Sexual Harassment in Public Spaces and Police Patrolling: Experimental Evidence from Urban India*

Sofia Amaral⁺Girija Borker[‡]Nathan Fiala[§]Anjani Kumar[¶]Nishith Prakash^{||}Maria Micaela Sviatschi**

October 2022

We implement a randomized controlled trial to evaluate the impact of the world's largest street patrolling program targeting sexual harassment in public space on women's victimization in Hyderabad, India. Using a novel high-frequency observation exercise to collect measures of sexual harassment at 350 hotspots, we show that visible police presence reduces severe forms of sexual harassment by 27 percent and thus, improves women's mobility behaviour. In particular, we find that women are less likely to avoiding a particular street to prevent sexual harassment. To explain the null effects on mild forms of sexual harassment, we exploit heterogeneity in police officers' attitudes towards sexual harassment and design an artefactual field experiment to understand police behavior and biases. We find that, on average, police officers' tolerance and will-ingness to sanction are lower for mild forms of sexual harassment. In line with this result, we find a reduction in less severe cases of sexual harassment cases. Overall, addressing sexual harassment in urban places through the lens of policing poses a significant challenge due to the nature of the crime and police officers' potential biases.

Keywords: Sexual harassment, policing, female mobility, social norms

JEL Codes: J24, K42, J16, C93, C91

^{*}We are grateful to the Hyderabad City Police for the collaboration and for sharing part of the data used in this project. In particular, we thank the head of SHE Teams, Ms. Shikha Goel, Additional Commissioner of Police (Indian Police Service), and the numerous police officers for providing invaluable logistical and contextual support. We appreciate the valuable comments and suggestions at various stages from Prashant Bharadwaj, Chris Blattman, Jennifer Doleac, Oeindrila Dube, Thomas Fujiwara, Seema Jayachandran, Asim Khwaja, Florence Kondylis, Marcus Holmlund, Ilyana Kuziemko, Aprajit Mahajan, Rohini Pande, Heidi Stoeckl, Owen Zidar, Gautam Rao, and seminar participants at the NBER Development, ViCE Seminar, Princeton University, World Bank, and the Center for Economic Research in Pakistan. For invaluable fieldwork coordination and superb work as research assistants, we thank Bruno Jimenez, Aishwarya Kekre, Paulo Matos, Aditi Priya, Xinyu Ren, Jagannath R, and field staff from IFMR. This work was supported by the JPAL Crime and Violence Initiative, Princeton University, the Leibniz Association, the Human Rights Institute at the University of Connecticut, and by UK aid from the UK government through the ieConnect for Impact Program. The views expressed here do not necessarily represent the views of our partners. Ethics approval was obtained from Princeton University. A pre-analysis is available in the American Economics Association RCT Registry: AEARCTR-0005137.

[†]ifo Institute, Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich, and CESifo. Email: amaral@ifo.de

[‡]DIME, World Bank & IZA. Email: gborker@worldbank.org

⁸University of Connecticut. Email: nathan.fiala@uconn.edu

[¶]Indian Police Service.

¹¹ University of Connecticut, Northeastern University, CESifo, IZA, CReAM, HiCN & GLO. Email: n.prakash@northeastern.edu

^{**}Princeton University, CESifo & NBER. Email: msviatschi@princeton.edu

1 Introduction

Sexual harassment in public space is a major problem worldwide with more than 50 percent of women worldwide have experienced street harassment in their lifetime and about 82 percent report avoiding certain areas of their city because of harassment or the fear of it (ActionAid, 2016; Livingston, 2015).¹ It not only limits women's physical mobility, but has far reaching implications on their education choices, and labor force participation (Borker, 2021; Chakraborty et al., 2018; Jayachandran, 2021; Siddique, 2018). Despite the well-known detrimental impact that gendered crime has on its victims (Bindler et al., 2020; Lindo et al., 2018; Rickne and Folke, 2020), research on sexual harassment in public spaces is still limited (Moser, 2012).² This paper uses a randomized controlled trial to evaluate the impact of the world's largest street patrolling program targeting sexual harassment in public space on women's victimization in India.

Research on sexual harassment in public spaces and addressing this pervasive issue is challenging. First, sexual harassment is extremely difficult to measure making the scale of the problem unknown. The measurement problem exists both because sexual harassment is rarely reported to the police, and data available from the administrative databases are prone to measurement error and reporting bias (Saguy and Rees, 2021). Second, sexual harassment is also highly frequent and socially accepted by many, making the level of incidence a byproduct of prevalent gender norms and probability of punishment (Jayachandran, 2021). A potential solution to street harassment is to use the existing police force to apprehend perpetrators and make public spaces safer for women. However, as a related challenge, there is a lack of understanding of how attributes of first responders – their skills, preferences, and norms – interact with sexual harassment in public spaces. In particular, harassment is socially accepted, any policing intervention to tackle street harassment is making the socially accepted accepted accepted by the public spaces.

¹Street harassment includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, non-verbal or physical sexual conduct by a stranger in a public space. Street harassment is a major problem worldwide, for example, 86 percent of women living in cities in Brazil, 75 percent in the UK and 79 percent in India have faced some form of harassment in public (ActionAid, 2016).

²Most of the research has focused on the effects of gendered crime indoors such as at the workplace, universities, and households.

rassment would require that police officers' views and skills be aligned with the objective of addressing sexual harassment.

This paper aims to address these challenges by analyzing a novel policing program to tackle sexual harassment in public spaces in Hyderabad, India. The program, Safety, Health and Environment police unit (SHE Teams), is a hotspot policing patrol that specifically aims to detect and penalize sexual harassment in public spaces. The SHE Teams policing program serves about 7 million individuals making it one of the largest policing interventions in the world directly addressing sexual harassment in public spaces. We partnered with the Hyderabad City Police (HCP) to design and implement a firstof-its-kind randomized control trial, randomizing not only exposure to the SHE teams patrolling but also the officers' visibility across hotspots.³ From a sample of 350 newly identified sexual harassment hotspots by the HCP, the research team implemented a cluster randomized control trial consisting of three arms. The first arm is the control, which is not exposed to any SHE team patrolling. The second arm has undercover SHE team patrols-officers dressed in civilian clothing. The third arm of hotspots has uniformed SHE team patrols–officers in regular visible police uniforms. The gender and experience composition of officers is fixed across patrol teams. There are 150 hotspots in the control group and 100 hotspots in each of the treatment arms. In treated hotspots, we assigned SHE team officers to patrol the areas for 15 to 20 minutes per day, 6 days per week from September 2019 to March 2020.⁴

This design allows us to understand not only the effect of patrolling but also if the effects are driven by changes in citizens' and perpetrators' behavior by anticipating police presence – deterrence effect– or by police incapacitating criminals whereby they are removed from the scene of crime. Undercover police patrolling can be effective with the expectation that officers would be better able to identify harassment since they can move around without being noticed and this would lead to incapacitation effects. Uniformed

³The original program only had undercover or plain-clothes officers and the research team jointly with HCP agreed to include a visible angle.

⁴This type of patrolling is in line with patrols implemented in other settings such as the US (Telep et al., 2014) and the UK (Blanes i Vidal and Mastrobuoni, 2018). For a review, see (Braga et al., 2019).

police patrolling on the other hand will have both incapacitation effects and deterrence effects.

To better understand if police officers' views towards sexual harassment matter to reduce street harassment, we collect individual measures of police' skills in relation to harassment and attitudes related to harassment. We collect this data through surveys and an artefactual field experiment with police officers, including those of the intervention. In particular, these data allow us to understand how police performance and attitudes interact with the efficacy of increased police patrolling by severity of harassment.

To quantify the causal effect of SHE teams on sexual harassment and overcome key measurement issues, we develop a new observation-based measure of harassment. Female enumerators roam the hotspots and spillover areas and record observational counts of victims and instances of harassment on their phones, both when officers are patrolling and when they are not. We trained enumerators to identify the entire spectrum of the types of harassment, ranging from mild to severe cases following the same training as that of HCP to SHE teams police officers.⁵ This measure allows us to solve many of the problems associated with measurement, including stigma (enumerators are recording harassment that *other* women face), reporting issues (these are not official reports, so there is no cost of recording), and experimenter demand effects (the enumerators were unaware of the intervention).

Using the novel observational measure, our first main finding is that uniformed police patrolling reduces severe forms of sexual harassment by 27%. In contrast, hotspots assigned to undercover police patrolling experienced no reduction in street sexual harassment relative to the control group, highlighting the importance of deterrence effects. We also find that incapacitation effects are too small to account for the observed reduction in street harassment. On average, the enumerators observed 210 incidents per week across all sites, and the officers charged/cited only 10% of these incidents. These results suggest that the program's effects are driven not only by police performance but also by changes

⁵Severe offenses include stalking, touching, groping, pushing, intimidation, indecent exposure, physical abuse or abduction while mild cases of harassment consisted of unwelcome comments, catcalling, whistling, inappropriate gestures or facial expressions, taking photographs without consent, or ogling.

in perpetrators' behavior, updating their responses based on encounters with police.

As a result of the reduction in the severe forms of sexual harassment in public spaces, we find that in hotspots with uniformed policing, women also experience increased mobility. In particular, we find that in hotspots with visible police patrolling, women are less likely to engage in personal protective behaviors such as avoiding certain locations because of the fear of harassment, seeking bystander protection, or resorting to self-defense.

Next, we find that uniformed policing did not decrease mild cases of harassment. To better understand the factors driving these null effects, we exploit the heterogeneity in the police officers' skills and norms when handling harassment. ⁶ To conduct our lab experiment, we invited 354 police officers from HCP (including all police officers who participated in our intervention) to attend a one-hour lab session at the police headquarters. During this session, we displayed ten videos to each officer, and after each video, officers answered a small survey–similar to a vignette model of elicitation of responses based on hypothetical situations. Of the ten videos, seven displayed instances of low severity sexual harassment, one displayed a property offense, and two displayed a neutral event - i.e., where no offense was taking place. In all videos, women take center stage – either as victims or as the main party engaging with another man. The aim of the videos was to mimic real sexual harassment situations that police officers face while patrolling the street. We create scripts based on reports made to SHE Teams and we also use CCTV footage.

Based on the lab experiment, we show that police officers' tolerance of mild cases of sexual harassment is high i.e. police officers are less likely to think that mild cases of sexual harassment should be prevented and/or punished relative to other offenses. Consequently, their willingness to sanction mild offenses relative to other types of crimes is, on average, lower. These findings are in accordance with the police officers' social norms heterogeneity effect and, when taken together, suggest that the reduction in severe forms of harassment is likely driven by deterrence due to police officer presence and punishment, while the lack of decline in mild sexual crimes is due to the fact that police are more

⁶We pre-specified this heterogeneity in the pre-analysis plan.

tolerant toward these offenses because of which they are also are less likely to sanction those who perpetrate them.

Consistent with this evidence and exploiting variation in police officers' baseline characteristics in gender norms towards harassment, we find that hotspots experience a reduction on all types of harassment including the mild forms when they are patrolled by officers' whose teams have better gender norms. This result suggests that perpetrators update their beliefs about the probability of punishment if they see that police officers are in fact taking action against mild sexual harassment offenses.

We also examine other potential mechanisms for which street patrolling may reduce severe forms of harassment with no effect on the mild forms but do not find evidence to support them. In particular, we rule out that results are driven by the lack of detection ability on the part of the police officers or reporting effects. First, using evidence from the lab, we find that police officer are able to detect mild sexual harassment even when these offenses occur quickly and in crowded areas. This ability is consistent with the intense training that SHE teams officers receive. Second, when linking the exact location where crimes are reported to the hotspots, we also do not find an increase in victims' calls related to street sexual harassment to the police in treated hotspots. This finding together with our main result - a decrease in the incidence of harassment - suggest that the propensity to report cases to the police might have increased. This result is in line with the findings of (Dahl and Knepper, 2021; Amaral et al., 2021a; Sukhtankar et al., 2022).T. We also find that police patrolling neither displaced crime nor resulted in a substitution effect among crime. Finally, we also do not find evidence of changes in footfall in hotspots or spillover areas. Overall, these results demonstrate that a lack of police tolerance toward sexual harassment in public spaces, a greater likelihood of being punished for such crimes, and changes in behavior among perpetrators due to fear and increased likelihood of punishment, and not citizen behavior, drive the decline in sexual harassment.

Our findings have several policy implications. First, we show that visible policing is effective in reducing severe forms of harassment, bounding the worst case scenario for women in public spaces. Second, we show that sexual harassment does constrain women's behavior in public spaces. Third, our results demonstrate that addressing sexual harassment in urban areas through policing is extremely challenging due to the nature of the crime and police officers' tolerance of street sexual harassment. Therefore, for any policing intervention to be effective, it is necessary to address the social norms that govern police officer behavior. Third, we show that police visibility and the likelihood of punishment arising from the police officers' attitudes and tolerance towards street harassment are two important mechanisms that drive the reduction in severe sexual harassment in public spaces. These results shed light on how to effectively allocate limited police resources and emphasize the importance of uniformed police presence in reducing the high frequency of sexual crimes. In fact, we show that even though police officers increase notices, warnings, and arrests for sexual harassment incidents, the incapacitation effects alone are too small to explain a crime reduction. This implies that any direct effect of the SHE teams comes from also deterring perpetrators.

This paper contributes to several strands of literature. First, our findings complement the literature on policing and crime, and the role of officers' attributes in improving job performance. Police patrolling has been found to be an effective form of policing to reduce crime (Blattman et al., 2021; Di Tella and Schargrodsky, 2004; Draca et al., 2011). The success of such interventions has been attributed to the effect that citizens learn from their encounters with the police and perpetrators update their beliefs on the probability of detection and punishment (Banerjee et al., 2019). Specifically for violence against women, women's increased access to the police has been linked to reductions in the incidence of gender violence (Sviatschi and Trako, 2021; Blair et al., 2019), and female representation in law and enforcement has been linked to greater reporting (Amaral et al., 2021a; Cooper, 2019) and improved legal action (Sukhtankar et al., 2022). We complement this literature by providing novel evidence on the effectiveness of different types of policing on violence against women in public spaces, with a focus on police attributes. In particular, we focus on little studied street sexual harassment and consider the role of police presence on the street by varying officer visibility, which has not been examined by the previous literature on police patrolling. Relatedly, current research on the police has focused on the effects of increased autonomy (Banerjee et al., 2021), building trust between citizens and officers (Blair et al., 2021) and officer attributes like race and gender (Ba et al., 2021; Miller and Segal, 2019) on police efficacy in reducing crime. However, there is still limited research on assessing the effects of individual beliefs and group norms on bureaucracies (Khan, 2021). We contribute to this literature with new evidence on how police officers' tolerance on types of crimes affects their efficacy in sanctioning them and how team norms can play an important role for crimes ridden with implicit bias.

Second, this paper is related to the nascent literature on sexual harassment in public spaces, a major concern affecting women across the world (Borker, 2022). Using quasiexperimental and descriptive evidence, this literature has found that women's safety in public spaces affects women's travel costs (Kondylis et al., 2020), their higher education outcomes (Borker, 2021) and is negatively correlated with women's labor force participation (Chakraborty et al., 2018; Siddique, 2018; Cook et al., 2021). We complement this literature by providing the first experimental evidence of how sexual harassment affects women's economic outcomes, overcoming any endogeneity concerns in the location and timing of harassment. In particular, we show how harassment negatively affects women's behavior while commuting. Reducing constraints to women's physical mobility is a key outcome of interest as recent evidence has shown that it may translate into changes in female labor force participation (Cheema et al., 2019; Field and Vyborny, 2021). We also contribute to this literature on street sexual harassment by providing evidence that this problem can be the byproduct of social norms and law enforcement. In particular, we demonstrate how street patrolling that targets sexual harassment can be an effective tool to reduce any form of sexual harassment only when police officers' personal attitudes are aligned with their professional duties.

2 Background

This section presents an overview of the prevalence of sexual harassment in public spaces in Hyderabad. In particular, we provide descriptive evidence of the high occurrence of street sexual harassment from our surveys. Second, we describe the SHE teams intervention, which we exploit for identification to shed light on how to address sexual harassment and understand how it affects women's ability to move in public spaces.

