). This reflects another way used to defend rape culture that is presented by the JWB framework, which perceives the world as a fair place filled with justice and sexual offenders were not responsible for offending as the victim brought the tragedy for themselves (Stubbs-Richardson et al., 2018). The implications of this narrative could reinforce harmful social stigma as it's normalised continuous rape victim blaming culture. Moreover, research found that males with a stronger belief in the Just World are more likely to judge victims negatively, while females with a weaker belief in a Just world are more inclined to make negative judgments about victims. Theory also have claimed that victim blaming

driven by JWB has long-term consequences for the victim, therefore, it is necessary to consider all possible consequences. For instance, in the legal setting, it has been argued that jurors' decisions are less likely to side with the victim, most likely due to the law institution's distorted perspective of the victim (Foley & Pigott, 2000). As a result, this belief makes the victim feel guilty rather than protected which then contributes to underreported sexual harassment.

Although a lot of prior research about the correlation between JWB and victim blaming culture, most studies have been conducted from a Western perspective, particularly in the United States. This narrow focus creates a gap in understanding of how JWB and victim blaming occurs in non-Western cultural contexts. Given that cultural background and societal norms can significantly influence the relationship between JWB and victim blaming, there is a need for research conducted in another country, specifically in Indonesia, to provide a more comprehensive and culturally relevant understanding of these dynamics to reduce the culture.

The Acceptance of the Modern Myth about Sexual Aggression and Victim Blaming

Rape myths have shown significant influence on societal perceptions of sexual harassment, including the belief that victims are partly responsible for the assault (Ryan, 2019). Previous research has defined rape myths as prejudiced, false beliefs or stereotypes about the victim, the perpetrator, or the rape case itself (Burt, 1980). According to Grubb and Turner (2012), rape myths are more beneficial to the perpetrators, as they justify sexual assaults and can create biased versions of events that align with cultural stereotypes. For example, a common narrative blames the victim for their attire, suggesting they 'asked' to be raped or excuses the perpetrator's action due to their intoxicated state. Previous studies have found that Indonesia's patriarchal culture of sexual objectification and ambivalent sexism is strongly correlated with the acceptance of rape myths (Poerwandari et al., 2021). Additional factors, such as religious values and media portrayal, also play a significant role in the acceptance of rape myths within the society. Other research adds that in cultures where religion and norms are very important, any sexual activity, whether intentional or unintentional, is considered immoral and punishable, leading to victims being blamed for their misfortune instead of being protected (Avezahra & Chusniyah, 2022). Furthermore, Indonesian media often focuses on the detail of the victim rather than the perpetrator, thus justifies victim blaming by reinforcing rape (Avezahra & Chusniyah, 2022). Hence, the normalisation of the rape myth leads to Rape Myth Acceptance, a cognitive distortion that influences tendencies toward sexual aggression (Yapp & Quayle, 2018), which affect perception bias, making the victim seems responsible for their unfortunate events while diminishing the blame on the perpetrator.

In accordance with that, Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA) has been widely acknowledged in European societies and is strongly correlated with hostile sexual beliefs (Burt, 1980). A study by support this theory by showing people who scored highly on the RMA scale were more likely to place more responsibility on the rape victim rather than the perpetrator. While the outcomes of this scale were predictive, studies found some statistical drawbacks in utilizing RMA. Participants

who completed the RMA questionnaire often chose the extreme endpoints of the scale, leading to skewed results and reducing the precision of the scale. This issue complicates the evaluation of the intervention's effectiveness. Therefore, an enhanced version of the Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA), known as The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA), was developed (Gerger et al., 2007).

