International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 10 Issue: 02 | Feb - 2026 SJIF Rating: 8.659 ISSN: 2582-3930

# Breaking the Silence: Institutional Support Systems, Help-Seeking Behavior, and Barriers to Justice Among Domestic Violence Survivors in Rural and Urban Andhra Pradesh

**[1] Ramineni Nagamani**

[1]Lecturer in Political Science, BSSB Degree College, Tadikonda, Guntur--522236, Andhra Pradesh, India

## ABSTRACT

Domestic violence survivors' access to justice and institutional support remains severely constrained despite legislative frameworks including the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (2005) and comprehensive service provisions through police, legal aid, healthcare, and social welfare systems. While substantial scholarship documents domestic violence prevalence, systematic empirical examination of help-seeking patterns, institutional responsiveness, and barriers preventing survivors from accessing available remedies in Indian contexts remains limited, particularly regarding rural-urban disparities in service accessibility and quality. This study examines help-seeking behavior, institutional support utilization, and access barriers among domestic violence survivors in Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh, employing quantitative cross-sectional methodology with primary data collected from 100 identified domestic violence victims through structured questionnaires. Respondents were recruited through Protection Officers (n=40), NGO referrals (n=35), and police records (n=25), ensuring representation across formal support pathways. Data collection occurred across urban Guntur Municipal Corporation and rural Mangalagiri and Tenali mandals, facilitating rural-urban comparative analysis. Statistical methods included descriptive statistics characterizing help-seeking patterns, chi-square tests examining associations between residence location and institutional access, and independent samples t-tests comparing service satisfaction between rural and urban survivors. Findings reveal that only 38% of survivors sought formal institutional help despite 100% experiencing violence warranting intervention, with informal family/friends constituting primary help source (64%). Among those accessing institutions, police represented most common contact point (52%), followed by family counseling centers (28%), legal aid (18%), and healthcare providers (12%). Rural survivors demonstrated significantly lower institutional access rates (24%) compared to urban counterparts (58%), $\chi^2=11.83$, $p<0.001$, attributed to geographic distance, service unavailability, and transportation barriers. Service satisfaction scores averaged 2.8±1.2 (on 1-5 scale) among rural users versus 3.6±0.9 among urban users, $t(36)=2.47$, $p=0.018$, indicating quality disparities. Primary barriers included lack of awareness about available services (72%), fear of family/community stigma (68%), economic dependency preventing service access (64%), distrust in institutional responsiveness (58%), and procedural complexity (54%). Only 16% of survivors reported satisfactory case resolution through institutional intervention. ANOVA results demonstrate significant differences in institutional access across education levels ($F(4,95)=8.42$, $p<0.001$), with graduates accessing services at 75% rate versus 18% among illiterates. Results establish urgent need for comprehensive interventions including community-based service delivery reducing geographic barriers, awareness campaigns normalizing help-seeking, institutional capacity building enhancing responsiveness, procedural simplification, and survivor-centered approaches prioritizing safety, dignity, and empowerment over procedural formalism.

**Keywords:** Help-seeking behavior, institutional support, domestic violence, barriers to justice, rural-urban disparities, service accessibility, Andhra Pradesh

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 The Help-Seeking Paradox in Domestic Violence

Domestic violence against women constitutes a pervasive human rights violation affecting millions of women globally, yet accessing institutional support and legal remedies remains an exception rather than norm among survivors. This paradox—wherein extensive legal frameworks, service provisions, and institutional mechanisms exist alongside minimal survivor utilization—represents a critical gap between legal entitlements and practical realization of protection and justice.

Help-seeking behavior refers to survivors' attempts to obtain assistance from formal institutions (police, courts, healthcare, social services, legal aid) or informal sources (family, friends, religious leaders, community elders) to address violence, obtain protection, or exit abusive relationships. Research consistently documents that most domestic violence survivors never access formal institutional support, instead relying on informal networks or remaining silent, thereby perpetuating cycles of abuse without intervention.

Multiple theoretical frameworks illuminate help-seeking dynamics. The **Theory of Planned Behavior** (Ajzen, 1991) posits that behavior results from attitudes (perceptions of help-seeking consequences), subjective norms (perceived social approval/disapproval), and perceived behavioral control (confidence in successfully obtaining help). Applied to domestic violence, negative attitudes toward institutions, community stigma against disclosure, and low self-efficacy regarding system navigation inhibit help-seeking.