2.1 Street Harassment in Hyderabad

Our study is based in the city of Hyderabad, India. Hyderabad, the capital of the Telangana state, is the fourth-most populous city in India, with a population of 6.9 million residents and a metropolitan area that serves 9.7 million inhabitants (GOI, 2011). Within Hyderabad, the Hyderabad City Police (HCP) serves as the local law enforcement agency and operates under a police commissionerate system.⁷

As is the case with most urban centers across the world, sexual harassment in public spaces is a major problem in Hyderabad. According to our baseline survey of 8,264 women, approximately 29 percent experienced some form of harassment in public spaces within the previous month.⁸ These incidents contribute to women's perceptions of safety with only 25 percent of those surveyed reported feeling safe while moving about the city after 4 p.m. In response to such harassment, 87 percent of women report taking preventative measures to avoid sexual harassment. These include traveling in a group, dressing modestly, or avoiding certain parts of the city. Only 16 percent of women harassed, reported seeking help from police during or after the incident. Harassment can be of varying degrees of severity ranging from staring that makes women feel uncomfortable, groping and grabbing to rape.

Under the HCP, sexual harassment offenses are governed by the Hyderabad City Police Act of 2011 and penalties are booked under relevant legislation of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).⁹ Petty offenses and first-time sexual harassment offenders are registered and face penalties ranging from 10 days of imprisonment, fines up to Rs.1000, and attending

⁷Police commissionerate systems are head by a commissioner officer from the Indian Police Service. The police commissioner has more independence and discretion in managing the police than other police systems and is only accountable to the state government and the state police chief.

⁸It is worth noticing that victimization of property offenses taking place in public spaces in the previous month is only 2 percent. This includes victimization of snatching of items such as chains, purses, phones, etc., or pick- pocketing/theft.

⁹For more details on the Act please refer to HCP (2011).

counseling sessions. SHE Teams maintains a registry of all offenders. More serious and repeat offenders may face between 3 to 7 years of imprisonment depending on the severity of the offense. In practice, SHE Teams use two tools depending on the evidence available to officers while on patrol. For red-handed cases (instances where perpetrators are caught while committing an offense), perpetrators are dealt with according to the type of offense they are caught committing. For example, if the perpetrator was caught stalking a woman and sufficient evidence was available in the form of a recording and/or a victim complaint, he would be arrested and eventually taken to court. In case there is some evidence of a harassment incident but the evidence is insufficient to stand in court, the officer will give the offender a notice that would involve collecting the information about the perpetrator, and providing a warning. These different tools are used at the discretion of the police. ¹⁰

2.2 The SHE Teams Intervention

In 2014, the HCP launched the Safety, Health, and Environment police unit (SHE Teams) in response to growing concerns for women's safety in Hyderabad following the national public debate on the topic of women's safety following the 2012 Delhi gang rape and murder. The SHE Teams' main objective was to improve women's safety in the public sphere through a zero-tolerance approach to sexual harassment infringements.

SHE Teams are made up of police officers from the HCP stations. Officers are assigned to work on the SHE Teams task force for approximately 6 months. Once they begin their assignment, officers receive formal training in what constitutes street sexual harassment, how to identify and respond to it, and their patrol duties. After completing their SHE Teams assignment, officers are expected to return to their original posts.

The SHE Teams' main tasks involve patrolling and conducting awareness campaigns in schools and communities to increase citizen engagement with the criminal justice system.¹¹ SHE Teams officers track police report data, social media, and calls made to the

¹⁰In Appendix Table A1 we provide a description of the relevant legislative penalties per offense.

¹¹For the purpose of our experimental design, police officers who participated in our intervention were

HCP's Dial 100 helpline using a dashboard system.¹² They also use this to maintain a registry of offenders. Based on this data, the officers conduct patrols and anti-harassment and awareness campaigns at bus stops, colleges, hostels, shopping malls, and other locations were police reports of harassment are surging. Prior to the start of our intervention, the SHE Teams had been operating on a small scale and at low intensity.¹³

The SHE Teams' main strategy has been to patrol using undercover police officers who rotate across different hotspots. There are two main reasons why the SHE Teams implement this approach. First, the HCP saw undercover policing as an effective way to achieve its goal to detect perpetrators and build a criminal record database of sexual offenders. Second, because the number of officers and SHE Teams' resources are limited, an undercover task force gives the public the impression that the force is much larger than what it is and that the SHE Teams are "omnipresent", thereby deterring perpetrators from acting by making it more difficult for potential offenders to predict the probability of being caught.

With the growing national interest from other police forces, in the task force and the HCP's aim of expanding the policy, there was a strong motivation to understanding the effects of the mode of patrolling in order to better plan for a scale-up of the policy. With this in mind, this study was designed to evaluate the program at scale and test how the visibility of the patrolling officers affects desired outcomes. In particular, jointly with the HCP designed together the intervention in order to determine which form of patrolling would be most effective and understand police, citizens, and perpetrators' behavior. We hypothesize that with the visibility arm, that police patrolling would have deterrent and incapacitation effects as well as changes in women's behavior. With the undercover arm, we expect that policing would have a larger incapacitation capacity but a more limited deterrent effect since the ability to signal police presence to citizens is diminished.

involved only in patrolling; they did not organize or participate in awareness campaigns.

¹²Dial 100 is the official police helpline number in India. In Hyderabad it is used to access the HCP helpline.

¹³In 2018, the SHE Teams force consisted of approximately 10 teams of patrols. During the year 2018, the force made 44 red-handed petitions.

3 Experimental Design

In this section, we describe the randomized experiment, describe the data collection process and we outline our empirical model and present results on randomization balance and compliance.

3.1 Design

We use a clustered randomized experiment to identify the effects of uniformed and undercover policing on observed street sexual harassment. The HCP identified 350 public spaces and 700 adjacent areas (locations within a radius of 200 and 500 meters of the hotspot). The 350 public spaces are under the jurisdiction of the HCP and had to meet two criteria: i) have high rates of reported sexual harassment, and ii) be newly identified hotspots.

After receiving the list of locations from the HCP, we conducted two tests to validate their definition. First, we validate the hotspot definition using the Enumerator Observation Survey and women's data. In Figure **??**, we display the three measures of sexual harassment - EOS, women's survey and police calls. We see that areas with higher rates of observed harassment are also areas with high rates of women's victimization, and the number of harassment calls received by the police. This can also be observed in Tables A3, A4 and A5. Here we show that in hotspots there is a substantial gap in harassment rates, perceptions of safety and precautions taken in comparison to spillover areas. Second, we validate the geolocation of each hotspot and adjacent areas to ensure that these areas are well-defined public spaces - this was done by conducting a short observational survey in each area. The adjacent areas were identified as being locations within a radius of 200 meters and 500 meters.

We randomize the 350 hotspots into three groups. The first group consists of 100 hotspots that are patrolled by SHE Teams officers dressed in official HCP uniforms. The second group is made up of 100 randomly allocated hotspots patrolled by undercover SHE Teams officers dressed in plain clothes. The third group is the control group, con-

sisting of 150 randomly allocated hotspots that remained without patrols, for the entire duration of the study.

On average, patrol teams were composed of three officers with one female officer present at all times. During the 24 weeks of the intervention study period, the SHE Teams operated with 72 officers and 17 patrol vehicles. Every Friday officers would be informed of their schedule for the following week. Daily schedules for individual officers were planned by the coordinator of the SHE Teams and the research team a week in advance of the scheduled patrolling. Every day, upon arrival to the SHE teams office officers would be allocated to their team and a team leader would be assigned, based on the rank of the officer. They would also receive the list of areas to cover for the day. The patrols took place across treated hotspots between 8 am and 8 pm.¹⁴ Each team spent 15-20 minutes at a given hotspot, and hotspots for a total of 45 minutes per week (compared to a baseline of zero). Patrolling occurred randomly in that it did not take place at a set time or day of the week. We also varied randomly the routes, shifts, and team composition. Additionally, during our study period to maintain our experimental design, police officers only patrolled the hotspots and did not engage in any awareness campaigns.

3.2 Randomization

To take into account some of the key factors that affect the degree of sexual harassment across public spaces in Hyderabad, we stratify the randomization across the 350 hotspots in Hyderabad. The stratification is based on two criteria that best characterize a public space: (i) footfall and (ii) type of public space. We measure density using the data collected from the baseline EOS and women's survey. Hotspots are categorized as low, medium, high, and very high pedestrian activity.¹⁵ A footfall of fewer than 30 individuals is considered low; between 30 and 150 is categorized as medium; between 150 and

¹⁴In practice, the 24 teams patrolled during morning or afternoon shifts.

¹⁵This categorization was done based on the average classification done by enumerators when conducting the women's baseline survey and EOS survey. Since surveys were conducted during the same timing of patrol we used in the intervention, this categorization reflects the average footfall activity of an area.

400 is considered high, and anything above 400 is categorized as very high. For the type of public space, we have four categories: educational hotspots (i.e., located near schools and colleges), general hotspots (i.e., located in or near markets and temples), residential hotspots, and commuter hotspots (i.e., located at or near bus stops and railway stations). In Table A2 we provide the area descriptions by the strata categories used in the randomization.

The randomization was completed using a total of 2,000 iterations over 57 key variables from the baseline survey. The survey includes women's observable characteristics such as age, education level, occupation, marital status, mode of transportation, victimization rates, perception of safety, and preventative measures - see Table A3. The two treatment groups and the control arm are balanced across these characteristics. We also show that, before the intervention began, the treatment and control hotspots behaved similarly in terms of harassment, safety, and hotspot time-varying characteristics, including footfall.

The randomization also determined the treatment exposure condition for spillover areas located within a 200- and 500-meter radius from the hotspots. In tables A4 and A5 we show that the spillover areas are comparable across treatment and control groups.

3.3 Data

Our study relies on three data sets. We attempt to push the frontier on measuring sexual harassment in public spaces using a novel Enumerator Observation Survey (EOS). This dataset provides real-time measures of sexual harassment and women's responses to harassment. Free from reporting bias and stigma, the EOS records harassment that is observed by enumerators sent to the field across treatment and control hotspots. Second, to understand the mechanisms behind the effects of the intervention, we exploit administrative data on calls received by the police. Finally, we have data on police officer performance as well as our own survey and lab experiments with police officers.

Enumerator Observation Survey. Measuring harassment and tracking harassment rates over time and across contexts are notoriously difficult to do. Limited administrative data

exists on harassment, for example, the official data on harassment in India is available from the National Crime Records Bureau. But, this data has serious limitations such as being available only at the district level, annually and it is based on data that is reported. Survey data, while higher frequency and more disaggregate, continues to suffer from reporting bias in direct-question surveys and the different ways people understand what constitutes harassment (Saguy and Rees, 2021). To address these challenges, we developed the EOS, a novel method to measure the sexual harassment of women in public spaces.

We recruited 173 enumerators to observe hotspots and spillover areas throughout Hyderabad. Specifically, enumerators were trained to identify the number of instances and types of sexual harassment that occur at different locations in a discreet way using their phones. We specified 14 different types of harassment. Severe offenses include stalking, touching, groping, pushing, intimidation, indecent exposure, physical abuse, or abduction while mild cases of harassment consisted of unwelcome comments, catcalling, whistling, inappropriate gestures or facial expressions, taking photographs without consent, or ogling.¹⁶ Enumerators were asked to observe the hotspots and spillover areas to which they were assigned for 15-20 minutes and record the total number of victims, the different forms of victimization, and any subsequent actions taken by the victim, bystander, or police, on their mobile phones. Each enumerator observed 6 hotspots. On average, hotspots were visited once per week for 16 minutes.¹⁷ The routes and locations were randomly assigned to each enumerator on a daily basis. Enumerators could not be distinguished from the general public in the area. Researchers audited this exercise and determined that passersby would not notice the enumerators as observers, and even the SHE Teams officers did not know this exercise was taking place.¹⁸

¹⁶Following evidence from the fields of criminology and sociology (Madan and Nalla, 2016), we take into account that harassment varies extensively in its severity and that victims also perceive severity differently. Therefore, in our analysis, we present the results for overall harassment and also by type of harassment.

¹⁷This duration is similar in frequency and duration to the police patrol exercise.

¹⁸The batches of enumerators were replaced three times throughout the course of the study to mitigate concerns over fatigue and bias. Each batch of enumerators contained 15-20 people. In Appendix A we discuss additional procedures that were put in place and the different ethical considerations taken into account pertaining to this exercise.

The EOS took place over the course of 28 weeks: 4 weeks before the intervention commenced and 24 weeks of the intervention's duration. Our data consists of 24,669 observations recorded at hotspots and spillover areas. For every observational visit, we code the total number of instances and victims of harassment instances, and whether or not the victims, bystanders, or police took any action. Not all hotspots were visited every week. About 60 percent of the hotspots were visited during the intervention. We construct the measure for the weekly rate of observed harassment as the total number of observed victims by type of harassment divided by the number of enumerator visits per week. Figure A4(a) shows the rate of harassment as measured by the EOS at baseline.

Validity of the EOS. The harassment measure based on the EOS has multiple advantages. First, it tracks changes in harassment over time, an important and novel feature permitted through the fact that enumerators' observations occurred daily. This frequency boosts the potential to identify the treatment's short-term effects. Second, the EOS was separate from the experiment with enumerators being blinded to the treatment assignment and officers and citizens being unaware of this exercise. Together, this makes it possible to provide an accurate and unbiased account of the treatment effect.¹⁹ Third, reporting effects—a challenging concern to address—do not impact the EOS. Despite the EOS's advantages, we compare the measure with other data to address two potential concerns. First, we show in Figure A4 in Appendix A that EOS visits and duration of observation are not related to the treatment assignment of a hotspot/spillover area. We also find that less than 5% of enumerators' visits overlap with when the police were present.

Police Reports. To measure citizens' willingness to call the police to report an offense, we use incident-level information on all complaints reported to the Hyderabad Police Dial 100 helpline for 43 weeks – 16 weeks before the intervention and 27 weeks of intervention data. For each call, the call handler collects information on the type of incident, the date at which the call is taking place, and the location. For each complaint, we geocode its location and then map it to the nearest hotspot. This allows us to create a measure of unique calls

¹⁹It is worth mentioning that SHE Teams officers in uniform are indistinguishable from other police task forces. This implies that enumerators would not be able to associate SHE Teams patrols with their own task since police presence would appear as regular police presence.

made from hotspots in a given week. We gather information on calls reporting crimes against women and other forms of crimes which we use to test for potential spillovers of the intervention across crime types. Our main dataset consists of tracking calls from 350 locations over 27 weeks and data from 16 weeks prior to the intervention.²⁰ With Dial 100 calls being the most common method of emergency police response in Hyderabad, this serves as our measure of citizen reporting behavior at the hotspots. Figure A4(c) shows the harassment reports received via Dial 100 calls. We can see that these align closely with the EOS data in panel (a).

Police Patrols, Routes, Shifts and Performance. To measure police teams' compliance with the treatment and subsequent police performance, we construct three variables. First, we use a weekly measure for total patrols in a hotspot and their duration (in minutes). To create these variables we make use of GPS tracking data for each vehicle transporting a police team. Each patrol team travelled in its own vehicle.²¹ We map the routes and the timing of the parking of each vehicle at the hotspots to create dummies for hotspot visitations. We calculate the duration of a patrol using the number of minutes the ignition of a vehicle was off in the vicinity of a hotspot.

Second, we have information on the total number of actions taken by the police – initiated through red-handed cases, notices or warnings– that teams attribute to any potential sexual harassment event identified during a patrol on a given hotspot. The data on visits and duration helps us test compliance of officers to the intervention requirements and the data on red-handed offenses, warnings and notices is our measure of incapacitation. This is explained in greater detail in Section 1.

Police Officer Survey and Experiments. We conducted a survey containing questions about the officers' employment history with the HCP, their views on policing, sexual harassment, and the SHE Teams, their own perceived skills, job motivation, and socioeconomic demographic information for a cross-section of HCP officers using a phone survey.

²⁰Equivalent to 9,450 data points and 5,600 data points respectively.

²¹On any given day, officers would gather with their teams at the SHE Teams office and initiate the patrolling on their own assigned vehicle. Two teams could not travel by the same vehicle. Each team leader was given a list of hotspots that needed to be covered during the shift.

Officers received a letter from us, which informed them that we are collaborating with the HCP and inviting them to participate in a 30-minute survey that was of interest to the HCP. Officers were reassured that their participation would be anonymous, so none of their colleagues would be able to access (or identify) their responses. Next, we called police officers in order to arrange a convenient time to conduct the survey. We surveyed all officers who ever worked as a SHE Teams' officer, including all police officers who participated in our intervention, as well as all non-SHE Team officers who worked in the same police stations and held the same rank as the SHE Team officers before the latter joined the SHE Teams task force. Our final sample consisted of 128 SHE Teams officers and an additional 226 HCP officers.