In AMMSA, a rape myth is described as a descriptive belief about sexual harassment that justifies men's sexually aggressive behavior towards women, thereby promoting a victim-blaming culture (Gerger et al., 2007). To measure the acceptance of modern rape myths and their consequences, the AMMSA scale was constructed, providing a more refined tool for assessing the issue, particularly in European countries (Gerger et al., 2007). Unlike RMA, a more subtle questionnaire was established, featuring less direct and more general questions related to victim-blaming beliefs rather than accusatory or straightforward ones, to reduce participant reluctance in completing the questionnaire (Gerger et al., 2007). The result indicates that individuals who score high on the AMMSA scale tend to shift their attention from the alleged perpetrator to the victim when determining guilt and blame (Süssenbach et al., 2017). Unfortunately, similar to Just World Belief, the normalisation of AMMSA also has legal consequences for rape victims, which is shown by juror decision-making as jurors relied on general public decisions and perspectives (Persson & Dhingra, 2022). Thus, it is important to explore AMMSA thoroughly to determine the strategic solution to tackle the issue.

Although the impact has been recognized, the contemporary studies that examined the correlation between AMMSA and victim blaming culture are limited in Asian countries, as this approach is more prevalent in European countries such as Germany, Italy and Spain (Milesi et al., 2020). Iran might be one of the very few Asia countries that have explored the positive relationship between AMMSA and victim blaming culture. However, Iranian culture encompasses distinct cultural and moral values, such as Qeirat (honor) and Namous (emotional response to a threat), which likely influence decision-making processes on the AMMSA scale, creating a gap with other Asian countries, including Indonesia, that have different cultural and moral values (Atari et al., 2020). Consequently, deeper research investigating the correlation between AMMSA and the victim blaming culture for rape cases specifically in Indonesia should be meticulously conducted.

Moral Foundation Theory and Victim Blaming

Moral Foundation Theory (MFT) has been found to have an association with the perception of a victim, including factors such as victim injury or victim stigmatization (Milesi et al., 2020). MFT is a framework that conceptualizes and organizes moral systems by categorizing their origins to provide society with an understanding of moral values from broader and more diverse perspectives. Haidt (2008) divided Moral Foundation Theory into five foundations that consist of (1) Harm/Care, (2) Fairness/Reciprocity, (3) Ingroup/Loyalty, (4) Authority/Subversion, and (5) Purity/Sanctity. Each foundation serves a distinct purpose and is rooted in different origins.

Harm/Care prioritizes compassion and goodwill, condemning aggression and inhumanity and often occurs in liberal culture. Fairness/Reciprocity highlights justice, rights, well-being, and protection and shows intentions to help outgroups in need. Ingroup/Loyalty focuses on commitment and community trust. Any form of betrayal and cheating were condemned in this foundation. Authority/Subversion revolves around hierarchy and social structure, promoting admiration and obedience, and those who contradict the system will be considered immoral. Lastly, Purity/Sanctity is common in conservative environments that prioritize virginity as the highest value of sexual activity and is closely linked to religious values and moral boundaries (Adiputra et al., 2022). Women usually scored higher in Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity and Purity/Sanctity foundations in the Moral Foundation questionnaires as these foundations endorse more empathetic behaviour (Graham et al., 2011).

Each foundation of MFT was classified into an individualizing and binding foundation (Davies et al., 2014). The individualizing foundation encompasses Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity foundations which focus on safeguarding individual rights (Graham et al., 2011). On the contrary, the other three foundations that are part of binding foundations are more leaning toward protecting collective or community rights (Graham et al., 2011). Moreover, binding foundations in MFT are known to be interconnected to victim blaming culture as this foundation is closely linked to rape myth acceptance. Among the three binding foundations of MFT, Authority/Subversion is the foundation most strongly associated with the rape myth acceptance and the victim blaming culture in Western countries (i.e. Europe and the USA). Authority/Subversion accentuates admiration for social hierarchies and structure (Baboli & Karimi-Malekabadi, 2020) which is closely tied to benevolent sexism and traditional gender roles and often result in blaming female victims of rape (Maria L Vecina & Piñuela, 2017).