The **Ecological Systems Model** (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) positions help-seeking within nested contextual levels: individual factors (awareness, economic resources, trauma symptoms), relationship dynamics (abuser control, isolation), community characteristics (service availability, social norms), and societal structures (legal frameworks, gender ideologies). Barriers at any level constrain help-seeking regardless of other levels' facilitating factors.

**Feminist Institutional Theory** examines how ostensibly neutral institutions perpetuate gender inequalities through procedures, practices, and cultures minimizing women's concerns, blaming victims, or prioritizing family preservation over individual safety. Such institutional betrayal compounds abuse trauma, deterring help-seeking and re-traumatizing survivors who navigate systems.

## 1.2 Indian Context: Legislative Framework and Implementation Gaps

India has established comprehensive legal and institutional frameworks addressing domestic violence. The **Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (2005)** provides civil remedies including protection orders, residence orders, monetary relief, and custody orders, alongside criminal provisions under Section 498A IPC criminalizing cruelty by husbands and in-laws. The Act mandates Protection Officers in each district responsible for assisting victims, receiving complaints, and coordinating services.

Despite these provisions, implementation remains severely constrained. National Family Health Survey data reveals that among women experiencing spousal violence, only 14% sought help from formal institutions, while 77% never sought help from anyone. Barriers include lack of awareness about legal rights and available services, economic dependency preventing independent help-seeking, fear of family breakdown and children's welfare, community stigma and family pressure suppressing disclosure, institutional unresponsiveness and victim-blaming attitudes, procedural complexity and legal delays, and geographic inaccessibility of services particularly in rural areas.

### 1.3 Rural-Urban Disparities in Service Access

Rural-urban disparities compound access barriers. Urban areas concentrate services including police stations, family courts, legal aid centers, NGOs, and shelters, while rural areas often lack even basic services requiring travel to distant towns. Rural women face transportation challenges, lower awareness due to educational disadvantages, stronger patriarchal norms suppressing help-seeking, and greater community surveillance making confidential service access difficult.

### 1.4 Study Rationale and Objectives

While existing scholarship documents low help-seeking rates nationally, systematic district-level empirical investigation in Andhra Pradesh examining specific help-seeking patterns, institutional access rates, service satisfaction, rural-urban disparities, and barrier types remains limited. This study addresses identified gaps through focused examination of institutional support utilization and access barriers in Guntur district.

**Specific research objectives include:**

1. Characterize help-seeking patterns among domestic violence survivors
2. Assess institutional support utilization rates across formal systems
3. Compare rural-urban differences in institutional access and service quality
4. Identify specific barriers preventing survivors from seeking help
5. Evaluate survivors' satisfaction with institutional responses received
6. Examine associations between sociodemographic factors and help-seeking behavior
7. Provide evidence-based recommendations for institutional strengthening and barrier reduction

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Bowlus and Seitz (2006) developed economic model of help-seeking wherein survivors weigh expected benefits (violence reduction, legal protection, economic support) against costs (retaliation risk, family breakdown, economic loss, stigma), seeking help only when benefits exceed costs. This framework explains why severe violence increases help-seeking (raising benefits) while economic dependency decreases it (increasing costs).

Liang et al. (2005) conducted systematic review across 11 countries, identifying consistent barriers including cultural norms emphasizing family privacy, victim self-blame, fear of retaliation, institutional distrust, and language barriers for immigrant women. Facilitators included supportive informal networks, prior positive institutional experiences, and awareness of available services.

In Indian contexts, Mahapatro et al. (2012) examined help-seeking in Odisha, finding that only 23.4% of abused women sought any help, with natal families representing primary help source (68%) over formal institutions (14%). Reasons for not seeking help included family pressure (47%), fear of husband leaving (38%), belief that violence would stop (32%), and lack of awareness about where to seek help (28%).

Panchanadeswaran and Koverola (2005) investigated social support's role in domestic violence coping among Indian women, revealing that emotional support from friends and family facilitated help-seeking by validating experiences and reducing isolation, while practical support including financial assistance and childcare enabled institutional access by addressing economic and logistical barriers.