To conduct the lab experiments, we sampled officers after the completion of the officers' surveys. We sampled officers in two steps so that we could have a large sample. First, we invited all SHE Teams officers. Next, to increase our sample, from the pool of officers that had previously conducted the survey, we sampled officers who had been involved in patrolling tasks during the same period of the intervention. This was done to identify officers who conduct similar tasks as those of SHE Teams. Our final sample of police officers attending lab sessions is 354. Officers were invited for one-hour sessions and in groups of 10. We mixed officers from different task forces and police stations in the same sessions.²²

Timeline. Figure A1 shows the 4-year study timeline spanning from 2018 to 2021. The qualitative interviews, engagement with the police and scoping work were initiated in the Summer of 2018. Next, the baseline women's survey and the baseline EOS exercise took place between August and September of 2019. After enrolling the SHE Teams officers into the task force and randomly assigning the teams to hotspots and their respective spillover areas, the intervention started in mid-September of the same year. The intervention ended, as planned, after 24 weeks. During this period, the EOS exercise was conducted across the 350 hotspots and 750 spillover areas. After the pandemic stay-at-home orders were lifted

²²In Appendix **??**, we describe in detail the lab protocol and safety and ethical procedures that were followed.

in Hyderabad, we surveyed the officers in December 2020 and February 2021. The lab experiments with the officers took place soon after, between March and April 2021.

External Validity. The intervention's external validity—specifically the fact that SHE Teams officers could potentially be very different from other officers in the HCP force—is an important concern. In Figure A7, we compare SHE Teams officers to other patrol officers in HCP. We can see from this figure that SHE Teams officers are similar to their professional peers in terms of the social norms towards harassment that they follow, their motivation, and their job satisfaction. SHE Teams officers are older and more likely to be female when compared to their HCP counterparts. The differences we see between the SHE Teams and other patrol teams is driven by the criteria of having at least one female officer and a larger share of higher rank officers in SHE Teams relative to other patrolling teams. Officers are assigned to SHE Teams and do not select into them.

3.4 Empirical Specification

As outlined earlier, we randomized the 350 hotspots to one of the three experimental arms: uniformed patrolling, undercover policing (officers in plain clothes) and control. To compute direct treatment effects for each arm, we compare the average observed harassment at treated hotspots to control hotspots. To estimate spillover effects, we draw 200 and 500-meter rings around treated and control hotspots and compare harassment instances on nearby potential spillover streets, in these areas. Our analysis follows the pre-analysis plan registered prior to the intervention, with only minor adjustments that we detail in A.

We estimate treatment effects using the following equation:

$$Harassment_{hw} = \beta_0 + \delta_1 Uniform_h + \delta_2 Undercover_h + X_{hw} + \gamma_s + \epsilon_{hw}$$
(1)

where the main dependent variable of interest is $Harassment_{hw}$, which represents the number of observed victims of a type of harassment per enumerator visit at each hotspot h in week w. The main independent variables are a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot was randomly assigned to receive patrols with uniformed officers and zero

if the hotspot was randomly assigned to the control group. The difference between the uniform arm and control arm is captured by the coefficient δ_1 . We also have a dummy that takes value one if the hotspot was randomly assigned to receive patrols with undercover officers. The difference between the undercover arm and control arm is captured by the coefficient δ_2 . X_{hw} is a vector of hotspot week characteristics that include dummies for whether the hotspot was affected by a public holiday or a bus strike in week w. γ_s are strata fixed effects and ϵ_{hw} is the error term. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level.

3.5 Inference

Since we test four hypotheses – two treatment conditions across two outcomes - we correct p-values using the (Westfall and Young, 1993) adjustments. We report the Family-Wise Error Rate (FWER), taking into account the two treatments, and p- values are obtained from 1,000 bootstrap replications to account for correlation across the different outcomes. We also report randomized inference p-values to account for the fact that hotspots in this urban context are not well-defined geographic areas, and, as a result, clustering the standard errors at the hotspot level could lead to a biased estimation of the effect of the intervention.²³ To account for this concern we present estimations for the main intervention sample and the spillover areas, separately, and also present p-values obtained from randomly rearranging the treatment conditions and re-estimating our coefficients of interest using the placebo assignment. We calculate randomized inference p-values using 500 random permutations. We present these two additional p-values in the main table of results.

3.6 Compliance and Police Patrol Performance

To better illustrate the officers' compliance with the intervention by the treatment arm, we estimate Equation 1 on the number of times a hotspot was patrolled, time spent at

²³This is a common concern in the literature when designs include estimations with treatment and spillover areas, see, for example, (Blattman et al., 2016).

the hotspot, and the number of warnings and sanctions issued at the location. We show the results in Table 1. Columns (1)-(2) show that on average in both treatments arms, uniformed, and plainclothes police officers increased the number of visits and the duration of their visits. Specifically, in uniform hotspots, we see almost 4 more visits per week while undercover hotspots see on average 2.5 more visits, relative to the control group. Officers also spend 38 minutes more in uniform hotspots and 36 more minutes in undercover hotspots per week. So we see a large difference between the uniform and undercover arms on the extensive margin and not as much on the intensive margin. Column (3) also displays an increase in the number of warnings and sanctions by police officers in both arms relative to the control group. The fewer visits and less time spent per hotspot by undercover vs. uniform officers could be explained by the fact that if undercover officers were better able to identify perpetrators, as a result, issuing more citations and warnings than uniformed officers would imply they would also spend more time at the police station dealing with victims and perpetrators (time that they could have spent patrolling). Note, that once a warning or notice is issued, police officers must immediately transport the perpetrator to the police station.

While we observe an increase in sanctions, a measure of incapacitation, these effects are too small to potentially explain a reduction in sexual harassment. On average, enumerators observed 210 incidents per week but, logistically plainclothes and uniformed officers could sanction only about 21 (10%) and 8 (4%) incidents, respectively.²⁴²⁵

 $^{^{24}}$ The associated coefficient (standard error) is 0.054 (0.024). This implies a 21% increase relative to the mean.

²⁵One potential concern we had was whether enumerators could detect sexual harassment incidents better than police officers. Several factors suggest that this may not be the case. Firstly, the same people and materials were used to train enumerators and SHE team officers. Secondly, although enumerators were mostly female, every SHE team had to also have at least one female officer. Thirdly, in Section5.1 we show that police officers, including SHE Teams members, are able to detect sexual harassment offenses most of the time. And finally, the enumerators were detecting harassment in the exact same environmental conditions as the officers in terms of crowds, lighting, etc.

| | Total Visits | Patrol Duration | Notices and Warnings |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | | | |
| Uniform Hotspot | 3.679*** | 37.708*** | 0.037*** |
| | (0.088) | (0.687) | (0.007) |
| Undercover Hotspot | 2.495*** | 35.558*** | 0.099*** |
| | (0.073) | (0.687) | (0.016) |
| | | | |
| Observations | 8,400 | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 3.087 | 36.615 | 0.500 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Uniform=Undercover (p-value) | 0.000 | 0.025 | 0.000 |

Table 1: Effects on Patrol Duration and Total Visits

Notes: The dependent variables are the total number of police visits to a hotspot per week (column 1), the total minutes of patrol per week, and, the number of police actions - in the form of notices following red-handed cases and warnings given per week. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and shown in brackets. Data source: Police vehicle GPS trackers, and SHE Teams administrative records.

4 **Results**

In this section, we present three main findings. First, we show that uniformed patrolling was effective at reducing the high severity types of harassment, thereby limiting the worst case for women in these areas. Undercover policing, on the other hand, was not effective at reducing any form of harassment in public spaces. These results highlight the importance of police visibility and demonstrate that the reduction in sexual harassment in hotspots patrolled by uniformed police is driven by a combination of deterrence and incapacitation. Second, we show that, because of the reduction in severe forms of harassment in a severe forms of harassment in the severe forms of harassmen

rassment at hotspots patrolled by uniformed police, female civilians are less likely to take preventative measures against sexual harassment. In particular, we find that women in these locations are more likely to walk alone and less likely to avoid particular locations because of the fear of harassment. Finally, we find no evidence of spillover effects on other forms of crime or in space to nearby areas.

4.1 Police Patrolling and Street Sexual Harassment

Table 2 presents the results on the effects of patrolling on total street sexual harassment and offenses by severity. We find a 27% reduction in severe sexual harassment in locations patrolled by uniformed police. However, we observe that uniformed policing has no effects on low-severity sexual harassment. We also find that undercover policing did not affect the incidence of any type of street harassment. These results are robust to different specifications such as the week, enumerator fixed effects, controlling for public holidays and bus strikes, as well as using the number of repeated incidences per victim, rather than the unique number of instances, as the main dependent variable (see Appendix A6 and A7).

The lack of effects of undercover policing suggests that any direct effect of police patrolling comes from the deterrence or displacement of criminals rather than only from incapacitating them. This is not surprising given the results presented in Table 1, which show that even when police officers increased the number of warnings and sanctions they issued, this number was still very small relative to the number of victims that were identified. Moreover, in Table A8 in Appendix, we study whether uniformed patrolling reduces severe forms of harassment by displacing potential criminals to spillover areas. We show that this was not the case, since we see no increase in sexual harassment of potential crimes to spillover areas. In fact, we find that none of the treatment arms displaced perpetrators of sexual harassment to other hotspots.²⁶ We also find – see Table A9 – that the interven-

²⁶This result is consistent with the evidence presented in other settings, see, for example, the review in Braga et al. (2019). Experimental evidence on crime displacement is mixed because displacement depends on the crime, location, and policing strategies (Banerjee et al., 2019).

tion did not change footfall - observed number of people at a location - in hotspots or spillover areas.

Could the reduction in the severe forms of street sexual harassment be explained by a change in reporting behavior? A more visible police presence has the potential to impact citizens' willingness to call the police to report an offense, both as a victim and bystanders. For example, victims or witnesses of street sexual harassment could be impacted by the intervention if, for instance, police presence and interactions between police and citizens improved citizen's views of the police by seeing them in action on the field, which, in turn, would lower the stigma women experience around reporting street sexual harassment to the police.

Since calls to Dial 100 is a common form of reporting crimes in Hyderabad, we rely on this data for measuring the impact on reporting behavior. We use information from calls to Dial 100, the only helpline service operated by the HCP.²⁷ To test the impact of the intervention, we compare the rate of calls across hotspots. We estimated the model using Equation 1, where the main dependent variable is the sum of calls to report sexual harassment from hotspot h in a week w. We present the results in Table A10. Surprisingly, we find no evidence that increased uniformed or undercover police presence changed citizens' or bystanders' willingness to report sexual harassment to the police. We also observe no effect of police presence on other crimes (see Table A11). This result also indicates that victim-driven change in the probability of reporting sexual harassment to the police are visible. Additionally, it provides some evidence that other forms of crime did not increase in police-patrolled areas.

Finally, we also analyze whether effects are driven by hotspots where women have more equal gender norms related to sexual harassment. If effects would be driven by a change in bystander behavior we would expect larger effects in hotspots where women are less tolerant of street sexual harassment at baseline. Table A12 shows that this is not

 $^{^{27}}$ The Dial 100 is an emergency response system similar to the 911 number in the USA. The average response rate in urban areas is estimated to be 5-10 minutes and the satisfaction rates with the service among victims of GBV are very high M (2020).

the case and if anything effects seem to be driven by hotspots that have worse gender norms at baseline. These results provide further evidence that effects are not coming from changes in victims' or bystander behavior.

Overall, the results suggest that the decline in severe sexual harassment is due to the fact that uniformed police officers not only incapacitated criminals but also deterred potential perpetrators. What remains unclear, however, is why visible police officers did not deter mild severe cases of sexual harassment. In Section 5, we study other potential mechanisms behind the intervention's lack of effect on these mild severe cases of sexual harassment.²⁸

²⁸In the Appendix, we further analyze whether the reduction in sexual harassment due to uniformed policing is persistent over time. Figure A6 shows that the effects persisted 5 months after the intervention commenced. Unfortunately, we were unable to analyze the effects for more than 6 months into the intervention because the COVID-19 pandemic and consequent stay-at-home orders began. Therefore, as a second best to analyze if the reduction of street sexual harassment could be persistent, we take advantage that in a large part of our sample police officers and enumerators did not coincide at the same time at the hotspot. We analyze the effects limiting to only the times when police officers were not there and find similar effects. These results provide suggestive evidence that after a hotspot experience uniform policing, there could be persistent effects even when the intervention is over.

| | Total | Severe | Mild |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|
| | SSH | SSH | SSH |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | | | |
| Uniform | -0.029 | -0.035*** | 0.006 |
| | (0.025) | (0.013) | (0.019) |
| | [0.288] | [0.008] | [0.770] |
| | | {0.038} | {0.896} |
| Undercover | -0.009 | 0.006 | -0.015 |
| | (0.026) | (0.014) | (0.018) |
| | [0.708] | [0.608] | [0.400] |
| | | {0.896} | {0.796} |
| | | | |
| Observations | 4,988 | 4,988 | 4,988 |
| Mean of Dep. Var | 0.471 | 0.129 | 0.342 |
| Uniform=Undercover (p-value) | 0.478 | 0.002 | 0.325 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table 2: Effect of Police Patrolling on Street Sexual Harassment

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of harassment observed in a hotspot-week. This measure is the ratio of identified victims of severe or mild forms of sexual harassment, and total enumerator visits for a hotspot in a week. Severe victimization include victims of stalking, touching, groping, pushing, intimidation, indecent exposure, physical abuse, or abduction. Mild victimization consist of victims of unwelcome comments, catcalling, whistling, inappropriate gestures or facial expressions, taking photographs without consent, or ogling. Total harassment victimization is the sum of the number of victims of severe or mild forms of harassment. In Column 1 we present the rate per total form of harassment and in Columns 2 and 3 we display the rate by severe and mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Randomized inference p-values are displayed in squared brackets. Westfall-Young adjusted family-wise error rate p-values are in curly brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

4.2 Does Reduced Street Sexual Harassment Improve Women's Mobility Behaviour?

In this section, we explore whether reducing the severe forms of harassment at visibly patrolled hotspots translates into better economic outcomes for women.²⁹ In particular, we test whether the decline in sexual harassment at hotspots patrolled by uniformed officers reduces women's safety concerns by analyzing mobility behavior – a stepping stone requirement to understanding the relationship between physical mobility and economic mobility. We use EOS data where enumerators observed women's actions and define as an outcome variable a dummy indicating whether enumerators observe women moving to another block, fleeing from perpetrators, or avoiding certain areas within the hotspot.

Table 3 presents the results and shows that uniformed policing reduced the probability that women would take reactionary measures against harassment by 1.8 percentage points (40%). Consistent with the previous results, we find that uniform policing improves women's mobility outcomes, making them less likely to move away from a location because of safety concerns. In the Appendix, we also looked at whether women substitute police response by taking action against the perpetrator, such as asking for help from a bystander or confronting the perpetrator themselves. However, Figure A5 shows no evidence of it. Overall, these results demonstrate how sexual harassment in public spaces may constrain women's mobility and behavior within the city.

²⁹In the original design, we intended to administer an endline survey to quantify the intervention's effects on female labor force participation and mobility. However, we were unable to collect this data due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

| # Women Who Constraint their Mobility | Severe SSH | Mild SSH | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----------|--|
| | | | |
| Uniform | -0.018** | 0.020 | |
| | (0.008) | (0.018) | |
| Undercover | 0.006 | 0.017 | |
| | (0.009) | (0.017) | |
| | | | |
| Observations | 4,988 | 4,988 | |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 0.044 | 0.188 | |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | |
| Uniform=Undercover (p-value) | 0.004 | 0.879 | |

Table 3: Street Sexual Harassment and Women's Mobility

Notes: The main dependent variable is the number of observed women by enumerators that move to another block, flee from a perpetrator or avoid an area within the hotspot in response to severe and mild street sexual harassment. In column 1 we present this variable for victims of severe harassment and in column 2 for victims of mild harassment. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

5 Mechanisms: Do Police Norms Toward Sexual Harassment Affect Their Performance?

In this section, we explore the potential mechanisms that could explain the reduction in severe forms of harassment and the lack of effects of uniform policing on mild severity sexual harassment offenses. In particular, we aim to understand whether the social norms surrounding sexual harassment in public spaces that police officers follow affect their performance, and ultimately, the occurrence of sexual harassment. This heterogeneity was

motivated by the fact that social norms concerning gender are an important risk factor for gender-based violence and the police response to it.³⁰ In particular, we investigate the differential role of gender norms of individual officers surrounding sexual harassment in public spaces.