While existing research has established the connection between MFT and victim blaming, it frequently focuses on Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) context (María L Vecina & Chacón, 2021) and shows a significant gap, as it overlooks other forms of sexual harassment, such as stranger or acquaintance rape, where moral foundations may contribute differently. Moreover, most studies are based on Western populations which creates questions on how the findings will differ in non-Western contexts. Indonesia's diverse cultural and religious values may have distinct perspective related to how MFT is linked to victim blaming. As suggested, the Moral Codes or Moral Foundations of other countries may differ significantly from or even conflict with Western Moral Foundations (Rai & Fiske, 2011). Thus, this research aims to fill these gaps by examining how MFT correlates with victim blaming in cases of stranger/acquaintance rape from the Indonesian citizens' point of view.

Honour Culture and Victim Blaming

In controversial situations, an individual's reaction and perception of an incident are varied depending on several factors. The CuPS (Cultural x Person x Situation) approach was proposed to highlight how cultural background, situational context, and personality traits psychologically

correlate with an individual's behavior toward an incident (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Culture can be categorised into face culture, dignity culture and honour culture (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Each culture emphasizes different subjects and values, which affect the individual way to perceive and respond to any issue. Face culture focuses on the importance of maintaining social harmony modesty, humility, and self-control within the hierarchical structure (Kim & Cohen, 2010). Dignity culture relies on regulation and systems by the institution, ensuring that individuals in this culture are equally protected and governed by the legal system (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Honour culture is centred on the significance of managing an individual's reputation to determine their self-worth, where an individual's value is closely associated with how other people perceive them (Nisbett, 2018). The difference between cultures influences an individual's tolerance towards aggression and justification towards offending behaviour.

It has been claimed that the Honour Culture is associated with victim-blaming tendencies, as individuals within this culture may go to great lengths, including blaming the victim, to protect their dignity and avoid the stigma of being labeled as a perpetrator, which could harm their reputation (Canto et al., 2017). In addition, those who adhere to the Honour Culture tend to exhibit a higher prevalence of domestic and sexual violence toward women, as this behavior is often perceived as a way to "man up" and protect their pride (Brown et al., 2018). Thus, this culture also can predict the prevalence of aggressive reactions when individuals feel their honour is violated as shown in Mediterranean and West Asian countries.

In Indonesia, honour holds great importance that puts reputation and social standing as priority (Yao et al., 2017). In some subcultures, like the Bugis, the customary law called *Siri'* that differentiates positive *Siri'* (honour) and negative *Siri'* (shame). While maintaining *Siri'* is mainly a male duty, Bugis people put women's sexuality as the most notable source of shame that potentially leads to negative *Siri'*. To protect their honour, Indonesians are more likely to remain silent or address issues within close circles to preserve harmony and protect their dignity (Magnis-Suseno, 1984). It is necessary to examine whether there is a link between the Indonesian traditional value of honour, its traditional way of protecting and its contribution to a culture of victim blaming like other countries since no study has yet explored how these factors affect victim blaming in rape cases. Thus, comprehensive research is needed to explore how Indonesia's honour culture impacts victim blaming, which could help develop culturally sensitive interventions.

Based on the background that has been described, the purpose of this study is to analyze the influence of belief in the Just World Assumption, acceptance of Modern Rape Myths, individual moral foundations, and views on the culture of honor on the tendency to blame victims of sexual violence in Indonesia. The benefit of this research is to provide sustainable solutions to reduce the culture of victim blaming in Indonesia, especially in cases of sexual violence, so that it can support the creation of a more just and inclusive society.

RESEARCH METHOD

Design

To determine the relationship between the predictors of victim blaming including the Moral Foundation, Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression, Belief in a Just World and Honour Culture, an experimental quantitative research design is implemented in this study. This research utilized The Global Belief of Just World Scale (GBJWB), The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) Scale, the Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ-30), and the Masculine Honour Belief Scale that were selected for their proven reliability in previous research and their suitability for exploring the relationship between the independent and dependent variables in this study.

Ethical Approval

This research has been approved by the Manchester Metropolitan University Ethical Board in July 2024.