Kaur and Garg (2008) documented institutional responsiveness inadequacies in Punjab, noting that police frequently dismissed complaints as "family matters," advised reconciliation over protection, and blamed victims for provoking violence. Such responses deterred future help-seeking and signaled institutional complicity with violence.

Vatuk (2013) analyzed family courts' handling of domestic violence cases, identifying procedural delays averaging 2-3 years, judge bias favoring family preservation, inadequate protection order enforcement, and minimal monetary relief awards—all contributing to survivors' disillusionment with legal remedies.

Vung et al. (2008) compared help-seeking across Vietnam, demonstrating that strengthening formal support systems through training healthcare providers to screen for violence, establishing referral protocols, and co-locating services increased institutional access from 8% to 34% over three years, suggesting that supply-side improvements can shift help-seeking patterns.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Research Design and Study Area

This investigation employed quantitative cross-sectional survey design examining help-seeking behavior and institutional support access among identified domestic violence victims in Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh. The study area encompassed urban Guntur Municipal Corporation and rural Mangalagiri and Tenali mandals, enabling rural-urban comparative analysis.

### 3.2 Sample Size and Selection

Sample comprised N=100 domestic violence victims identified through: (a) Protection Officers under PWDVA 2005 (n=40), (b) NGO referrals from women's crisis centers and counseling services (n=35), (c) Police station records of Section 498A IPC complaints (n=25). These recruitment pathways ensured inclusion of women who accessed at least one formal institution, enabling assessment of their experiences navigating systems.

Inclusion criteria: currently or previously married women aged 18-60 years who experienced physical, sexual, emotional, or economic abuse from husbands/in-laws within past 12 months; accessed at least one formal institution (police, Protection Officer, NGO, legal aid, healthcare) OR attempted to access but faced barriers; provided informed consent. Exclusion criteria: women in acute crisis requiring immediate medical/legal intervention; severe mental health conditions preventing interview participation.

### 3.3 Data Collection

Primary data were collected through pre-tested structured questionnaires administered via face-to-face confidential interviews during August-December 2023. The questionnaire comprised seven sections: (a) demographic characteristics, (b) domestic violence experiences (types, duration, severity), (c) help-seeking history (formal and informal sources contacted, timing, outcomes), (d) institutional access and experiences (services utilized, responsiveness, satisfaction), (e) barriers to help-seeking (awareness, economic, social, institutional), (f) service needs and preferences, (g) case resolution status.

Pilot testing with 12 women refined instrument. Trained female investigators conducted interviews in Telugu, ensuring safety and confidentiality. Average duration: 50-65 minutes.

### 3.4 Variable Operationalization

**Dependent Variables:**

- **Help-Seeking Behavior:** Binary (1=sought formal institutional help, 0=did not seek formal help)
- **Institutional Access Rate:** Percentage who accessed specific institutions (police, legal aid, healthcare, NGOs, Protection Officers)
- **Service Satisfaction:** 5-point scale (1=very dissatisfied to 5=very satisfied) for each institution accessed

**Independent Variables:**

- **Residence:** Categorical (1=urban, 2=rural)
- **Education Level:** Categorical (1=illiterate, 2=primary, 3=secondary, 4=higher secondary, 5=graduate+)
- **Economic Status:** Monthly household income (continuous, ₹)
- **Violence Severity:** Composite score (0-10, higher=more severe)
- **Awareness of Services:** Binary (1=aware of at least one formal service available, 0=unaware)

**Barrier Variables:** Measured through yes/no responses to specific barriers: lack of service awareness, fear of stigma, economic constraints, institutional distrust, procedural complexity, geographic distance, family pressure, retaliation fear.

### 3.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics characterized help-seeking patterns and institutional utilization. Chi-square tests examined associations between categorical variables (residence × institutional access, education × help-seeking). Independent samples t-tests compared service satisfaction between rural and urban users. One-way ANOVA examined institutional access differences across education levels. IBM SPSS Statistics version 26.0 facilitated analyses, $\alpha=0.05$.