5.1 Detection Experiment

Between January and March 2021, we conducted a lab experiment to analyze whether the officers' probability of detection and punishment as well as their tolerance for sexual harassment explain the intervention's lack of effect on mild offenses.³¹ Officers have to detect multiple types of offenses on the job, it could be the case that they prioritize some over others. Given that more severe offenses are likely to be easier to detect and prosecute, we use a first experiment to explore if police officers indeed are able to detect and punish mild offenses when compared to other offenses. Next, we conduct a second experiment to understand whether officers were more or less likely to punish mild cases of sexual harassment offenses relative to severe ones.

To examine whether police officers are able to detect and address sexual harassment offenses taking place within the public sphere, we invited 354 HCP officers to attend a one-hour session in a lab created specifically for our research at the police headquarters. Each lab session accommodated a maximum of 10 officers.³² Officers were incentivized with correct answers that could earn each participant a maximum of INR 520 in the form of an Amazon voucher. Each game played also contained 2 encouragement messages and attention checks.

During the first experiment, each officer was shown 9 videos presenting vignettes intended to elicit the officers' reactions to specific situations. After each video, the officers answered a brief survey indicating how they would respond in each of the hypotheti-

³⁰Our pre-analysis plan specified conducting a heterogeneity analysis based on gender norms.

³¹This experiment was developed after an analysis of the intervention data took place. Its main purpose is to shed light on channels that can explain the main effects.

³²The distribution of seats and the setting is shown in Figure A8 in Appendix. On average, sessions were attended by eight officers.

cal situations. Of the nine videos, 6 depicted instances of mild sexual harassment, one displayed a property offense, and two displayed neutral events without any illegal activities³³ In all of the videos, women took center stage either as victims or as the main party engaging with other men. The presentation of videos was randomized in two ways. First, we randomized the order in which the videos were shown and, second, the speed at which they were shown (fast videos were played at a speed of 1.75x).³⁴ This randomization served to mimic the challenges that officers face when patrolling, since detecting sexual harassment requires a high degree of attention, knowledge regarding what occurs when harassment takes place, and quick response. We relied on showing several videos in order to provide several opportunities to measure detection since sexual harassment offenses vary substantially in its forms, and it would be difficult to obtain a representation of sexual harassment instances based on only one vignette.³⁵ To gather officer-level information, we merged data obtained from this sample with information obtained from the phone survey that had been conducted with officers beforehand. Our final sample consists of 3,360 observations obtained across 336 officers and 46 sessions.

To test the role of police officers' detection capacity, probability of administering punishment, and their tolerance of mild sexual harassment relative to non-sexual harassment instances, we compare officers' responses across types of video (mild cases of sexual harassment vs. non-sexual harassment) such that:

$$Y_{vos} = \beta_0 + \delta_1 Sexual Harassment_v + X_o + \gamma_s + \epsilon_{vos} \tag{2}$$

where Y_{vos} is the main dependent variables of interest for each video v randomly shown to officer o in session s. The main dependent variables are: (*i*) offense identification, is a

³³Appendix Table **??** describes the scenes and types of videos. The scripts were developed based on instances of sexual harassment that women described during the pilot of the baseline survey and from police reports made to the SHE Teams office.

³⁴For instance, if the length of a video is 2 minutes, then a quick video lasted approximately 1.14 minutes. Through piloting, we determined that these video duration mimicked the conditions of patrolling the streets. The lab videos allowed sufficient time for officers "on patrol" to notice and identify sexual harassment.

³⁵Of the 354 officers invited to participate in the experiment, 18 did not pass the attention checks. To measure the officers' attention during the experiment and maximize their engagement, all officers viewed two encouraging messages during the same part of the experiment.

dummy that takes value one if officers correctly identify the scene displayed in the video, (*ii*) perception of ease of detection a offense, is a dummy equal to one if officers perceive the offense as being easy to detect, (*iii*) punitive action, is a dummy that takes the value one if officers take some police action (e.g. give a warning or take the suspect to the station, and (*iv*) rate of the necessity of investigation, is a dummy that takes the value one if an officer thinks the offense needs any action.

The main independent variable of interest is $SexualHarassment_v$, a dummy that takes the value of one for videos displaying mild sexual harassment incidents and zero otherwise. X_o is a vector of officer-level characteristics that include age (in years), gender, a dummy to identify officers that are of high ranks, and education level. γ_s is a lab session fixed-effects and ϵ_{vos} is the error term. Standard errors are clustered at the officer level. ³⁶

Table 4 shows the results. First, about 82% of officers can detect street sexual harassment offenses in the videos. Also, we find that police officer are equally likely to detect mild cases of sexual harassment offenses relative to property crime offenses (Column 1). Moreover, in the Appendix, we show that police officers can even detect mild cases of sexual harassment in challenging circumstances i.e., when the speed of videos is larger. These results suggest that the lack of effects of police patrolling in mild cases of sexual harassment is not due to their inability to detect these crimes.

Second, while police officers are able to detect mild sexual harassment offenses in public spaces as well as property crimes, Column 2 shows that they are more likely to believe that identifying these crimes requires more effort than non-sexual harassment crimes. Police officers are 10 percentage points less likely to think that mild cases of street sexual harassment are easy to detect relative to property crimes.

Third, Columns 3 and 4 show that police officers think there is no need to detect or

³⁶On average, 81 percent of officers attending the experiment were male, 59 percent had graduate or postgraduate education and 14 percent were SHE Team officers. Officers' ability to identify is high, with 82 percent correctly identifying a scene, 61 percent perceiving that detection is easy, and 80 percent not dismissing an instance–consistent with the fact that 8 out of the 10 videos displayed a crime instance. Officers exhibit significant victim-blaming beliefs, with 40 percent of officers believing it is the victim's fault that an instance took place. Since the randomization was done by type of video and speed, we also show that officers' characteristics do not differ across treatment arms. In addition, the officers' total completion time of the experiment, and the composition of the session are well balanced.

punish mild sexual harassment crimes.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Detection | Easy to Detect | Need to | Punish |
| | | | Address | |
| Sexual Harassment Film | -0.024 | -0.097*** | -0.076*** | -0.187*** |
| | (0.022) | (0.022) | (0.010) | (0.012) |
| Obs. | 2688 | 2688 | 2688 | 2688 |
| Dep. Var. Mean | 0.82 | 0.70 | 0.92 | 0.84 |

Table 4: Detection, Tolerance, and Punishment of Sexual Harassment Against Other Crimes

Notes: The dependent variable in Column 1 is a dummy that indicates if an officer is able to differentiate sexual harassment offenses from other offenses in the videos. The outcome in Column 2 is the share of officers who believe that sexual harassment offenses are easier to detect than non-sexual harassment crimes. Column 3 uses a binary indicator for whether police officers believe that they should invest their time gathering evidence for mild sexual offenses as the outcome. Column 4 reports the treatment effect on a dummy that indicates whenever an officer believes that sexual offenses deserve a punishment. Clustered by police officer standard errors in parenthesis: *p < 0.1,** p < 0.05,*** p < 0.01.

Overall, these results suggest that as police officers believe that mild sexual harassment offenses require more effort and at the same time, they believe there is less need for police work on these cases, they are ultimately less likely to act against them.

Next, while previous results mimic the variety of incidents that police officers observe while patrolling, to study the decision of police officers, we design a second experiment where now police officers only watched videos on sexual harassment in public spaces and we vary the severity of sexual harassment crimes. Both the first and second exercises were implemented in the same structure and sample. The main difference is that in this second experiment, all officers view the same videos and we do not vary the conditions under which officers analyze each case. To address harassment offenses, officers view 7 videos, one of mild offenses and 6 of severe offenses. ³⁷ Based on this experiment, we can understand the performance of police officers if they would be only working in the SHE teams program, which is only in charge of patrolling and looking for sexual harassment offenses. The results are very similar to Table 4. We find that police officer if anything is more likely to detect low-severity offenses. However, they are much less likely to punish them (see Table A13). This result is consistent with the intuition that officers' norms, and not their detection ability, are an important explanation for the effect of SHE Teams police patrols on the incidence of mild harassment.

5.2 Heterogeneity Based on Police Officers' Views Of Harassment

What could drive a reduction in severe sexual harassment offenses that does not extend to mild severe offenses? One potential explanation that we can test in the data is the police officers' social norms regarding sexual harassment would explain such differences. Individuals who belong to professions that have been historically segregated by sex such as the military or police, tend to follow more biased gender norms that are challenging to address (Dahl et al., 2021; Miller and Segal, 2019). Consequently, we would expect visible patrolling by officers with "more equal" social norms around sexual harassment could be more effective at addressing offenses since such officers would not only tolerate these crimes less but also more overtly signal their ability to punish perpetrators.

To test this hypothesis, we ask police officers to respond to several statements about policing, sexual harassment, and their role in preventing and punishing such an offense. We gather information based on 8 different items and then combine this individual-level data with weekly data on the officers' hotspot assignments. We subsequently combine this information with the EOS data by creating a week-hotspot measure of the officers' sexual harassment norms.³⁸ We use this information to test the differential effect of police

³⁷Appendix Table **??** describes the scenes and types of videos. The videos can be accessed through this link. The scripts were developed based on instances of sexual harassment that women described during the pilot of the baseline survey and from police reports made to the SHE Teams office.

³⁸It is worth noting that teams and assignments vary by day. As a result, our gender norms measure explores the variation in team norms over time and across hotspots.

officers' norms on their effectiveness in deterring harassment offenses. To calculate and interpret the result, we create a dummy equal to 1 if the norms of the team of officers patrolling a given hotspot-week belong to the top quartile of the distribution of norms across teams and zero if not.³⁹

Table 5 presents these results. First, we see that uniformed officers with better attitudes toward sexual harassment reduce the incidence of all types of harassment in public spaces, by 12%. We also find that severe victimization rates are not differentially impacted by patrols of officers with less equal norms around harassment. The main effect of the intervention remains unchanged, and we show that having officers with more equal norms does not alter their ability to reduce the most severe forms of harassment. In contrast, we find that victimization of mild sexual harassment offenses decreases by 15% percent when hotspots are patrolled by officers in the top quartile of the distribution of norms (Column 3). Patrols of officers in the remaining three-quarters of the distribution do not have an impact on mild harassment rates.

These results indicate that officers' views of harassment are likely impacting the actions they undertake on the job regarding mild cases of harassment that are widely classified as "E.g., harmless," which take place at a more frequent rate and are more socially tolerated. In addition, we also show that for severe offenses for which the probability of sanctioning might be higher there is no added police performance effect by having more equal team norms. Our results are consistent with perpetrators learning by updating their beliefs about the probability of being punished by the police (Banerjee et al., 2019; Anwar and Loughran, 2011; Wilson et al., 2017).⁴⁰ This highlights the fact that police effort is discretionary and therefore, depends on the underlying individual-level characteristics of

³⁹We also analyze whether women's norms or bystander behavior at baseline at the hotspot mitigates the effects in Appendix. We find no evidence that effects are smaller in hotspots with more "tolerant" norms related to harassment.

⁴⁰Banerjee et al. (2019) study a police patrol intervention to address drunk driving in Rajasthan. The authors experimentally vary the intensity of patrolling and the location of sobriety checkpoints to be either fixed or rotating. The authors show that rotating checkpoints reduced night accidents by 17%, and night deaths by 25%, while fixed checkpoints had no significant effects. The authors also show that drivers learn about police presence and as a result, change their behavior strategically. This result is consistent with the evidence we present.

police officers.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Total | Severe | Mild |
| | SSH | SSH | SSH |
| | | | |
| Uniform X More Equal Norms | -0.058* | -0.003 | -0.055* |
| | (0.033) | (0.016) | (0.030) |
| Uniform | -0.005 | -0.032** | 0.028 |
| | (0.028) | (0.015) | (0.021) |
| Undercover X More Equal Norms | 0.044 | 0.047 | -0.003 |
| | (0.056) | (0.031) | (0.039) |
| Undercover | -0.004 | 0.000 | -0.004 |
| | (0.030) | (0.016) | (0.021) |
| | | | |
| Observations | 4,582 | 4,582 | 4,582 |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 0.471 | 0.129 | 0.342 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table 5: Effect of Policing on Street Sexual Harassment by Patrol Officers Harassment Related Norms

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a hotspot week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to a hotspot in a week. In Column 1 we present the rate per total form of harassment and in Columns 2 and 3 we display the rate by severe and mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Officers Norms Index is a dummy that takes the value one if the average team of officers patrolling a hotspot in a given week score in the 75th percentile or higher of the gender norms index. The gender norms index is obtained from individual-level officer surveys. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey and police officer survey.

The result that patrols of officers with better attitudes towards street harassment reduced mild offenses conveys that officers' intrinsic views about women's safety impact their job performance. In particular, it indicates that the determinants of the officers' job performance (as measured by their ability to detect sexual harassment in public spaces or their willingness to respond to criminal offenses) are impacted by their own social norms in relation to these same crimes. This result corresponds to the nature of policing, which requires a high degree of discretion.⁴¹ In such contexts, officers' individual characteristics become important factors.⁴²Our finding provides novel evidence that malleable social norms are also an important factor that drives police job performance. Moreover, we show that the officers' social norms significantly alter the effectiveness of the SHE Teams. Such a result is orthogonal to other characteristics - such as gender or experience - since patrolling teams have the same composition in these dimensions.

To better understand the relationship between officers' on-the-job performance and a reduction in incidence by type of harassment, we develop a novel lab experiment. The experiment is motivated by the fact that the intervention data does not allow to directly test for this relationship directly.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we find that street patrolling with police officers in uniform reduces severe forms of sexual harassment but not mild forms. Surprisingly, we did not find an impact on any form of sexual harassment for the street patrolling with undercover police officers. Results from the lab experiment explain the impact of street patrolling on the milder forms of sexual harassment. First, it is the police officers' views on detecting and punishing milder forms of sexual harassment, rather than the difficulty to detect them. Second, it is

⁴¹This common feature of policing is highlighted in many other contexts, such as Rajasthan, Cook County, Dallas, or West Midlands (Banerjee et al., 2019; Ba et al., 2021; Hoekstra and Sloan, 2022; Amaral et al., 2021a).

⁴²Previous studies have investigated the impact of police officers' identity traits on their job performance and discrimination towards women and other minorities (Amaral et al., 2021a; Blair et al., 2019; Ba et al., 2021).
the police officers' team norm related to gender and sexual harassment is one of the key drivers. In particular, we find that teams with equal gender norms are more effective in reducing both mild and severe forms of sexual harassment.

Furthermore, from a policy standpoint, this paper highlights how to make police officers more effective at addressing sexual harassment – one of the least reported forms of crime in the world. This is especially relevant for developing countries including India which has only 144 police officers per 100,000 people – one of the lowest police per capita in the world (UN, 2017). More importantly, we provide pathways through which the police can improve job performance as measured by a reduction in sexual harassment. We show that the choice of the mode of police patrolling – uniform vs. undercover – is important to deter sexual harassment. In our context, the status quo mode of police patrolling by the SHE Teams involves only undercover police officers. In line with the initial predictions of the Hyderabad City Police, we show that these officers are indeed better able to detect offenders when undercover, since their patrolling mode carries an added element of surprise. Yet, we show that this effect is small and not sufficient to drive a change in the incidence of sexual harassment. Most importantly, we show that visible policing is more effective due to its deterrence potential in addressing an offense that is highly frequent. This result adds to a growing literature studying the efficient use of police resources (Banerjee et al., 2019; Collazos et al., 2021).

Finally, we show that police officers' team norms are an important determinant of their job performance. In particular, officers with more progressive and gender-equal norms about their role in addressing sexual harassment can address both severe and mild forms of harassment. This is an important result from a policy standpoint since the police are the first point of contact for all citizens for any form of crime across the world. It suggests training programs aimed at altering perverse norms as a plausible tool for improving police performance.⁴³

⁴³To better understand the implication of this policy conclusion, in ongoing work, Amaral et al. (2021b) study the impact of gender sensitization training on police officers' skills and performance when dealing with women.

References

ActionAid (2016). Fearless. Technical report, ActionAid.