Participants

A priori Power Analysis was conducted using G*Power Software (Version 3.1; Faul et al., 2007) indicating that a sample size of approximately 155 is required to robustly test the study hypothesis. Therefore, 155 Indonesian citizens residing in the UK and Indonesia were recruited to participate in this research through a poster shared on the official Instagram profile of the Indonesian Student Association Official in Greater Manchester.

Materials

Global Belief of Just World Scale (GBJWS)

The Global Belief of Just World Scale (GBJWS) is a widely recognized and validated instrument developed and originated from Lerner's Just World Belief (JWB). GBJWS indicates a high level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .93$) (Reich & Wang, 2015). This scale comprises a 7-item Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), the high score indicates participants' high belief in the Just World assumption. The items including "I feel that people get what they are entitled to have" and "I feel that rewards and punishments are fairly given".

The Acceptance of the Modern Myth of Sexual Aggression Scale

The Acceptance of the Modern Myth of Sexual Aggression (AMMSA), developed by (Gerger et al., 2007) was also administered. This scale contains 30 items with 7 Likert scales, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree) and indicates strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$) (Gerger et al., 2007). Participants with higher score suggests more acceptance towards a modern rape myth. AMMSA was chosen as this questionnaire was proven to be less straightforward or accusatory compared to the previous Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Gerger et al., 2007).

Moral Foundation Questionnaire - 30 (MFQ-30)

The English version of the Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ-30) consists of 32 items, asking participants to rate their relevancy of the given statement on a scale from 0 (not at all relevant) to 5 (extremely relevant). MFQ-30 has shown solid internal reliability ($\alpha = .84$). This

questionnaire was separated into two parts, the first part will examine participants' relevancy when making a moral decision (i.e. "Whether or not someone suffered emotionally) and the second part will see their agreement with the given statement (i.e Justice is the most important requirement for a society). Every MFT foundation questions are scored separately to determine an individual's tendency in each foundation (Graham et al., 2011).

The Masculine Honour Belief (MHB)

The Masculine Honour Belief scale was developed and introduced by (Saucier et al., 2015). This questionnaire comprises 35 items with 5 subscales that encompass provocation, masculine courage, protection, virtue, pride in manhood, socialisation, family, and community bond. Overall, this scale demonstrates a strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$) (Saucier et al., 2015). To score this questionnaire, all the contrary questions were reverse scored and the higher the average score is, the higher the participants' tendency to adhere to honour culture (Saucier et al., 2015).

Case Vignette

A case vignette was used to explore participants' tendencies in victim blaming within a given scenario. The scenario used was adapted from Abram et al. (2003) and required participants to rate their reaction towards the rape scenario on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (completely). This case vignette has shown a solid internal consistency ($\alpha = .81$). To make this scenario more appropriate to the Indonesian participants, the character names were modified to ensure cultural relevance.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through the online advertisement posted on the official Instagram account of the Indonesian Student Association in Greater Manchester. 155 Indonesian citizens residing in the UK and Indonesia who were willing to take part in the questionnaire accessed the series of questionnaires in the designated Qualtrics link. Before completing the questionnaire, participants were required to read the Participants Information Sheet (PIS) and provide consent through the same Qualtrics link. Upon agreeing to participate in the study, participants proceeded to complete the questionnaires, which comprise the Global Belief in Just World Scale (GBJWS), the Acceptance of Modern Myth about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) scale, the Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ-30), the Masculine Honour Belief Scale and the Case Vignette scenario. All instruments were selected for established validity and reliability by previous research. After submission, participants were redirected to the debriefing sheet, containing essential information, including the contact number of emergency mental health services contacts in the UK and Indonesia.