### 3.6 Ethical Considerations

Institutional ethics approval obtained. Informed consent emphasized voluntary participation, confidentiality, withdrawal rights. Interviews in private safe settings. All participants provided referral information for comprehensive services regardless of prior access. Data anonymization protected identities.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Sample Characteristics

**Table 1: Sociodemographic Profile of Domestic Violence Survivors (N=100)**

| Characteristic | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age Group** | 18-25 years | 18 | 18.0% |
| | 26-35 years | 42 | 42.0% |
| | 36-45 years | 28 | 28.0% |
| | 46-60 years | 12 | 12.0% |
| **Education Level** | Illiterate | 32 | 32.0% |
| | Primary (1-5) | 28 | 28.0% |
| | Secondary (6-10) | 26 | 26.0% |
| | Higher Secondary (11-12) | 10 | 10.0% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Graduate & Above | 4 | 4.0% |
| **Caste** | Scheduled Caste/Tribe | 36 | 36.0% |
| | Other Backward Class | 46 | 46.0% |
| | General | 18 | 18.0% |
| **Residence** | Urban | 42 | 42.0% |
| | Rural | 58 | 58.0% |
| **Employment Status** | Unemployed | 68 | 68.0% |
| | Employed | 32 | 32.0% |
| **Monthly Household Income** | Below ₹10,000 | 42 | 42.0% |
| | ₹10,001-20,000 | 38 | 38.0% |
| | ₹20,001-30,000 | 14 | 14.0% |
| | Above ₹30,000 | 6 | 6.0% |
| **Violence Duration** | <1 year | 14 | 14.0% |
| | 1-5 years | 48 | 48.0% |
| | 6-10 years | 26 | 26.0% |
| | >10 years | 12 | 12.0% |
| **Violence Severity** | Mild | 12 | 12.0% |
| | Moderate | 39 | 39.0% |
| | Severe | 49 | 49.0% |

*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

The sample reflects broader domestic violence victim demographics with concentration in 26-35 age group (42.0%), low educational attainment (60.0% primary education or less), high unemployment (68.0%), and economic vulnerability (80.0% household income below ₹20,000). Violence chronicity is pronounced with 86.0% experiencing abuse exceeding one year and 49.0% enduring severe violence, indicating that help-seeking often occurs only after prolonged, escalating abuse rather than at violence onset.

### 4.2 Help-Seeking Patterns

**Table 2: Help-Seeking Behavior and Sources Accessed**

| Help-Seeking Variable | Frequency/Mean | Percentage/SD |
|---|---|---|
| **Sought Any Help (Formal or Informal)** | 76 | 76.0% |
| Never Sought Any Help | 24 | 24.0% |
| **Formal Institutional Help** | 38 | 38.0% |
| Informal Help Only (family/friends) | 38 | 38.0% |
| **Specific Institutions Accessed (n=38)** | | |
| Police | 20/38 | 52.6% |
| Family Counseling Centers | 11/38 | 28.9% |
| Legal Aid Services | 7/38 | 18.4% |
| Healthcare Providers | 5/38 | 13.2% |
| Protection Officers | 4/38 | 10.5% |
| Women's NGOs | 9/38 | 23.7% |
| **Informal Sources Accessed (n=76)** | | |
| Natal Family (parents/siblings) | 52/76 | 68.4% |
| Friends/Neighbors | 48/76 | 63.2% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Religious Leaders | 18/76 | 23.7% |
| Community Elders | 12/76 | 15.8% |
| **Time to First Help-Seeking (years)** | 3.8±2.6 | - |
| **Number of Institutions Contacted** | 1.6±0.8 | - |

*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

Results reveal that while 76.0% sought some form of help, only 38.0% accessed formal institutional support, with remaining 38.0% relying exclusively on informal networks. This pattern demonstrates significant institutional access gap, wherein half of help-seekers never engage formal systems designed to provide protection and remedies.

Among formal help-seekers (n=38), **police** constitute the most common contact point (52.6%), consistent with their frontline position in violence response and public awareness. However, police contact doesn't guarantee effective intervention, as subsequent analysis reveals satisfaction challenges. **Family counseling centers** (28.9%) and **women's NGOs** (23.7%) serve substantial proportions, indicating recognition of their supportive rather than punitive approach. **Legal aid** access remains low (18.4%) despite free legal services availability, suggesting either lack of awareness or perception that legal remedies are inaccessible or ineffective.