- Amaral, S., Bhalotra, S., and Prakash, N. (2021a). Gender, crime and punishment: Evidence from women police stations in india.
- Amaral, S., Borker, G., Prakash, N., and Sviatschi, M. M. (2021b). Debiasing law enforcement: Effects of an expressive arts intervention in india.
- Anwar, S. and Loughran, T. A. (2011). Testing a bayesian learning theory of deterrence among serious juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 49(3):667–698.
- Asiedu, E., Karlan, D., Lambon-Quayefio, M., and Udry, C. (2021). A call for structured ethics appendices in social science papers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(29).
- Ba, B. A., Knox, D., Mummolo, J., and Rivera, R. (2021). The role of officer race and gender in police-civilian interactions in chicago. *Science*, 371(6530):696–702.
- Banerjee, A., Chattopadhyay, R., Duflo, E., Keniston, D., and Singh, N. (2021). Improving police performance in rajasthan, india: Experimental evidence on incentives, managerial autonomy, and training. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 13(1):36–66.
- Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Keniston, D., and Singh, N. (2019). The efficient deployment of police resources: theory and new evidence from a randomized drunk driving crackdown in india. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bindler, A., Ketel, N., and Hjalmarsson, R. (2020). Costs of victimization. *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, pages 1–31.
- Blair, G., Weinstein, J. M., Christia, F., Arias, E., Badran, E., Blair, R. A., Cheema, A., Farooqui, A., Fetzer, T., Grossman, G., et al. (2021). Community policing does not build citizen trust in police or reduce crime in the global south. *Science*, 374(6571):eabd3446.

- Blair, R. A., Karim, S. M., and Morse, B. S. (2019). Establishing the rule of law in weak and war-torn states: Evidence from a field experiment with the liberian national police. *American Political Science Review*, 113(3):641–657.
- Blanes i Vidal, J. and Mastrobuoni, G. (2018). Police patrols and crime.
- Blattman, C., Green, D. P., Ortega, D., and Tobón, S. (2021). Place-based interventions at scale: The direct and spillover effects of policing and city services on crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(4):2022–2051.
- Blattman, C., Jamison, J., Koroknay-Palicz, T., Rodrigues, K., and Sheridan, M. (2016). Measuring the measurement error: A method to qualitatively validate survey data. *Journal of Development Economics*, 120:99–112.
- Borker, G. (2021). Safety first: Perceived risk of street harassment and educational choices of women.
- Borker, G. (2022). Constraints to women's use of public transport in developing countries, part ii: Safety. *Global Indicators Briefs*, 2(10).
- Braga, A. A., Turchan, B., Papachristos, A. V., and Hureau, D. M. (2019). Hot spots policing of small geographic areas effects on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3):e1046.
- Chakraborty, T., Mukherjee, A., Rachapalli, S. R., and Saha, S. (2018). Stigma of sexual violence and women's decision to work. *World Development*, 103:226–238.
- Cheema, A., Khwaja, A. I., Naseer, F., and Shapiro, J. N. (2019). Glass walls: Experimental evidence on access constraints faced by women. Technical report, Mimeo, Harvard University.
- Collazos, D., García, E., Mejía, D., Ortega, D., and Tobón, S. (2021). Hot spots policing in a high-crime environment: An experimental evaluation in medellin. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 17(3):473–506.

- Cook, C., Diamond, R., Hall, J. V., List, J. A., and Oyer, P. (2021). The gender earnings gap in the gig economy: Evidence from over a million rideshare drivers. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(5):2210–2238.
- Cooper, J. (2019). State capacity and gender inequality: experimental evidence from papua new guinea. *Working Paper*.
- Dahl, G. B. and Knepper, M. M. (2021). Why is workplace sexual harassment underreported? the value of outside options amid the threat of retaliation. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Dahl, G. B., Kotsadam, A., and Rooth, D.-O. (2021). Does integration change gender attitudes? the effect of randomly assigning women to traditionally male teams. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(2):987–1030.
- Di Tella, R. and Schargrodsky, E. (2004). Do police reduce crime? estimates using the allocation of police forces after a terrorist attack. *American Economic Review*, 94(1):115–133.
- Draca, M., Machin, S., and Witt, R. (2011). Panic on the streets of london: Police, crime, and the july 2005 terror attacks. *American Economic Review*, 101(5):2157–81.
- Field, E. and Vyborny, K. (2021). Women's mobility and labor supply experimental evidence from pakistan. *Working Paper*.
- GOI (2011). Census of india 2011. Government of India.
- HCP (2011). Hyderabd city police act. Hyderabad City Police.
- Hoekstra, M. and Sloan, C. (2022). Does race matter for police use of force? evidence from 911 calls. *American Economic Review*, 112(3):827–60.
- Jayachandran, S. (2021). Social norms as a barrier to women's employment in developing countries. *IMF Economic Review*, 69(3):576–595.
- Khan, M. Y. (2021). Mission motivation and public sector performance: experimental evidence from pakistan. *Unpublished manuscript*.

- Kondylis, F., Legovini, A., Vyborny, K., Zwager, A. M. T., and Cardoso De Andrade, L. (2020). Demand for safe spaces: Avoiding harassment and stigma. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (9269).
- Lindo, J. M., Siminski, P., and Swensen, I. D. (2018). College party culture and sexual assault. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10(1):236–65.
- Livingston, B. (2015). Hollaback! international street harassment survey project. Technical report, ActionAid.
- M, S. (2020). Dial 100 on time in telangana. *Telangana Today*.
- Madan, M. and Nalla, M. K. (2016). Sexual harassment in public spaces: Examining gender differences in perceived seriousness and victimization. *International criminal justice review*, 26(2):80–97.
- Miller, A. R. and Segal, C. (2019). Do female officers improve law enforcement quality? effects on crime reporting and domestic violence. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(5):2220–2247.
- Moser, C. (2012). Mainstreaming women's safety in cities into gender-based policy and programmes. *Gender & Development*, 20(3):435–452.
- Rickne, J. and Folke, O. (2020). Sexual harassment and gender inequality in the labor market.
- Saguy, A. C. and Rees, M. E. (2021). Gender, power, and harassment: Sociology in the# metoo era. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47:417–435.
- Siddique, Z. (2018). Violence and female labor supply. *Available at SSRN* 3273713.
- Sukhtankar, S., Kruks-Wisner, G., and Mangla, A. (2022). Policing in patriarchy: An experimental evaluation of reforms to improve police responsiveness to women in india. *Science*, 377(6602):191–198.
- Sviatschi, M. M. and Trako, I. (2021). Gender violence, enforcement and human capital: Evidence from women justice centers in peru. *SSRN Electron. J.*

- Telep, C. W., Mitchell, R. J., and Weisburd, D. (2014). How much time should the police spend at crime hot spots? answers from a police agency directed randomized field trial in sacramento, california. *Justice quarterly*, 31(5):905–933.
- UN (2017). Data on police organisations 2017. Population Division.
- Westfall, P. H. and Young, S. S. (1993). *Resampling-based multiple testing: Examples and methods for p-value adjustment*, volume 279. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wilson, T., Paternoster, R., and Loughran, T. (2017). Direct and indirect experiential effects in an updating model of deterrence: A research note. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 54(1):63–77.

A Appendix - Tables and Figures

List of Figures

| A1 | Timeline of Activities | 45 |
|----|--|----|
| A2 | Effect of the Intervention on EOS visits and observation minutes | 46 |
| A3 | Spatial Distribution of Hotspots and Experimental Assignment | 47 |
| A4 | Measurement of Street Harassment at Hotspots at Baseline | 51 |
| A5 | Effect of Policing by Type of Women's Response | 62 |
| A6 | The Effects of Uniform Patrolling on Street Sexual Harassment by Month | 63 |
| A7 | Officers Characteristics: SHE Teams vs. Other Patrol Officers | 64 |
| A8 | Lab Map and Setting | 70 |

List of Tables

| 1 | Effects on Patrol Duration and Total Visits | 22 |
|-----|--|----|
| 2 | Effect of Police Patrolling on Street Sexual Harassment | 26 |
| 3 | Street Sexual Harassment and Women's Mobility | 28 |
| 4 | Detection, Tolerance, and Punishment of Sexual Harassment Against Other Crimes | 32 |
| 5 | Effect of Policing on Street Sexual Harassment by Patrol Officers Harassment Related Norms | 35 |
| A1 | Legislation and Penalties for Sexual Harassment Offenses | 48 |
| A2 | Stratification by Type and Size of Public Space | 50 |
| A3 | Balancing Tests - Hotspot Areas | 52 |
| A4 | Balancing Tests - Spillover Areas within 200m Radius from Hotspots | 53 |
| A5 | Balancing Tests - Spillover Areas within 500m Radius from Hotspots | 54 |
| A6 | Effect of policing street sexual harassment accounting for enumerator fixed- effects | 55 |
| A7 | Effect of policing on street sexual harassment - Robustness checks | 56 |
| A8 | Effect of Policing on Street Sexual Harassment within 200m and 500m of the Intervention | 57 |
| A9 | Effect of Police Patrolling on Footfall | 58 |
| A10 | Effect on Dial 100 Calls– Sexual Harassment | 59 |
| A11 | Effect on Dial 100 Calls–Other Crimes | 60 |
| A12 | Heterogeneity Based on Female Commuters Gender Norms | 61 |
| A13 | Detection and Punishment of Severe Sexual Harassment against Mild Forms | 63 |

| A14 Summary Statistics - Def | ection Experiment |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
|------------------------------|-------------------|

Figure A1: Timeline of Activities





Figure A2: Effect of the Intervention on EOS visits and observation minutes

Notes: The figures display coefficients δ_1 and δ_2 and respective the 95% confidence intervals from regressions of the form $Y_{hw} = \beta_0 + \delta_1 Uniform_h + \delta_2 Undercover_h + X_{hw} + \gamma_s + \epsilon_{hw}$ - following Equation 1. In Figure (a), Y_{hw} is the number of visits by an enumerator to a hotspot-week. In Figure (b), Y_{hw} is the total duration (in minutes) of visitations by enumerators to a hotspot-week. All regressions include strata fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level. Data source: Enumerator Observation Survey.

Figure A3: Spatial Distribution of Hotspots and Experimental Assignment



Notes: The figures display the location of hotspots and the respective patrol areas within the Hyderabad Police jurisdiction.

| S. No. | Crime Type | IPC Sections | Maximum Punish- |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | ment |
| 1 | Rape | 375, 376, 376A (Causing Death | 20 years to |
| | | or resulting in persistent vegeta- | Life |
| | | tive state) | |
| | | 376B (by husband without con- | 2 to 7 years |
| | | sent during separation) | |
| | | 376C (by person in authority) | 5 to 10 years |
| | | 376D (Gang rape) | 20 years to |
| | | | life |
| | | 376E (Repeat Offender) | Life |
| 2 | Attempt to Commit | 376/511 | One-half |
| | Rape | | of the pun- |
| | | | ishment |
| | | | provided |
| 3 | Un-natural offence | 377 | 10 years to |
| | | | Life |
| 4 | Kidnapping and se- | 362 and 363 | 7 years & |
| | duction | | fine |
| 5 | Murder | 302 | Life |
| | Dowry Death | 304B | 7 years to |
| | | | life |
| | Abetment of suicide | 306 | 10 years |
| 6 | Cruelty by husband | 498A | 3 years & |
| | or his relatives | | fine |
| 7 | Outraging the mod- | 354 | Fine and |
| | esty of women | | imprison- |
| | | | ment of 2 |
| | | | years |
| | Harassment | 354(A) - Sexual Harassment, | |
| | | Physical contact, demanding | |
| | | or requesting sexual favours, | |
| | | showing pornography, making | |
| | | sexually colored remarks | |
| | | 354(B) - Assault on women with | 3 years |
| | | the intent to disrobe a woman | |
| | | 354(C) Voyeurism - captures im- | 3 to 7 years |
| | | ages of women engaging in pri- | |
| | | vate act | |

Table A1: Legislation and Penalties for Sexual Harassment Offenses

| | | 354(D) - Stalking: Follows a woman and contacts, attempt to contact, monitors by inter- net, email, electronic communi- cation Section 298 A and B - Various | 3 to 5 years 3 months | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| | | forms of harassment: a man who is found guilty of making a female the target of obscene ges- tures, remarks, songs or recita- tion | | |
| 8 | Word gestures or act intended to insult the modesty of a woman | 509 | Fine or up to 1 year im- prisonment | |
| 9 | Cheating and manip- ulating to marry | 418, 420 | 7 years | |
| 10 | Criminal intimida- tion, Blackmailing & threatening | 503 & 506 | 2 years | |
| 11 | Harassing through social media & what- sapp, creating fake accounts, morphing, sending obscene videos & pictures | Sec. 66 & 67 of IT Act | & Section 292 | & 3 to 5 years fined; fine of 2000 and 2 imprisonment for first time offenders, repeated offences are punished with 5000 fine and 5 years imprisonment. |
| 12 | Petty cases | Sec. 70(C) of City Police Act | 10 Days & fine | |

Notes: This table displays the relevant acts and Indian Penal Code legislation that address sexual harassment offenses. Sources: Hyderabad City Police and (HCP, 2011).

| | Control | Uniform | Undercover | Total |
|-------------------|---------|---------|------------|-------|
| Type Public Space | | | | |
| Educational | 37 | 24 | 25 | 86 |
| General | 47 | 30 | 31 | 108 |
| Residential | 18 | 13 | 12 | 43 |
| Commuter | 48 | 33 | 32 | 113 |
| Total | 150 | 100 | 100 | 350 |
| | | | | |
| Size | | | | |
| Normal | 129 | 87 | 85 | 301 |
| Large | 17 | 9 | 12 | 38 |
| Very Large | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Total | 150 | 100 | 100 | 350 |

Table A2: Stratification by Type and Size of Public Space

Notes: This table displays the distribution of hotspots by strata items by type of public space and size. The type of public space includes hotspots characterized as serving educational institutions, general public space, residential areas, or commuting areas.

Figure A4: Measurement of Street Harassment at Hotspots at Baseline



(c) Sexual Harassment Police Calls

Notes: This figure displays the spatial distribution of the level of street sexual harassment using three different measures. Panel (a) displays observed harassment - the primary outcome; panel (b) displays the rate of victimization using women's survey responses; panel (c) displays the number of police calls of sexual harassment using Dial 100. All measures use pre-intervention data and are collected at the hotspot level.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Variable | Mean Uniform | Mean Undercover | Mean Control | Diff Uniform-Control | Diff Undercover-Control | Diff Uniform-Undercover |
| Education Level: No Education | 0.045 | 0.043 | 0.056 | -0.012 | -0.013 | 0.002 |
| | (0.207) | (0.202) | (0.230) | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.012) |
| Education Level: Up to High School | 0.597 | 0.559 | 0.544 | 0.054** | 0.017 | 0.041 |
| * • | (0.491) | (0.497) | (0.498) | (0.026) | (0.027) | (0.030) |
| Education Level: Graduate and Post-Graduate | 0.356 | 0.398 | 0.400 | -0.043 | -0.004 | -0.045 |
| | (0.479) | (0.490) | (0.490) | (0.027) | (0.027) | (0.031) |
| Occupation Status: Unemployed or Retired | 0.036 | 0.029 | 0.042 | -0.007 | -0.013 | 0.008 |
| | (0.187) | (0.168) | (0.200) | (0.010) | (0.009) | (0.010) |
| Occupation Status: Student | 0.504 | 0.491 | 0.497 | 0.007 | -0.005 | 0.011 |
| * | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.034) |
| Occupation Status: Homemaker | 0.115 | 0.104 | 0.087 | 0.028 | 0.017 | 0.012 |
| * | (0.319) | (0.305) | (0.283) | (0.019) | (0.016) | (0.018) |
| Occupation Status: Employed | 0.345 | 0.375 | 0.372 | -0.026 | 0.002 | -0.031 |
| | (0.476) | (0.484) | (0.483) | (0.024) | (0.026) | (0.029) |
| Marital Status: Never Married | 0.703 | 0.654 | 0.692 | 0.011 | -0.039 | 0.050 |
| | (0.457) | (0.476) | (0.462) | (0.029) | (0.028) | (0.031) |
| Marital Status: Ever-Married | 0.291 | 0.335 | 0.299 | -0.007 | 0.037 | -0.044 |
| | (0.454) | (0.472) | (0.458) | (0.028) | (0.028) | (0.031) |
| Mode of Transport: Cab/Carpool/Auto | 0.228 | 0.207 | 0.238 | -0.006 | -0.029 | 0.018 |
| | (0.419) | (0.405) | (0.426) | (0.031) | (0.028) | (0.032) |
| Mode of Transport: Walking | 0.182 | 0.191 | 0.200 | -0.020 | -0.006 | -0.010 |
| | (0.386) | (0.393) | (0.400) | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.026) |
| Mode of Transport: Bus | 0.779 | 0.745 | 0.738 | 0.043 | 0.004 | 0.037 |
| | (0.415) | (0.436) | (0.440) | (0.028) | (0.029) | (0.029) |
| Mode of Transport: Local Train or Metro | 0.049 | 0.070 | 0.063 | -0.018 | 0.003 | -0.019 |
| | (0.215) | (0.255) | (0.244) | (0.015) | (0.019) | (0.017) |
| Mode of Transport: Two-Wheelers | 0.087 | 0.081 | 0.089 | -0.001 | -0.007 | 0.007 |
| | (0.282) | (0.273) | (0.284) | (0.017) | (0.016) | (0.019) |
| Mode of Transport: Private Car | 0.022 | 0.012 | 0.019 | 0.003 | -0.009 | 0.009 |
| | (0.148) | (0.108) | (0.137) | (0.010) | (0.006) | (0.009) |
| Gender Norms: Index (Sum) | 1.090 | 0.976 | 1.084 | 0.013 | -0.156 | 0.104 |
| | (1.346) | (1.410) | (1.461) | (0.175) | (0.211) | (0.190) |
| Victimization Rate (City) | 0.324 | 0.360 | 0.359 | -0.039 | -0.000 | -0.032 |
| | (0.468) | (0.480) | (0.480) | (0.036) | (0.031) | (0.035) |
| Feel Safe at HP | 0.673 | 0.671 | 0.649 | 0.028 | 0.026 | 0.002 |
| | (0.469) | (0.470) | (0.477) | (0.040) | (0.034) | (0.042) |
| Time Spent Outdoors (Hours) | 7.148 | 7.242 | 7.183 | -0.039 | 0.045 | -0.095 |
| | (2.435) | (2.610) | (2.506) | (0.153) | (0.148) | (0.163) |
| Takes at Least 1 Precaution | 0.896 | 0.871 | 0.886 | 0.012 | -0.014 | 0.023 |
| | (0.305) | (0.335) | (0.318) | (0.024) | (0.025) | (0.028) |
| Observations | 1,072 | 1,101 | 1,624 | 2,696 | 2,725 | 2,173 |