The data gathered through Qualtrics will be examined using multiple regression in SPSS to determine the result of the relationship between the continuous independent variables and their impact on the dependent variables, which can be visualized through scatterplots. This analysis aims to investigate what factors underlie the culture of victim blaming in Indonesia, with the

main objective of finding an effective practical solution to reduce the prevalence of victim blaming culture in the daily context.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

155 participants completed the questionnaire with 62 male participants (40.0%) and 93 female participants (60.0%). For the location, 46 participants (29.7%) reside in the United Kingdom and 109 participants are based in Indonesia (70.3%). A multiple linear regression analysis was utilised to investigate the correlation between independent variables, including Moral Foundation Theory, The Belief in a Just World, Acceptance of the Modern Myth of Sexual Aggression, and Honour Culture with victim blaming as the dependent variable. The assumption (linearity, independence, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity) checks were conducted before doing the regression analysis and the result indicates that the assumption was met (See Appendix 7.6).

After confirming that all assumptions were met, a multiple regression model was undertaken. The result indicates an overall correlation $F(8, 146) = 15.35, p < .001$ with an $R^2 = [.46]$ and R^2 adjusted = [.43] and 47% of the variance in predicting victim blaming. The analysis suggests that the primary predictor of victim blaming culture among Indonesian citizens both in the UK and in Indonesia are the Aggression of Modern Myth in Sexual Aggression ($\beta = .49$ $t(146) = 3.90, p < .001$) and the Fairness/Reciprocity foundation of Moral Foundation Questionnaire ($B = -.28$) $t(-.146) = -2.24, p < .05$). Specifically, an increase in the AMMSA and a decrease in the Fairness/Reciprocity scale values correspond to increases in victim blaming, with 95% CIs of [0.033, 0.101] and [-0.429, -0.025], respectively.

Interestingly, the foundation that was initially expected to be the significant factor — the Authority/Subversion of Moral Foundation Theory ($\beta = -.01$) $t(146) = -.09, p > .05$) and the Global Belief in Just World Scale ($\beta = -.14$) $t(146) = -1.17, p > .05$) as well as the Harm/Care foundation ($\beta = -.05$) $t(146) = .60, p > .05$), The Purity/Sanctity foundation of Moral Foundation Questionnaire ($\beta = .18$) $t(146) = 1.95, p > .001$) and the Honour Culture ($\beta = 0.2$) $t(146) = 1.8, p > .001$) do not significantly correlate with the occurrence of victim blaming culture in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the Ingroup/Loyalty aspect of the Moral Foundation Theory shows that this foundation can decrease the inclination of victim blaming ($\beta = .07$) $t(146) = .77, p > .05$). The result demonstrates that only the hypothesis that claimed AMMSA and one aspect of Moral Foundation theory, Fairness/Reciprocity foundation, as the main predictor of victim blaming is proven in this study. Refer to Table 1. for further details.

Table 1. Regression Table

Predictor	β	t	p	95% CI for B
(Constant)	—	3.854	<.001	[7.475, 23.212]
MFQ Harm/Care	0.050	0.540	0.590	[-0.167, 0.292]
MFQ Fairness/Reciprocity	-0.270	-2.224	0.028	[-0.429, -0.025]

Predictor	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI for <i>B</i>
MFQ Ingroup/Loyalty	0.069	0.769	0.443	[-0.108, 0.245]
MFQ Authority/Subversion	-0.006	-0.088	0.930	[-0.208, 0.190]
MFQ Purity/Sanctity	0.179	1.950	0.053	[-0.002, 0.345]
Just World Belief	-0.139	-1.167	0.245	[-0.254, 0.065]
Acceptance of Modern Myth about Sexual Aggression	0.483	3.891	<.001	[0.033, 0.101]
Masculine Honour Belief	0.203	1.802	0.074	[-0.003, 0.073]

To summarize, this study confirms that the regression model was appropriate for examining the interrelationships between predictors of victim blaming culture. The results highlight the hypothesis that The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression and the Fairness/Reciprocity foundation of Moral Foundation Theory, in shaping attitudes towards victims is approved. Therefore, addressing these moral foundations and beliefs is necessary to reduce victim blaming in Indonesia.