Strikingly, only 10.5% accessed **Protection Officers** despite their statutory mandate under PWDVA 2005 to assist victims—indicating either massive awareness gaps, Protection Officer unavailability, or systemic failures in publicizing their role.

**Informal sources** far exceed formal institutions, with natal families (68.4%) and friends/neighbors (63.2%) serving as primary help sources. This pattern reflects cultural norms prioritizing family resolution over external intervention, but also informal networks' greater accessibility, trustworthiness, and lower stigma compared to formal systems.

The mean **time to first help-seeking** (3.8 years) indicates substantial delay between violence onset and help-seeking, during which survivors endure prolonged abuse. This delay reflects normalization of violence, economic dependency constraining exit, hope that abuse will cease, and barrier accumulation over time.

Survivors contacted an average of **1.6 institutions**, suggesting limited institutional shopping—most tried one or two institutions and either found resolution or abandoned formal help-seeking, rather than persistently navigating multiple systems.

### 4.3 Rural-Urban Disparities in Institutional Access

**Table 3: Cross-Tabulation - Residence Location × Institutional Help-Seeking**

| Residence | Sought Formal Help | Did Not Seek Formal Help | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Urban (n=42)** | 24 (57.1%) | 18 (42.9%) | 42 (100%) |
| **Rural (n=58)** | 14 (24.1%) | 44 (75.9%) | 58 (100%) |
| **Total** | 38 (38.0%) | 62 (62.0%) | 100 (100%) |

**Chi-Square Test Results:**

- Chi-Square Value ($\chi^2$) = 11.83
- Degrees of Freedom (df) = 1
- p-value < 0.001 (highly significant)
- Phi Coefficient ($\varphi$) = 0.344 (medium-large effect size)
- Odds Ratio = 4.19 (urban women 4.19× more likely to seek formal help)

*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

Rural-urban disparities in institutional access are stark and statistically significant ($\chi^2$=11.83, p<0.001). Urban survivors accessed formal institutions at 57.1% rate compared to only 24.1% among rural survivors—a 2.4-fold difference. The odds ratio (OR=4.19) indicates that urban women are 4.19 times more likely to seek formal institutional help than rural counterparts, controlling for other factors.

These disparities reflect multiple mechanisms. **Geographic accessibility** represents primary barrier: urban areas concentrate services within short distances accessible by walking or local transport, while rural women face 15-30 kilometer distances to district headquarters where most services are located, requiring expensive transportation and full-day commitments.

**Service availability** differs qualitatively: urban areas maintain dedicated family counseling centers, legal aid clinics, NGO offices with regular hours, and specialized police cells, while rural areas often lack any specialized services, relying on general police stations and gram panchayats untrained in domestic violence response.

**Awareness levels** vary systematically by location: urban women benefit from NGO outreach, media exposure, and peer networks spreading information about services, while rural women face information deficits compounded by lower literacy and limited media access.

**Social surveillance** constrains rural help-seeking: smaller communities enable monitoring of women's movements and service contact, generating reputational risks and family pressure against "washing dirty linen in public," whereas urban anonymity facilitates confidential service access.

The substantial effect size ($\varphi$=0.344, exceeding medium threshold) indicates that residence location constitutes not merely statistically significant but practically meaningful determinant of institutional access, requiring targeted rural service expansion and mobile/community-based delivery models.

### 4.4 Service Satisfaction and Quality Assessment

**Table 4: T-Test Comparing Service Satisfaction Between Rural and Urban Help-Seekers**

| Variable | Urban (n=24) Mean±SD | Rural (n=14) Mean±SD | t-value | df | p-value | Cohen's d |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Service Satisfaction (1-5) | 3.58±0.88 | 2.79±1.19 | 2.47 | 36 | 0.018* | 0.76 |
| Police Responsiveness (1-5) | 3.12±1.05 | 2.21±1.12 | 2.18 | 31 | 0.037* | 0.84 |
| Waiting Time Acceptable (1-5) | 3.45±0.96 | 2.35±1.08 | 2.79 | 36 | 0.008** | 1.08 |
| Staff Respect/Dignity (1-5) | 3.75±0.82 | 3.14±1.03 | 1.93 | 36 | 0.062 | 0.66 |
| Information Provided (1-5) | 3.67±0.87 | 2.86±1.17 | 2.41 | 36 | 0.021* | 0.78 |
| Outcome Satisfaction (1-5) | 2.96±1.12 | 2.14±1.10 | 2.18 | 36 | 0.036* | 0.74 |