Table A3: Balancing Tests - Hotspot Areas

| Tabl | e A4: | Bala | ancing | Tests | - Spill | over | Areas | within | 200m | Radi | ius f | from | Hotsp | oots |
|------|-------|------|--------|-------|---------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
|------|-------|------|--------|-------|---------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|--|--------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Variable | Mean Uniform | Mean Undercover | Mean Control | Diff Uniform-Control | Diff Undercover-Control | Diff Uniform-Undercover |
| Education Level: No Education | 0.059 | 0.059 | 0.038 | 0.023* | 0.023* | -0.000 |
| | (0.236) | (0.236) | (0.191) | (0.013) | (0.013) | (0.016) |
| Education Level: Up to High School | 0.619 | 0.619 | 0.554 | 0.055* | -0.005 | 0.057 |
| | (0.486) | (0.486) | (0.497) | (0.033) | (0.036) | (0.037) |
| Education Level: Graduate and Post | 0.322 | 0.322 | 0.408 | -0.078** | -0.021 | -0.054 |
| | (0.468) | (0.468) | (0.492) | (0.034) | (0.037) | (0.039) |
| Occupation Status: Unemployed or Retired | 0.034 | 0.034 | 0.027 | 0.008 | -0.009 | 0.017 |
| | (0.180) | (0.180) | (0.162) | (0.010) | (0.009) | (0.010) |
| Occupation Status: Student | 0.514 | 0.514 | 0.513 | -0.011 | -0.042 | 0.031 |
| | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.034) | (0.035) | (0.041) |
| Occupation Status: Homemaker | 0.152 | 0.152 | 0.122 | 0.030 | 0.042 | -0.010 |
| | (0.360) | (0.360) | (0.327) | (0.025) | (0.026) | (0.031) |
| Occupation Status: Employed | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.337 | -0.027 | 0.009 | -0.038 |
| | (0.458) | (0.458) | (0.473) | (0.030) | (0.031) | (0.035) |
| Marital Status: Never Married | 0.638 | 0.638 | 0.636 | -0.008 | -0.023 | 0.015 |
| | (0.481) | (0.481) | (0.481) | (0.035) | (0.034) | (0.040) |
| Marital Status: Ever-Married | 0.351 | 0.351 | 0.357 | 0.004 | 0.024 | -0.020 |
| | (0.478) | (0.478) | (0.479) | (0.035) | (0.034) | (0.040) |
| Mode of Transport: Cab/Carpool/Auto | 0.248 | 0.248 | 0.218 | 0.039 | 0.010 | 0.026 |
| | (0.432) | (0.432) | (0.413) | (0.036) | (0.035) | (0.040) |
| Mode of Transport: Walking | 0.171 | 0.171 | 0.169 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.001 |
| | (0.377) | (0.377) | (0.375) | (0.029) | (0.031) | (0.036) |
| Mode of Transport: Bus | 0.758 | 0.758 | 0.804 | -0.049 | -0.051* | 0.005 |
| | (0.429) | (0.429) | (0.397) | (0.033) | (0.030) | (0.038) |
| Mode of Transport: Local Train or Metro | 0.091 | 0.091 | 0.041 | 0.051** | 0.016 | 0.037 |
| | (0.288) | (0.288) | (0.198) | (0.025) | (0.017) | (0.026) |
| Mode of Transport: Two-Wheelers | 0.088 | 0.088 | 0.089 | 0.002 | 0.023 | -0.024 |
| | (0.284) | (0.284) | (0.285) | (0.020) | (0.022) | (0.024) |
| Mode of Transport: Private Car | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.025 | 0.001 | 0.010 | -0.007 |
| | (0.158) | (0.158) | (0.156) | (0.014) | (0.014) | (0.014) |
| Gender Norms: Index (Sum) | 1.324 | 1.324 | 1.168 | 0.103 | 0.172 | -0.061 |
| | (1.596) | (1.596) | (1.485) | (0.187) | (0.174) | (0.209) |
| Victimization Rate (City) | 0.284 | 0.284 | 0.314 | -0.035 | -0.029 | 0.004 |
| | (0.451) | (0.451) | (0.464) | (0.042) | (0.044) | (0.046) |
| Feel Safe at HP | 0.799 | 0.799 | 0.796 | 0.001 | 0.025 | -0.019 |
| | (0.401) | (0.401) | (0.403) | (0.036) | (0.037) | (0.039) |
| Time Spent Outdoors (Hours) | 7.153 | 7.153 | 7.317 | -0.134 | -0.557*** | 0.416* |
| | (2.701) | (2.701) | (2.399) | (0.181) | (0.196) | (0.222) |
| Takes at Least 1 Precaution | 0.885 | 0.885 | 0.863 | 0.013 | -0.047 | 0.058 |
| | (0.319) | (0.319) | (0.344) | (0.028) | (0.036) | (0.036) |
| Observations | 624 | 624 | 1,003 | 8,264 | 8,264 | 8,264 |

| Tabl | e A5: | Bala | ancing | Tests | - Spi | llover | Areas | withi | n 500 |)m Ra | dius | from | Hots | pots |
|------|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|------|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|--|--------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Variable | Mean Uniform | Mean Undercover | Mean Control | Diff Uniform-Control | Diff Undercover-Control | Diff Uniform-Undercover |
| Education Level: No Education | 0.067 | 0.067 | 0.050 | 0.023* | 0.023* | -0.000 |
| | (0.251) | (0.251) | (0.218) | (0.013) | (0.013) | (0.016) |
| Education Level: Up to High School | 0.611 | 0.611 | 0.518 | 0.055* | -0.005 | 0.057 |
| * • | (0.488) | (0.488) | (0.500) | (0.033) | (0.036) | (0.037) |
| Education Level: Graduate and Post | 0.320 | 0.320 | 0.431 | -0.078** | -0.021 | -0.054 |
| | (0.467) | (0.467) | (0.495) | (0.034) | (0.037) | (0.039) |
| Occupation Status: Unemployed or Retired | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.028 | 0.008 | -0.009 | 0.017 |
| | (0.124) | (0.124) | (0.164) | (0.010) | (0.009) | (0.010) |
| Occupation Status: Student | 0.497 | 0.497 | 0.461 | -0.011 | -0.042 | 0.031 |
| - | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.499) | (0.034) | (0.035) | (0.041) |
| Occupation Status: Homemaker | 0.117 | 0.117 | 0.134 | 0.030 | 0.042 | -0.010 |
| | (0.322) | (0.322) | (0.341) | (0.025) | (0.026) | (0.031) |
| Occupation Status: Employed | 0.370 | 0.370 | 0.378 | -0.027 | 0.009 | -0.038 |
| | (0.483) | (0.483) | (0.485) | (0.030) | (0.031) | (0.035) |
| Marital Status: Never Married | 0.605 | 0.605 | 0.597 | -0.008 | -0.023 | 0.015 |
| | (0.489) | (0.489) | (0.491) | (0.035) | (0.034) | (0.040) |
| Marital Status: Ever-Married | 0.386 | 0.386 | 0.397 | 0.004 | 0.024 | -0.020 |
| | (0.487) | (0.487) | (0.490) | (0.035) | (0.034) | (0.040) |
| Mode of Transport: Cab/Carpool/Auto | 0.244 | 0.244 | 0.253 | 0.039 | 0.010 | 0.026 |
| | (0.430) | (0.430) | (0.435) | (0.036) | (0.035) | (0.040) |
| Mode of Transport: Walking | 0.180 | 0.180 | 0.147 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.001 |
| | (0.384) | (0.384) | (0.355) | (0.029) | (0.031) | (0.036) |
| Mode of Transport: Bus | 0.752 | 0.752 | 0.796 | -0.049 | -0.051* | 0.005 |
| | (0.432) | (0.432) | (0.403) | (0.033) | (0.030) | (0.038) |
| Mode of Transport: Local Train or Metro | 0.067 | 0.067 | 0.045 | 0.051** | 0.016 | 0.037 |
| | (0.251) | (0.251) | (0.207) | (0.025) | (0.017) | (0.026) |
| Mode of Transport: Two-Wheelers | 0.067 | 0.067 | 0.098 | 0.002 | 0.023 | -0.024 |
| | (0.251) | (0.251) | (0.298) | (0.020) | (0.022) | (0.024) |
| Mode of Transport: Private Car | 0.028 | 0.028 | 0.019 | 0.001 | 0.010 | -0.007 |
| | (0.165) | (0.165) | (0.138) | (0.014) | (0.014) | (0.014) |
| Gender Norms: Index (Sum) | 1.450 | 1.450 | 1.102 | 0.103 | 0.172 | -0.061 |
| | (1.755) | (1.755) | (1.488) | (0.187) | (0.174) | (0.209) |
| Victimization Rate (City) | 0.254 | 0.254 | 0.288 | -0.035 | -0.029 | 0.004 |
| | (0.436) | (0.436) | (0.453) | (0.042) | (0.044) | (0.046) |
| Feel Safe at HP | 0.809 | 0.809 | 0.806 | 0.001 | 0.025 | -0.019 |
| | (0.393) | (0.393) | (0.396) | (0.036) | (0.037) | (0.039) |
| Time Spent Outdoors (Hours) | 7.261 | 7.261 | 7.180 | -0.134 | -0.557*** | 0.416* |
| | (2.382) | (2.382) | (2.552) | (0.181) | (0.196) | (0.222) |
| Takes at Least 1 Precaution | 0.806 | 0.806 | 0.879 | 0.013 | -0.047 | 0.058 |
| | (0.396) | (0.396) | (0.326) | (0.028) | (0.036) | (0.036) |
| Observations | 640 | 640 | 977 | 8,264 | 8,264 | 8,264 |

| | Total | Severe | Mild |
|------------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | SSH | SSH | SSH |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | | | |
| Uniform | -0.019 | -0.031** | 0.012 |
| | (0.024) | (0.013) | (0.019) |
| | | | |
| Undercover | 0.011 | 0.009 | 0.001 |
| | (0.024) | (0.014) | (0.018) |
| | | | |
| N | 4,988 | 4,988 | 4,988 |
| Mean of Dep. Var | 0.471 | 0.129 | 0.342 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Enumerator FEs | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table A6: Effect of policing street sexual harassment accounting for enumerator fixedeffects

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a hotspot-week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to a hotspot in a week. In Column 1 we present the rate per total forms of harassment and in Columns 2 and 3 we display the rate by severe and mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. We also include a dummy that takes value one for enumerators that visited a hotspot in a week and zero for those that did not. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Randomized inference p-values are displayed in squared brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total | Severe | Mild | | | |
| | SSH | SSH | SSH | | | |
| Panel A: Control for Week FE and Public Holidays | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Uniform | -0.023 | -0.033** | 0.009 | | | |
| | (0.024) | (0.013) | (0.018) | | | |
| Undercover | 0.009 | 0.011 | -0.002 | | | |
| | (0.025) | (0.014) | (0.018) | | | |
| Panel B: Control fo | or Week l | FE, Public | Holidays, and Bus Strikes | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Uniform | -0.024 | -0.033** | 0.009 | | | |
| | (0.024) | (0.013) | (0.018) | | | |
| Undercover | 0.009 | 0.011 | -0.002 | | | |
| | (0.025) | (0.014) | (0.018) | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Ν | 4,988 | 4,988 | 4,988 | | | |
| Mean of Dep. Var. | 0.471 | 0.129 | 0.342 | | | |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |

Table A7: Effect of policing on street sexual harassment - Robustness checks

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a hotspot-week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to a hotspot in a week. In Column 1 we present the rate per total form of harassment and in Columns 2 and 3 we display the rate by severe and mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. In panel A we include week-fixed effects, in panel B we also add dummies taking into account for week-hotspots affected by public holidays such as religious festivals, and in panel C we also include a dummy for weeks-hotspots affected by bus strike. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

| | (1) To | (2) | (3) Source | (4) | (5) Mild | (6) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | 10tal 200m E00m | | 200m | 500m | 200m | 500m |
| | 200111 | 30011 | 200111 | 300III | 200111 | 30011 |
| | | | | | | |
| Uniform | -0.017 | -0.016 | 0.000 | -0.004 | -0.017 | -0.012 |
| | (0.024) | (0.025) | (0.014) | (0.013) | (0.018) | (0.019) |
| Undercover | 0.002 | 0.010 | -0.005 | -0.008 | 0.007 | 0.018 |
| | (0.026) | (0.024) | (0.015) | (0.013) | (0.019) | (0.018) |
| | | | | | | |
| Ν | 4,683 | 4,696 | 4,683 | 4,696 | 4,683 | 4,696 |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 0.404 | 0.373 | 0.110 | 0.096 | 0.294 | 0.277 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table A8: Effect of Policing on Street Sexual Harassment within 200m and 500m of the Intervention

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a spillover area week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to an area in a week. Columns 1,3 and 5 present results for areas that are 200 meters away from a hotspot, and columns 2,4, and 6 for areas that are 500 meters away from a hotspot. In columns 1 and 2, we present the rate per total forms of harassment and in columns 3 and 4, we display the rate by severe harassment, and in columns 5 and 5 we present results for mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot serving a spillover area is in the uniform treatment arm and zero it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot serving a spillover area is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the area level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | Hotspot | | 200m Spillover | | 500m Spillover | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Uniform | -0.060 | -0.057 | -0.071 | -0.062 | -0.050 | -0.056 |
| | (0.054) | (0.052) | (0.060) | (0.059) | (0.057) | (0.056) |
| Undercover | 0.034 | 0.051 | -0.004 | -0.006 | 0.102** | 0.085 |
| | (0.059) | (0.057) | (0.058) | (0.057) | (0.052) | (0.051) |
| Observations | 4.988 | 4.988 | 4.683 | 4.683 | 4.696 | 4.696 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.134 | 0.219 | 0.042 | 0.104 | 0.046 | 0.100 |
| Mean of Dep. Var / control | 3.586 | 3.586 | 3.297 | 3.297 | 3.247 | 3.247 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Week FE | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Public Holidays/Bus Strike | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