In Indonesia, incidents of sexual harassment are rising annually, thus understanding, and addressing this issue is crucial to mitigate the phenomenon. The normalisation of victim blaming as a common reaction in Indonesian sexual harassment cases motivates the researcher to explore its underlying factors and to develop strategies to prevent and reduce such occurrences. Victim blaming in Indonesia is strongly influenced by its conservative and patriarchal culture. This culture often places responsibility on women and blames them for their inability to protect themselves (Hamdy & Hudri, 2022); (Kartika, 2019). As a result, rape victims face social stigma, as being raped is viewed as shameful and immoral. Moreover, the lack of a strong legal framework and institutional support worsens the issue, leaving many cases unreported (Adiputra et al., 2022).

Interestingly, cultural differences between Indonesia and Western countries create a difference in the result of predictors with previous studies. For instance, the traditional gender roles, play a significant part in the perception towards victims. In Indonesia, women, including female victims are often seen as vulnerable (Hamdy & Hudri, 2022). While in Western cultures, female victims are expected to resist harassment (Milesi & Alberici, 2019). These different expectations lead to varied research findings. The result of this study exhibits how the Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) and the Fairness/Reciprocity foundation from Moral Foundation theory are the only significant predictors of victim blaming in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the Authority/Subversion foundation and Just World Belief, that previously considered strong predictors, as well as The Purity/Sanctity and the Harm/Care foundation of MFT and the Culture of Honour do not significantly impact the victim blaming culture in the country. Hence, understanding these cultural factors is crucial for developing solutions that fit Indonesia's unique context.

The finding shows AMMSA as the most significant predictor of victim blaming in Indonesia. This finding aligns with the suggestion that Indonesia's patriarchal culture often

objectifies women, thereby promoting the acceptance of rape myths (Poerwandari et al., 2021). Such acceptance shapes people's cognitive and behavioural responses, influencing their perceptions of sexual harassment severity and promoting victim blaming. Additionally, religious values also affect rape myth acceptance in Indonesian society. It has been added that in cultures where religion and norms hold significant importance, any sexual activity, whether consensual or not, is perceived as immoral. This often leads to victims being blamed for their actions or appearance rather than being protected, as they are believed to have violated religious rules (Avezahra & Chusniyah, 2022). The way of media portrays victims of rape, focusing on their attributes, also makes the rape myth acceptance become a common occurrence that exacerbates victim blaming in Indonesia (Avezahra & Chusniyah, 2022). This suggests that Indonesian's strong tendency in accepting rape myth due to its strong belief in cultural norms and religious values influences their inclination to do victim blaming.

This research indicates that, unlike earlier studies that highlighted the importance of Authority/Subversion, Fairness/Reciprocity plays more crucial role in victim blaming in Indonesia. The Fairness/Reciprocity foundation is based on justice principles that emphasise human rights, justice, and protection. It was found that women are more likely to score highly in this foundation, demonstrating greater empathy for others (Graham et al., 2011). Given the majority of this study are female, the outcome reflects how participants feel towards or as the victim of rape and the injustice felt by Indonesian women, who are often seen as inferior in a patriarchal society. Differences in study subjects also influence these findings. While previous research focused on Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and found a significant link between Authority/Subversion and victim blaming (María L Vecina & Chacón, 2021), this study examines acquaintance/stranger rape, highlighting more about gender inequality.

The gender of the participants also affects the rejected hypothesis about Just World. Studies show that women tend to believe less in a Just World and empathise more with victims, while men are more likely to judge victims negatively. This demonstrates how the female perspective can influence the likelihood of not using the Just World Belief to justify blaming the victim of rape. Meanwhile, the Harm/Care does not affect the significance towards victim blaming in Indonesia. It can be hypothesised that because Indonesia is a conservative country, meanwhile, this foundation tends to occur in a more liberal culture.

Another dismissed hypothesis is that the Purity/Sanctity Foundation and the Culture of Honour which are not significantly correlate with victim blaming tendencies among Indonesians. The Purity/Sanctity foundation is typically prevalent in conservative societies and is closely linked to religious beliefs and moral boundaries (Adams et al., 2014). While Indonesians place great importance on virginity and disapprove of premarital sex which is essential in the Purity/Sanctity foundation (Crawford et al., 2014), victim blaming is seen as a moral boundary violation, which is also often avoided by those with strong religious convictions. This may explain why the Purity/Sanctity foundation does not correlate with the victim blaming culture in Indonesia.