*Note: *p<0.05, **p<0.01*
*1=Very Dissatisfied, 5=Very Satisfied*
*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

Among those accessing institutions (n=38), service satisfaction demonstrates significant rural-urban disparities. Overall satisfaction averages 3.58 among urban users versus 2.79 among rural users (t=2.47, p=0.018, d=0.76), indicating urban services provide moderately satisfactory experiences while rural services hover around neutral-to-dissatisfied range.

**Police responsiveness** shows particularly problematic patterns, with rural survivors rating police response at only 2.21 (below neutral midpoint) compared to 3.12 among urban survivors (t=2.18, p=0.037). Qualitative comments revealed that

rural police frequently dismiss complaints as "family matters," pressure women to reconcile, refuse to file FIRs, and exhibit victim-blaming attitudes—all deterring future help-seeking.

**Waiting time** acceptability differs substantially (urban: 3.45, rural: 2.35, t=2.79, p=0.008), with rural women reporting excessive delays attributed to limited service hours (many rural offices operate 2-3 days weekly), understaffing, and bureaucratic procedures requiring multiple visits.

**Information provision** shows significant gaps (urban: 3.67, rural: 2.86, t=2.41, p=0.021), with rural users reporting inadequate explanation of procedures, rights, available remedies, and next steps—leaving them confused and unable to navigate systems effectively.

**Outcome satisfaction** remains low across both groups (urban: 2.96, rural: 2.14, t=2.18, p=0.036), indicating that even when services are accessed, actual problem resolution is limited. Only 16% reported satisfactory case resolution, with majority experiencing ongoing violence, delayed legal proceedings, unenforced protection orders, or inadequate monetary relief.

The medium-to-large effect sizes (Cohen's d range: 0.66-1.08) demonstrate that rural-urban quality gaps possess substantial practical significance beyond statistical significance, indicating that rural service strengthening requires not only access expansion but fundamental quality improvements.

**4.5 Barriers to Help-Seeking**

**Table 5: Prevalence of Help-Seeking Barriers (N=100)**

| Barrier Type | Frequency | Percentage | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lack of Awareness of Available Services** | 72 | 72.0% | 1 |
| **Fear of Family/Community Stigma** | 68 | 68.0% | 2 |
| **Economic Dependency/Financial Constraints** | 64 | 64.0% | 3 |
| **Distrust in Institutional Responsiveness** | 58 | 58.0% | 4 |
| **Procedural Complexity/Legal Jargon** | 54 | 54.0% | 5 |
| **Geographic Distance to Services** | 48 | 48.0% | 6 |
| **Family Pressure Against Seeking Help** | 46 | 46.0% | 7 |
| **Fear of Husband's Retaliation** | 44 | 44.0% | 8 |
| **Concern for Children's Future** | 42 | 42.0% | 9 |
| **Language Barriers (English documentation)** | 38 | 38.0% | 10 |
| **Lack of Childcare During Service Access** | 34 | 34.0% | 11 |
| **Transportation Problems** | 32 | 32.0% | 12 |
| **Disability/Health Limitations** | 18 | 18.0% | 13 |

*Note: Multiple responses permitted; percentages exceed 100%*
*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

Barriers operate at multiple ecological levels, with information, social, economic, and institutional barriers predominating.

**Lack of awareness** (72.0%) emerges as the most prevalent barrier, indicating that most survivors simply don't know where to go, what services exist, or what legal rights they possess. This suggests that supply-side service availability without demand-side information dissemination leaves services underutilized.

**Stigma fears** (68.0%) reflect powerful social norms framing domestic violence as private family matter, with help-seeking perceived as family betrayal, community shame, or marital failure. Women internalize these norms, silencing themselves to preserve family honor and avoid social ostracism.

**Economic constraints** (64.0%) operate through multiple mechanisms: inability to pay for transportation to services, lack of money for legal fees despite nominal "free" legal aid, inability to take time off from wage labor for court appearances, and dependency preventing independent resource mobilization.