Table A9: Effect of Police Patrolling on Footfall

Notes: The main dependent variable is the observed footfall by hotspot week (in logs). In columns 1-2 we present results for the hotspot areas, in columns 3-4 from spillover that are 200 meters away from the hotspot, and in columns 5-6 from spillover that are 500 meters away from the hotspot. This measure takes values 0-1000 and is the result of the enumerators observation and coding of the question "How many people are at the location?". In Columns 1,3 and 5 we present regressions controlling for the number of visits per week, and in columns 2,4 and 6 we also control for week fixed-effects, and dummies for weeks with public holidays or affected by the bus strike. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

| | Total Sexual Harassment Calls | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | |
| | | | | |
| Uniform Hotspot | -0.039 | -0.039 | -0.035 | |
| - | (0.048) | (0.048) | (0.047) | |
| Undercover Hotspot | 0.043 | 0.043 | 0.042 | |
| | (0.058) | (0.058) | (0.057) | |
| | | | | |
| N | 9,450 | 9,450 | 9,450 | |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 0.404 | 0.404 | 0.404 | |
| Uniform=Undercover (p-value) | 0.170 | 0.171 | 0.184 | |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Week FE | No | Yes | Yes | |
| Public Holiday | No | No | Yes | |
| Bus Strike | No | No | Yes | |

Table A10: Effect on Dial 100 Calls- Sexual Harassment

Notes: The main dependent variable is the sum of calls related to sexual harassment offenses per week and per hotspot. The main independent variables are a dummy that takes the value one for hotspots that are assigned to receive patrols in uniform - Uniform Hotspot- and a dummy that takes the value one for hotspots that are assigned to receive patrols in undercover - Undercover Hotspot. All regressions include strata fixed-effects. In Column 2 we include week fixed-effects and in Column 3 we include a dummy for weeks that are affected by a public holiday and those affected by the bus strike. Standard-errors are clustered at the hotspot level. Source: Hyderabad Police Dial 100 database.

| | Total Other Crimes | | | | Property |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| | | Accidents | Physical Offenses | Nuisances | Offenses |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | | | | | |
| Uniform Hotspot | -0.221 | -0.028 | -0.020 | -0.052 | -0.035 |
| | (0.279) | (0.045) | (0.036) | (0.069) | (0.032) |
| Undercover Hotspot | 0.159 | -0.021 | 0.012 | 0.064 | 0.006 |
| - | (0.303) | (0.049) | (0.039) | (0.071) | (0.035) |
| Observations | 9,450 | 9,450 | 9,450 | 9,450 | 9,450 |
| Mean of Dep. Var. / Control | 4.380 | 0.586 | 0.700 | 1.048 | 0.369 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Week FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Public Holiday | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bus Strike | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table A11: Effect on Dial 100 Calls-Other Crimes

Notes: The main dependent variable is the sum of calls related to non-sexual harassment crimes per week and per hotspot. The main independent variables are a dummy that takes the value one for hotspots that are assigned to receive patrols in uniform - Uniform Hotspot- and a dummy that takes the value one for hotspots that are assigned to receive patrols in undercover - Undercover Hotspot. All regressions include strata fixed effects, and controls for week fixed - effects, public holidays, and bus strike weeks. Standard-errors are clustered at the hotspot level. Source: Hyderabad Police Dial 100 database.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---------------------------|---------|------------|----------|
| | Total | Severe SSH | Mild SSH |
| | | | |
| Uniform X Above Median | -0.026 | -0.025 | -0.001 |
| | (0.030) | (0.015) | (0.023) |
| Uniform X Below Median | -0.041 | -0.061** | 0.019 |
| | (0.049) | (0.026) | (0.035) |
| Undercover X Above Median | -0.011 | 0.010 | -0.021 |
| | (0.031) | (0.016) | (0.022) |
| Undercover X Below Median | -0.006 | -0.005 | -0.002 |
| | (0.049) | (0.029) | (0.033) |
| Above Median | 0.008 | -0.030 | 0.037 |
| | (0.039) | (0.024) | (0.025) |
| Observations | 4.988 | 4.988 | 4.988 |
| Mean of Dep. Var | 0.471 | 0.129 | 0.342 |
| Strata FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table A12: Heterogeneity Based on Female Commuters Gender Norms

Notes: The main dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a hotspot week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to a hotspot in a week. In Column 1, we present the rate per total form of harassment, and in Columns 2 and 3 we display the rate by severe and mild forms of harassment, respectively. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Undercover is a dummy that takes the value of one if a hotspot is in the undercover treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. Above and below the median are dummy variables that take the value one if, at baseline, the average women's gender norms are above or below the hotspot sample median of the gender norms index. The gender norms index is constructed at the individual level using women's baseline responses on a 12 items scale and aggregated at the hotspot at which women were interviewed while commuting. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey and women's baseline survey.



Figure A5: Effect of Policing by Type of Women's Response

(b) Mild SH

Notes: The figures display coefficients δ_1 , δ_2 , and their respective the 95% confidence intervals from regressions of the form $Y_{hw} = \beta_0 + \delta_1 Uniform_h + \delta_2 Undercover_h + X_{hw} + \gamma_s + \epsilon_{hw}$ - following Equation 1. In Figure (a), Y_{hw} is the number of responses to severe sexual harassment by type. In Figure (b), Y_{hw} is the number of responses to mild sexual harassment by type. The types are defined as follows. We consider that a woman asked help from by-standers when she called over phone, informed the person with her, or asked help from bystanders. We consider that she responded by fighting whenever she called the perpetrator out publicly, used self-defense, confronted him quietly, or responded stayed there. A woman did not respond when she ignored or when she did not realize the incident. All regressions include strata fixed-effects. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level. Data source: Enumerator Observation Survey.

Figure A6: The Effects of Uniform Patrolling on Street Sexual Harassment by Month



Notes: The figure displays coefficients and 95 percent confidence intervals of the effect of the intervention by month. The dependent variable is the rate of victims observed in a hotspot week. This measure is the ratio of total identified victims of sexual harassment per total enumerator visits to a hotspot in a week. The regression follows 1 and interacts with the Uniform dummy with the months 1-6 of the week. Each regression includes strata fixed effects. Uniform is a dummy that takes the value one if a hotspot is in the uniform treatment arm and zero if it is a control group hotspot. We also include in the regression a variable to control for the Undercover arm. Standard errors are clustered at the hotspot level and identified in brackets. Data source: Enumerator observation survey.

| | (1) | (2) |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
| | Detection | Punish. |
| | | |
| Severe Sexual Harassment | -0.060** | 0.024** |
| | (0.028) | (0.012) |
| | | |
| Observations | 1,337 | 1,319 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.004 | 0.015 |
| Mean of Dep. Var / control | 0.797 | 0.984 |
| Sample | Sexual Ha | rassment |
| Session FE | Yes | Yes |
| Officer Controls | No | No |
| Social Desirability | No | No |

Table A13: Detection and Punishment of Severe Sexual Harassment against Mild Forms



Figure A7: Officers Characteristics: SHE Teams vs. Other Patrol Officers

Notes: The figures display coefficients β_1 , and their respective the 95% confidence intervals from regressions of the form $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ SHE Teams $+\epsilon_i$. SHE Teams is a dummy that takes the value one if *i* is an officer part of the SHE Teams, and zero if the respondent is part of other police patrol forces. Robust standard errors. Data source: Officer survey.

Additional Appendix A - Deviation from the pre-analysis plan

Our empirical analysis closely follows our pre-analysis plan. We deviate from this plan in three ways. First, we specified four primary outcomes: i) observed harassment; ii) safety perceptions iii) female mobility and iv) routes taken by women. Primary outcomes ii) - iv) required the completion of the women's survey at the endline. However, the intervention was completed right at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and the city of Hyderabad implemented strict mandated stay-at-home orders. For this reason, any pre-specified outcome measured at the women's level through surveys is not displayed. It is worth noticing that we attempted to conduct phone surveys with the respondents' survey at the endline, but this turned out to be impractical to implement since, due to the topic, women were reluctant to respond to the survey. This was also deemed dangerous to the women, so we decided not to complete the women's survey. In terms of secondary outcomes, any outcomes that required the completion of a women's survey were not collected due to the lockdown. For this reason, the paper does not cover the effects on labor outcomes and participation in social activities as pre-specified. While we ended up having only one primary outcome, which would make multiple hypothesis corrections misleading, we nonetheless conducted the pre-specified multiple hypothesis tests on the severe and mild forms of harassment - the remaining main outcomes that survived the pandemic disruptions. The pre-analysis also declared that the analysis for the main primary outcome - (i) - would include studying the impact on the severity of the harassment. To maintain the scientific value of the paper as per the pre-analysis plan, and as per the integrity of the research question, throughout the paper, when studying channels, we attempt to understand the effect of the intervention in the same line as described in the PAP but, using when possible, the information collected in the EOS exercise. This can be seen in the tables about mobility and women's responses - initially a secondary outcome measured through women's surveys.

The second main deviation pertains to the use of CCTV data to measure female mobility - a primary outcome. Due to data storage restrictions - in terms of computer storage on the part of the partner, the information on CCTV was not stored for the period of the intervention. As a result, this data can no longer be used.

Finally, when measuring police reports - a secondary outcome- we do not make use of information on police walk-ins. It was learned throughout the intervention that police walk-ins' information is not suitable for the project due to the lack of detail in which criminal records are kept and the missing information on the geolocation of such crimes. As a result, this data is not used.

Additional Appendix B - Ethics, Implementation and Intervention Content

B.I Research Ethics

The research had three study branches that required interactions with human subjects: (i) an enumerator observational survey (EOS), (ii) a police officer survey and lab experiments, (iii) and women's baseline survey. Following Asiedu et al. (2021), below we describe how we dealt with various ethics concerns to ensure the safety, privacy, and referral of all participants in the study. All activities were developed by the researchers and implemented by IFMR.

Informed consent, safety protocol, withdrawal and referral systems for enumerators. Before the study initiation, IFMR conducted a training exercise with all enumerators. For the EOS and any survey of women, we used female enumerators, whereas for police officers we used male enumerators. During the training, all individuals went through five training days in which the research team informed potential enumerators of the broad study and its aims and objectives. Enumerators were blind to the experimental components and the experimental arms. The training covered general gender-based enumerators training following the World Health Organization guidelines and specific training on identification of sexual harassment instances in commuting areas. The training made sure to make enumerators aware of the risks, suggest and oversee the application of mitigation strategies and provide a series of support services in case of specific concerns. The enumerators were informed of the study and their individual tasks. Enumerators who initially agreed to participate in the observational survey were welcome to retire anytime they wished to without any financial consequences or penalties. This aspect was reiterated to the enumerators during the training sessions and on multiple counts during the fieldwork. The enumerators were also trained and provided with a field protocol document. This guidebook was written to be consulted if and when needed during fieldwork and served as a guideline for particular training sessions. It details day-to-day activities during data collection, especially about enumerator observation survey, provides an overview of safety risks, outlines mitigation strategies, and highlights key support resources available to field staff during and, in some cases, after completion of fieldwork activities. Enumerators during the fieldwork activities will also have at their disposal a field officer at their disposal to discuss openly any issue they may bear. Enumerators conducting the observation exercise could not be employed for more than 6 weeks in a row. This was done since, after piloting, it was acknowledged that the task was challenging and enumerators could suffer social and emotional consequences accruing from the task itself. Enumerators also engaged in group sessions to generate a dialogue about any potential unpleasant experiences they may have encountered. This was done to manage better any potential unpleasant aspects of conducting the enumerator observation survey. Enumerators were not aware of the randomization and the treatments at each hotspot.

For all the study branches, in case the enumerators face any form of street harassment, they were instructed to report the case to a dedicated helpline to BHAROSA/ SHE Team

for the duration of the study. Enumerators were instructed to travel with a GPS tracking device which was monitored by the IFMR team, who was also based in Hyderabad. Enumerators were also in permanent contact - via mobile phone - with the research assistants to discuss any potentially harmful situation. This allowed for effective monitoring and ensuring the safety of enumerators.

The questionnaires for women - we described the ethics protocol below- and the EOS contain questions regarding sexual violence. This could possibly trigger trauma for respondents who have witnessed such violence firsthand. Along with the group sessions, safety checks while conducting activities, and direct communication lines to the research team and the police, we partnered with BHAROSA. BHAROSA is a support center for women and children which seeks to redress Domestic Violence.

Services offered by BHAROSA include legal aid, prosecution services, medical care along with counseling services for couples and children. BHAROSA also facilitates admission to temporary shelter homes for women who seek security if there is a risk of physical violence and immediate threat to life. This is the most knowledgeable agency available in Hyderabad to provide support in events of trauma related to exposure to harassment instances. For enumerators participating in the enumerator observation study, they had access to a project helpline at all points during their fieldwork. For the enumerator observation study during training sessions, all associated risks along with resources they possess for help and risk mitigation will be thoroughly explained and discussed in plenary sessions and enumerators will be encouraged to discuss any concerns with the lead investigators of this project.

The observational exercise involved having IFMR enumerators record observed circumstances of harassment in commuting areas recording observed instances of harassment taking place during their commute from point A to point B. Point A and Point B could mean home, office, hotels, hotspots, etc. These commuting areas are usual commuting places for any residence in Hyderabad. IFMR enumerators were recruited locally, and as a result, they were already exposed to these commuting places as part of their day-today activities. In addition, the enumerators of the observational survey were all trained to use the "Dial 100" (police helpline). "Dial 100" has a response time of 8-10 minutes and attends to any distress call. Apart from this, the enumerators have a personal phone number of police staff who were informed of the study and were prepared to provide assistance if needed. We, along with IFMR's help, developed exercise training modules to simulate situations of harassment or potential harassment to train the enumerators in multiple preventive and mitigation strategies.

Police officers survey and experiments. The survey consists of a collection of data that will take place in a single phase. IFMR enumerators contacted the police officers to seek an appointment to administer the survey. At this point, and before the commencement of the survey, IFMR enumerators produced an identification card. The officers later received a letter from the Commissioner of Police requesting the officers cooperate with the enumerators. Once this happened, the survey took place at the time of convenience to the officers, and consent, withdrawal, and non-response checks were incorporated into the survey. The survey did not contain any personal violence victimization questions. All enumerators were trained in a similar fashion to that described above.

Women's baseline survey. The baseline of women was administered to a subset of the general population of Hyderabad. This primary survey was administered to women aged 18 years old and over who are daily commuters within the city of Hyderabad. The survey took place in two phases. In the first phase, a random selection of subjects was approached by IFMR enumerators in public places and when they commute to their offices, markets, place of worship, etc. If the subject agrees to participate in the survey lasted 15 minutes. This initial survey collected information on social-demographic variables and women's experiences of sexual harassment during their daily commute. The subjects were not asked to name a potential perpetrator. Instead, the subjects were asked what is the type of relationship with the potential perpetrator (i.e., stranger). To collect such sensitive data, we took the following steps:

- Seek consent to collecting such sensitive data
- Allow the respondents to withdraw from the survey at any point in time
- Allow the respondents to skip any question they do not wish to address
- Make sure surveys are conducted with privacy i.e. in a way that there would not anyone aware that a survey was taking place. If someone stopped nearby or has listening the survey would be stopped and initiated as soon as the conditions were deemed safe by the enumerator and subject
- Make sure both the respondent and the enumerator can safely stop the interview at any point in time in case someone is listening or interrupts the process
- At the end of the survey, the respondent will be provided with a detailed referral protocol on how to discuss instances of harassment with BHAROSA, Women police stations or SHE Teams
- All data was anonymized and encrypted, and the anonymization and decryption were stored separately.

After the initial survey was conducted in commuting locations, the second phase of the survey was conducted with the same respondents. The second phase of the survey was conducted by the same enumerators to minimize risks of breach of confidentiality. To conduct such a survey, respondents were asked at the time of the first survey if they agreed to respond to more questions later period. If the respondent agrees to conduct a second phase of the survey, the enumerator collected the respondent's phone numbers and addresses. The respondent was contacted for the second survey and the survey team agreed on a time and place to conduct the survey. If that is not possible, the survey shall be completed over the telephone. The second phase of the survey collected travel patterns.