Moreover, the Honour Culture is another factor linked to victim blaming that was not evident among the Indonesian participants in this research. Their earlier study, people in other countries who follow the Honour Culture, particularly men in Mediterranean and West Asian countries, often resort to violence to regain their dignity. However, Indonesians are more inclined to adhere to their traditional and religious values by avoiding conflict and keeping themselves silent to maintain their honour and moral standing (Magnis-Suseno, 1984). Therefore, it can be assumed that a questionnaire focused on aggressive responses to resolve issues may not be suitable for Indonesian participants, as they are more likely to remain silent rather than act violently. Lastly, the result exhibits that the Ingroup/Loyalty decreased the victim blaming tendency among participants. Thus, as the participants are mostly female, the result may indicate the feeling of loyalty to other female victims to avoid betrayal.

Ultimately, this research provides a different worldview and promotes new insights into the factors that underlie the occurrence of victim blaming, particularly in patriarchal and religious societies that strongly adhere its own traditional culture (Adat) like Indonesia. It implies that the approach to reduce the occurrence of victim blaming also must be differentiated from other countries to create an appropriate solution that is suitable to the culture, values and religious beliefs.

CONCLUSION

To summarise, victim blaming in sexual harassment cases is common in Indonesia, a religious and patriarchal society with distinct gender roles. The main predictors are the Acceptance of the Modern Myth of Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) and the Fairness/Reciprocity foundation. Surprisingly, factors like the Authority/Subversion foundation and Belief in a Just World, as well as The Honour Culture, the Purity/Sanctity foundations and the Harm/Care foundation do not have a significant impact on the culture. The Ingroup/Loyalty foundation, however, can decrease the possibility of the culture occurrence. Engaging stakeholders, such as religious leaders and the media, could help change public perceptions. Future research should use translated questionnaires to ensure clarity and accurate responses.

REFERENCES

- Aborisade, R. A. (2022). Image-based sexual abuse in a culturally conservative Nigerian society: Female victims' narratives of psychosocial costs. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 1–13.
- Adams, T. G., Stewart, P. A., & Blanchar, J. C. (2014). Disgust and the politics of sex: Exposure to a disgusting odorant increases politically conservative views on sex and decreases support for gay marriage. *PloS One*, 9(5), e95572.
- Adiputra, S., Awanisa, A., & Purba, Y. H. (2022). The Urgency of the Law on Sexual Violence Criminal Act in Combating Sexual Violence in Indonesia. *Ius Poenale*, 3(1), 25–38.
- Atari, M., Graham, J., & Dehghani, M. (2020). Foundations of morality in Iran. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 41(5), 367–384.
- Avezahra, M. H., & Chusniyah, T. (2022). The internalisation and normalisation process of rape myth acceptance: A qualitative study. *Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 55–73.
- Baboli, M. F., & Karimi-Malekabadi, F. (2020). Qeirat values and victim blaming in Iran: The mediating effect of culture-specific gender roles. *Preprint Available at PsyArxiv*.
- Brown, R. P., Baughman, K., & Carvallo, M. (2018). Culture, masculine honor, and violence toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(4), 538–549.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217.
- Canto, J. M., Perles, F., & San Martín, J. (2017). Culture of honour and the blaming of women in cases of rape/La cultura del honor y la inculpación de la mujer en casos de violación. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(1), 80–107.
- Crawford, J. T., Inbar, Y., & Maloney, V. (2014). Disgust sensitivity selectively predicts attitudes toward groups that threaten (or uphold) traditional sexual morality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 70, 218–223.
- Foley, L. A., & Pigott, M. A. (2000). Belief in a just world and jury decisions in a civil rape trial. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(5), 935–951.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2007). The acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale: Development and validation in German and English. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 33(5), 422–440.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366.
- Hamdy, M. K., & Hudri, M. (2022). Gender Based Violence: the Relationship of Law and Patriarchy in Indonesia. *EMPATI: Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial*, 11(2), 73–85.
- Kartika, D. A. (2019). *Mengapa dampak #MeToo tidak sampai ke Indonesia?* Theconversation.Com. <https://theconversation.com/mengapa-dampak-metoo-tidak-sampai-ke-indonesia-113038>
- Kim, Y.-H., & Cohen, D. (2010). Information, perspective, and judgments about the self in face and dignity cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(4), 537–550.
- Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 203.
- Leung, A. K.-Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: individual differences