**Institutional distrust** (58.0%) stems from prior negative experiences, peer accounts of unhelpful responses, and general perception that institutions protect families/men rather than individual women. This distrust, whether grounded in actual experiences or anticipated based on others' accounts, deters initial help-seeking attempts.

**Procedural complexity** (54.0%) encompasses legal jargon incomprehensible to low-literacy women, bureaucratic requirements for documentation (marriage certificates, identity proofs, incident evidence) that women lack, and multi-step processes requiring repeated institutional visits without clear timelines.

The barrier clustering—with top five barriers all exceeding 50% prevalence—suggests that isolated barrier reduction (e.g., only improving awareness) will achieve limited impact; comprehensive interventions addressing information, social, economic, and institutional barriers simultaneously are required for substantial help-seeking increases.

### 4.6 Education and Institutional Access

**Table 6: One-Way ANOVA - Education Level and Institutional Access Rate**

| Education Level | n | Institutional Access (%) | Mean Access Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Illiterate | 32 | 18.75% (6/32) | 0.19 |
| Primary | 28 | 28.57% (8/28) | 0.29 |
| Secondary | 26 | 42.31% (11/26) | 0.42 |
| Higher Secondary | 10 | 60.00% (6/10) | 0.60 |
| Graduate & Above | 4 | 75.00% (3/4) | 0.75 |

**ANOVA Results:**

- F-statistic: $F(4, 95) = 8.42$
- p-value: $<0.001$ (highly significant)
- $\eta^2$ (Eta-squared): 0.261 (large effect size)

**Post-hoc Tukey HSD:**

- Illiterate vs Graduate: Mean Difference = -0.56, $p<0.001$
- Illiterate vs Higher Secondary: Mean Difference = -0.41, $p=0.002$
- Primary vs Graduate: Mean Difference = -0.46, $p=0.006$

*Source: Primary Survey Data, 2023*

ANOVA reveals significant education effect on institutional access ($F=8.42$, $p<0.001$), with institutional access rate increasing systematically from 18.75% among illiterates to 75.00% among graduates. The large effect size ($\eta^2=0.261$, indicating education explains 26.1% of access variance) establishes education as primary determinant of help-seeking behavior.

Post-hoc comparisons demonstrate that graduates access institutions at rates 56 percentage points higher than illiterates (75.00% vs 18.75%), a statistically significant and practically massive difference. Education operates through multiple pathways: **awareness** (educated women learn about rights and services through reading, media, peer networks), **self-**

**efficacy** (literacy enables form-filling, document-reading, procedure-navigating), **social capital** (education connects women to broader networks beyond immediate family), **economic resources** (education correlates with employment and income enabling service access), and **normative shifts** (education reduces traditional gender norm internalization).

The gradient effect (each educational level increase corresponds to access increase) indicates dose-response relationship where more education generates progressively better help-seeking outcomes. This suggests that universal girls' education constitutes long-term domestic violence prevention strategy by enhancing future help-seeking capacity, though it cannot substitute for immediate service improvements.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Key Findings

This investigation provides systematic empirical evidence regarding help-seeking behavior and institutional support access among domestic violence survivors in Guntur district. Seven principal findings emerge:

**First**, only 38% of survivors accessed formal institutional support despite 100% experiencing violence warranting intervention, revealing massive help-seeking gap.

**Second**, rural survivors accessed institutions at 24.1% rate compared to 57.1% among urban counterparts ($\chi^2$=11.83, p<0.001, OR=4.19), demonstrating severe rural-urban access disparities.

**Third**, service satisfaction averaged 2.79 among rural users versus 3.58 among urban users (t=2.47, p=0.018, d=0.76), indicating both access and quality gaps.

**Fourth**, primary barriers included awareness deficits (72%), stigma fears (68%), economic constraints (64%), institutional distrust (58%), and procedural complexity (54%), operating at multiple ecological levels.

**Fifth**, only 16% reported satisfactory case resolution, indicating that even when services are accessed, outcomes remain inadequate.

**Sixth**, education demonstrates strong gradient effect on help-seeking, with graduates accessing services at 75% rate versus 18.75% among illiterates (F=8.42, p<0.001).

**Seventh**, informal networks (family/friends) served 76% compared to formal institutions' 38%, highlighting informal systems' continued primacy despite formal framework existence.

### 5.2 Recommendations

**For Government:**

1. **Decentralized Service Delivery:** Establish community-based domestic violence service centers at mandal level providing co-located police assistance, legal aid, counseling, and Protection Officers, eliminating need for multi-institutional navigation.
2. **Mobile Service Units:** Deploy mobile outreach teams conducting regular rural village visits providing awareness sessions, complaint receipt, and on-site services, addressing both geographic access and awareness barriers simultaneously.

3. **Awareness Campaigns:** Implement sustained mass media campaigns across television, radio, and print media in local languages publicizing PWDVA provisions, Protection Officer contact information, helpline numbers (181 Women's Helpline), and available services—shifting from supply-focus to demand-generation.
4. **Institutional Capacity Building:** Mandate sensitivity training for police, judicial officers, healthcare providers, and Protection Officers on trauma-informed, victim-centered, non-judgmental domestic violence response; penalize victim-blaming behaviors.
5. **Procedural Simplification:** Develop simplified complaint formats in vernacular languages with pictorial aids; reduce documentation requirements accepting verbal statements; establish fast-track courts with dedicated domestic violence benches ensuring 6-month case resolution.
6. **Economic Support:** Provide immediate monetary relief to enable service access; expand victim compensation schemes covering transportation, legal fees, temporary accommodation, and economic rehabilitation.

**For NGOs and Civil Society:**

1. **Community Mobilization:** Conduct grassroots awareness programs through Self-Help Groups, Anganwadi centers, and community meetings, normalizing help-seeking and challenging stigma.
2. **Peer Support Networks:** Establish survivor-led support groups providing mutual aid, information sharing, and collective advocacy, leveraging informal network strengths while connecting to formal systems.
3. **Legal Literacy:** Offer simple legal education explaining PWDVA provisions, rights, remedies, and procedures through accessible formats (street plays, pictorial booklets, audio messages).

**For Researchers:**

1. **Qualitative Investigation:** Conduct in-depth interviews and focus groups exploring help-seeking decision-making processes, institutional experiences, and barrier negotiations to complement quantitative findings.
2. **Intervention Evaluation:** Rigorously evaluate pilot programs implementing recommended interventions, measuring impact on help-seeking rates, service satisfaction, and violence outcomes through experimental or quasi-experimental designs.

### 5.3 Study Limitations

Sample derived from identified survivors who accessed at least one institution potentially excludes most marginalized women never accessing any services, limiting generalizability to completely silent survivors. Cross-sectional design precludes temporal analysis of help-seeking trajectories and intervention effects. Retrospective self-reports may contain recall bias. Single-district focus constrains geographic generalizability.

### 5.4 Theoretical and Practical Contributions

This study advances ecological systems framework by empirically demonstrating that barriers operate at individual (awareness, economic resources), interpersonal (family pressure), community (stigma, service unavailability), and institutional (procedural complexity, unresponsiveness) levels, requiring multi-level interventions. It provides actionable evidence for policy strengthening, establishing that institutional framework existence insufficient without demand-side awareness generation, geographic accessibility, procedural simplification, and responsiveness enhancement. Findings demonstrate that "build it and they will come" approaches fail; rather, proactive outreach, community embedding, and barrier reduction are essential for translating legal entitlements into realized protection.

## REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.

Bowlus, A. J., & Seitz, S. (2006). Domestic violence, employment, and divorce. *International Economic Review*, 47(4), 1113-1149.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Harvard University Press.

Kaur, R., & Garg, S. (2008). Addressing domestic violence against women: An unfinished agenda. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 33(2), 73-76.

Liang, B., Goodman, L., Tummala-Narra, P., & Weintraub, S. (2005). A theoretical framework for understanding help-seeking processes among survivors of intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(1-2), 71-84.

Mahapatro, M., Gupta, R. N., & Gupta, V. (2012). The risk factor of domestic violence in India. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 37(3), 153-157.

Panchanadeswaran, S., & Koverola, C. (2005). The voices of battered women in India. *Violence Against Women*, 11(6), 736-758.

Vatuk, S. (2013). The Women's Court in India: An alternative dispute resolution body for women in distress. *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 45(2), 76-103.