B.II Enumerator Observation Exercise Survey

For every visit to a hotspot the enumerator would take note of the events observed for up to 5 women. The survey included the following questions:

- 1. Time stamp. (Capture the time when you arrived at the location)
- 2. How many people were at the location
- 3. Did you see police while you were at the location? Answer options: 1.Yes, 2.No
- 4. During your time at the location, did you see any other girl/woman/transgender face any harassment? Answer options: 1.Yes , 2. No. For each observed woman please complete the following.
- 5. Which group did she belong to? Answer Options: Girl (Below 18 years old), woman (age group-18 to 40), woman (age group 40 above), transgender, don't know
- 6. What incident/incidents did you see them encounter? Answer options: Threaten to hurt (verbal threats), indecent exposure, Taking pictures without consent, unwelcomed comments/catcalling/whistling, inappropriate gestures or facial expressions, stalking, touching/groping/pushing, staring which makes you feel uncomfortable (ogling), attempt to intimidate (by yelling at you, smashing things, trying to make physical contact etc.), physical abuse, abduction, acid attack
- 7. How did she respond to the incident? Answer options: She called someone over the phone right after the incident, she informed the person accompanying her at the location. called out the perpetrator publicly, used any form of self-defence (pepper spray, whistle etc.), asked for help from bystanders, she ran away from the location, she confronted the perpetrator quietly, did not see her report the incident, she responded to the incident but continued to be with the same person, she did nothing and stayed there, the woman didn't realise the incidents listed, others, specify
- 8. Did bystanders provide any kind of help/assistance to the victim? Answer options: Yes, when they witnessed perpetrator harassing the woman, yes, but she refused the help, no, they witnessed but did nothing, no, no one else witnessed.
- 9. End time. Note to enumerator: Capture the time of your departure from the location.
- 10. GPS Location. Automatically capture location below 3 meters.

B.III Lab Experiment Protocol

Between January and March of 2021, the research team set-up a computer lab in the headquarters of the Hyderabad Police. The lab was composed of 14 computers all separated following social distance rules. All computers were also separated by large cardboard blocks to avoid conversations across participants. Below we describe the protocol followed to conduct the experiments.



Figure A8: Lab Map and Setting

Notes: The left figure displays the distribution of officers in the lab, and the right figure displays a photo of one of the sessions.

Recruitment of Participants, Consent and Incentives Participants were selected from a the sample of respondents to the police officers survey. SHE Teams officers were all invited to participate. Among non-SHE Team officers, we identified officers working on similar police task forces. These included officers doing patrols for the Blue Colts task-force. We randomly selected officers to invite from this sub-sample. All officers were summed by letters from the Hyderabad City Police, and officers also receive a call for invitation. Officers could choose their preferred time slot to attend. Officers did not receive any cash or in-kind incentive to participate.

General Instructions and COVID-19 safety protocol. The sessions were conducted during a period where the COVID-19 pandemic was present in the daily lives of officers. Yet, police officers were among the priority group for vaccinations and officers were not under any mandated stay-at-home orders. To ensure the integrity of the experiment and preserve the safety of officers we followed the next instructions:

- 1. Participants are asked to enter one by one in the room
- 2. Participants are assigned to one computer each. Each participant's space is vacant on both sides to preserve anonymity in responses and due to Covid-19 regulations
- 3. Each participant's screen is separated on both sides with cardboard separators to preserve anonymity

- 4. Per session there is one lab manager and two assistants providing instructions and answering technical questions, respectively
- 5. The lab was be operational every week from Mondays to Saturdays
- 6. We conducted three sessions every day with 8 participants per session
- 7. Officers have been allocated to sessions and computers randomly by the RA using Stata
- 8. Before the arrival and start of the session the following steps were taken by surveyors and research assistants:
 - (a) Sanitize all equipment, desks and chairs.
 - (b) Label computers from 1 to 8
 - (c) Prepare the computers→ Check for internet connection and functionality of earphones by playing a video on YouTube
 - (d) Prepare attendance sheet UID, Name, Rank ID, Date, Session Number, Time, Reporting Time of the officer, Signature, Computer Number, Temperature
 - (e) Prepare the folder and the log file for the session. The log file should be used to enter any abnormal situation that took place in each session. Please save the file with the session ID.
 - (f) RA: make sure your laptop is charged and has an active internet connection at all time
 - (g) RA: Configure the following accounts for each of the 8 participants plus 2 of buffer, and set up the experiments links in each computer
 - (h) RA to confirm if all 10 computers are ready and have a functional internet connection
- 9. Upon arrival of each officer the surveyor is required to:
 - (a) Check the officer's temperature \rightarrow Note it down in the attendance sheet. Officers with high temperature should be asked to leave.
 - (b) Spray sanitizer on the officer's palms
 - (c) Give a face mask to the officer
 - (d) Make every officer sign the attendance sheet. Ask the officer to pick a sheet from the bowl and write down the number on the sheet in the attendance sheet
 - (e) Ask the officer about the mobile network he/she uses and note down in the attendance sheet
 - (f) Escort the officer to the computer which carries the same number as his/her sheet. (One of the two surveyors can take the duty of escorting the officer to his/her computer).
- 10. After the end of the session the surveyor is required to:

- (a) Disinfect all computers and desk materials and restart the session with the above instructions.
- (b) Spray sanitizer on the officer's palms
- (c) Give a face mask to the officer
- (d) Make every officer sign the attendance sheet. Ask the officer to pick a sheet from the bowl and write down the number on the sheet in the attendance sheet
- (e) Ask the officer about the mobile network he/she uses and note down in the attendance sheet
- (f) Escort the officer to the computer which carries the same number as his/her sheet. (One of the two surveyors can take the duty of escorting the officer to his/her computer).

Experimental scripts and surveys for the lab session. Below we provide a description of the events in lab experiment.

1. Greetings and general advice: Dear officer, welcome to this lab! We would like to thank you for your participation in this study which is being conducted by LEAD, a research organization. I am and these are my team members, . We will be present with you today to assist you in completing the session. We would like to inform you that the study will last for about 1 hour. This study involves playing two different games. Each game will take about 30 minutes to complete. In each of the games, you will be shown some videos and asked to answer questions based on those videos. If you answer the questions correctly, you stand to win an Amazon gift voucher worth upto Rs. 520. If you agree to participate, we would like to inform you that throughout the study, all your responses will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone in the Hyderabad Police or anyone outside the research team.

Now I will read some rules of the lab while my team members prepare your computer. Do not press any button yet.

- (a) Always wear your mask.
- (b) Do not talk once the session has begun as it might disturb other officers.
- (c) Do not discuss your responses/doubts with the person sitting adjacent to you.
- (d) Please do not look around to other officers either.
- (e) If you face any issue in the middle of the experiment like computer screen hangs or instructions are unclear, etc., do not press any item on the computer. Raise your hand and someone from the lab team will come to your desk to address your problem.
- (f) Please wear your headphones before starting the session.

Detection experiment 1: Now we will start with the first game which will take about 30 minutes of your time.
- 1. A lab monitor will come to enter details on the first screen. Do not enter any details on your own.
- 2. Do not start on your own. Wait for my announcement to start the session.
- 3. This experiment will involve watching some very short videos. You are requested to watch each video till the end.
- 4. You are not allowed to replay a video at any point of time.
- 5. Once you have seen and understood the information on the screen, you can go the next question by clicking the NEXT button.
- 6. It is necessary to answer each question to enable you to move to the next question.
- 7. DO NOT hit the PREVIOUS button at any point of the game.
- 8. These instructions are printed in the instruction's manual kept on your desk. You will be given time to read them.
- 9. When you reach the end of this game, do not press the submit button. Raise your hand. A lab monitor will come to your desk to submit your responses and prepare your computer for the next part of the game.

I request you to wait while my team enters your details on the screen. Please confirm if your details are correct.

Now you have 5 minutes to read the instructions manual kept on your desk. Your time

starts now.

Your reading time is over. Please wear your earphones and then click the NEXT button on your screen to begin the session.

For each video officers would be asked to reply the following questions:

- 1. 1. What action would you take if you were present at this location? Answer options: Make a video of this incident and take the man to the police station, Take the man to the police station, Issue a warning to this man, Escort the woman to a safe place, Woman is comfortable, so take no action, Woman is not uncomfortable, so take no action, Take an action only if the woman complaints, Take no action as there is nothing problematic going on in this situation, Don't know
- 2. 2. Given these circumstances, if you were to encounter such an incident while patrolling, how difficult do you think it would be to collect evidence against the suspect in this case? Answer options: Very Difficult, Difficult, Easy, Very Easy, Not needed since nothing wrong is happening

3. 3 Select the option that best describes the scene depicted in the video. Answer options: 4 different options per video with only one correct answer as shown in ?? , None of the above, Don't know

Congratulations! You have successfully completed part 1 of the session.

Detection experiment 2: Now we will begin the next and last part of this session. This will take about 20 minutes of your time. If you answer the questions in this game correctly, you can earn a gift voucher worth anywhere between INR 0 and INR 520. You can use this gift voucher to make online purchases on Amazon worth the amount earned by you. This game has 2 stages and the instructions to play these games will appear on your screen. In stage 1, you will be asked to count the number of zeros on your screen. In stage 2, you will be shown some videos and asked to answer some questions based on the videos. Now, I will read some instructions:

- 1. Do not start on your own. Wait for my announcement to start the session.
- 2. Please do not change any information entered by the lab monitors on the first screen.
- 3. Do not press the BACK button at the top-left corner of the screen at any given point of the experiment. You cannot change your responses once submitted.
- 4. To proceed to the next screen, select the blue-colored NEXT button present at the bottom of your screen.
- 5. If you face any issue during the experiment, please raise your hand and one of us will come to your desk to address your issue.
- 6. When you reach the end of the game, raise your hand and a lab monitor will come to your computer to submit your responses.
- 7. Please wear your earphones.

I request you to wait while my team enters your details on the screen. Please confirm if your details are correct. Now, you have 5 minutes to read the instructions manual kept on your desk. Your time starts now.

Your reading time is over. Please wear your earphones and then click the NEXT button on your screen to begin the session.

For each video, officers would be asked to identify what they observed and what action they would take. The questions presented to officers are:

1. Imagine you are an officer on duty and witness the scene depicted in the video. Select the option which best describes what you see. Answer options would vary video. For video 1 in Panel of **??** the options were: A man is looking at a woman, a man is looking at a woman inappropriately and winks, A man is looking at a woman inappropriately and winks which makes her uncomfortable, Refuse to answer. 2. If you were present in this situation, what action would you take? Answer, Warn the man and ask him to leave, Take the man to the nearest police station.

Thank you for your participation. You will receive a gift voucher equal to the amount earned by you in this game via SMS by tonight.

| Variable | N | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | |
|---|------|-------|---------|-----|-----|---|
| Main Outcomes: | | | | | | - |
| Offense Detection | 3360 | 0.76 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 | |
| Perceived Detection Ease (score) | 3360 | 0.61 | 0.30 | 0 | 1 | |
| Perceived Detection Ease | 3360 | 0.72 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 | |
| Detection Necessity | 3360 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 | |
| Detecion Capacity Index | 3360 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 0 | 1 | |
| Punitive action | 3360 | 0.78 | 0.42 | 0 | 1 | |
| Victim's Fault (dummy) | 3360 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | |
| Experiment Characteristics: | | | | | | |
| Sexual Harassment - Fast Video | 3360 | 0.41 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | |
| Sexual Harassment - Normal Video | 3360 | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 | |
| Non-Sexual Harassment - Fast Video | 3360 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0 | 1 | |
| Non-Sexual Harassment - Normal Video | 3360 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0 | 1 | |
| Total number of session participants | 3360 | 8.10 | 2.01 | 1 | 12 | |
| Officer Characteristics: | | | | | | |
| Åge (years) | 3360 | 34.61 | 8.33 | 20 | 61 | Ν |
| Female | 3360 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0 | 1 | |
| High-rank Officer | 3360 | 0.05 | 0.23 | 0 | 1 | |
| She Team Officer | 3360 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0 | 1 | |
| No Education | 3360 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0 | 1 | |
| Class 1-5 | 3360 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0 | 1 | |
| Class 6-9 | 3360 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0 | 1 | |
| Completed Class 10 | 3360 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0 | 1 | |
| Completed Class 12 | 3360 | 0.28 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 | |
| Graduate | 3360 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 | |
| Post-Graduate | 3360 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0 | 1 | |
| Social Desirability Index | 3360 | 6.13 | 2.28 | 2 | 12 | |
| Low social desirability | 3360 | 0.45 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 | |
| She Teams improves safety | 3360 | 0.76 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 | |
| SH is a police duty | 3360 | 0.89 | 0.31 | 0 | 1 | |
| Harassment deserves more policing | 3360 | 0.54 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 | |
| Seconds to Complete the Experiment (High) | 3360 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 | |

Table A14: Summary Statistics - Detection Experiment

| Variable | Mean SH Fast | Mean SH Normal | Diff SH Videos | Mean Non-SH Fast | Mean Non-SH Normal | Diff Non-SH Videos |
|---|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Age (years) | 34.580 | 34.647 | 0.000 | 34.669 | 34.508 | 0.000 |
| | (8.255) | (8.438) | (0.314) | (8.497) | (8.065) | (0.314) |
| Female | 0.189 | 0.192 | -0.000 | 0.193 | 0.187 | 0.000 |
| | (0.392) | (0.394) | (0.015) | (0.395) | (0.390) | (0.015) |
| High-rank Officer | 0.051 | 0.057 | 0.000 | 0.059 | 0.044 | -0.000 |
| - | (0.220) | (0.233) | (0.008) | (0.237) | (0.205) | (0.008) |
| She Team Officer | 0.145 | 0.133 | -0.000 | 0.129 | 0.158 | -0.000 |
| | (0.352) | (0.339) | (0.013) | (0.335) | (0.365) | (0.013) |
| No Education | 0.002 | 0.004 | -0.000 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | (0.046) | (0.065) | (0.002) | (0.069) | (0.000) | (0.002) |
| Class 1-5 | 0.004 | 0.002 | -0.000 | 0.002 | 0.005 | 0.000 |
| | (0.060) | (0.046) | (0.002) | (0.040) | (0.072) | (0.002) |
| Class 6-9 | 0.006 | 0.005 | -0.000 | 0.005 | 0.008 | 0.000 |
| | (0.080) | (0.072) | (0.003) | (0.069) | (0.088) | (0.003) |
| Completed Class 10 | 0.115 | 0.110 | 0.000 | 0.108 | 0.122 | -0.000 |
| | (0.320) | (0.313) | (0.012) | (0.310) | (0.327) | (0.012) |
| Completed Class 12 | 0.280 | 0.279 | -0.000 | 0.278 | 0.282 | 0.000 |
| | (0.449) | (0.449) | (0.017) | (0.448) | (0.451) | (0.017) |
| Graduate | 0.490 | 0.493 | 0.000 | 0.494 | 0.487 | 0.000 |
| | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.019) | (0.500) | (0.500) | (0.019) |
| Post-Graduate | 0.102 | 0.108 | 0.000 | 0.109 | 0.096 | -0.000 |
| | (0.303) | (0.310) | (0.012) | (0.312) | (0.295) | (0.012) |
| Social Desirability Index | 6.110 | 6.162 | 0.000 | 6.178 | 6.054 | -0.000 |
| | (2.290) | (2.272) | (0.086) | (2.267) | (2.311) | (0.086) |
| Low social desirability | 0.452 | 0.446 | -0.000 | 0.444 | 0.459 | 0.000 |
| | (0.498) | (0.497) | (0.019) | (0.497) | (0.499) | (0.019) |
| She Teams improves safety | 0.759 | 0.759 | -0.000 | 0.759 | 0.759 | 0.000 |
| | (0.428) | (0.428) | (0.016) | (0.428) | (0.428) | (0.016) |
| SH is a police duty | 0.892 | 0.895 | 0.000 | 0.895 | 0.889 | -0.000 |
| | (0.311) | (0.307) | (0.012) | (0.306) | (0.315) | (0.012) |
| Harassment deserves more policing | 0.532 | 0.541 | 0.000 | 0.543 | 0.523 | 0.000 |
| | (0.499) | (0.499) | (0.019) | (0.499) | (0.500) | (0.019) |
| Seconds to Complete the Experiment (High) | 0.253 | 0.245 | 0.000 | 0.243 | 0.262 | -0.000 |
| | (0.435) | (0.430) | (0.016) | (0.429) | (0.440) | (0.016) |
| Total number of session participants | 8.054 | 8.170 | 0.000 | 8.207 | 7.930 | -0.000 |
| | (1.998) | (2.022) | (0.076) | (2.028) | (1.968) | (0.076) |
| Observations | 1,394 | 958 | 3,360 | 622 | 386 | 3,360 |