- and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 507.
- Magnis-Suseno, F. (1984). *Etika Jawa. Sebuah Analisa Falsafi tentang Kebijakan Hidup Jawa*. Penerbit PT Gramedia.
- Milesi, P., & Alberici, A. I. (2019). "Frontrunners": An Investigation of the Discursive Construction of "Women Politicians" Intersectional Identity. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 15(3), 459.
- Milesi, P., Süßenbach, P., Bohner, G., & Megías, J. L. (2020). The interplay of modern myths about sexual aggression and moral foundations in the blaming of rape victims. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(1), 111–123.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2018). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Routledge.
- Perempuan, K. (2021). *Perempuan Dalam Himpitan Pandemi: Lonjakan Kekerasan Siber, Perkawinan Anak, Dan Keterbatasan Penanganan Di Tengah Covid-19, Catatan Tahunan Kekerasan Terhadap Perempuan Tahun 2020* (Catatan Ta).
- Persson, S., & Dhirga, K. (2022). Consequences of Rape Myth Acceptance on the Criminal Justice System and Women Subjected to Rape. In *Rape Myths: Understanding, Assessing, and Preventing* (pp. 53–82). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Poerwandari, E. K., Utami, C. P., & Primasari, I. (2021). Ambivalent sexism and sexual objectification of women as predictors of rape myth acceptance among male college students in Greater Jakarta. *Current Psychology*, 40(12), 5909–5918.
- Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118(1), 57.
- Reich, B., & Wang, X. (2015). And justice for all: Revisiting the global belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 78, 68–76.
- Ryan, K. M. (2019). Rape mythology and victim blaming as a social construct. *Handbook of Sexual Assault and Sexual Assault Prevention*, 151–174.
- Saucier, D. A., Strain, M. L., Hockett, J. M., & McManus, J. L. (2015). Stereotypic beliefs about masculine honor are associated with perceptions of rape and women who have been raped. *Social Psychology*.
- Stubbs-Richardson, M., Rader, N. E., & Cosby, A. G. (2018). Tweeting rape culture: Examining portrayals of victim blaming in discussions of sexual assault cases on Twitter. *Feminism & Psychology*, 28(1), 90–108.
- Süßenbach, P., Eyssel, F., Rees, J., & Bohner, G. (2017). Looking for blame: Rape myth acceptance and attention to victim and perpetrator. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(15), 2323–2344.
- Vecina, María L, & Chacón, J. C. (2021). The extreme moral diversity of men convicted of violence against their partners: four profiles based on the five moral foundations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(15–16), 7393–7413.
- Vecina, Maria L, & Piñuela, R. (2017). Relationships between ambivalent sexism and the five moral foundations in domestic violence: Is it a matter of fairness and authority? *The Journal of Psychology*, 151(3), 334–344.
- Yao, J., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J., Aslani, S., & Semnani-Azad, Z. (2017). A measurement model for dignity, face, and honor cultural norms. *Management and Organization Review*, 13(4), 713–738.

Yapp, E. J., & Quayle, E. (2018). A systematic review of the association between rape myth acceptance and male-on-female sexual violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 41, 1–19.

Copyright holder:

Nadhira Putri Maharani (2024)

First publication right:

Asian Journal of Engineering, Social and Health (AJESH)

This article is licensed under:

