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Abstract

The present study explored whether a number of variables previously shown to correlate with or predict pro-social attitudes and behaviours could be applied specifically to bystander anti-racism on behalf of Indigenous Australians. 150 participants completed an online survey which included questions pertaining to socio-demographic and social-psychological variables. Participants were also asked to indicate how likely they were to engage in bystander anti-racism in response to a low risk and a high risk discrimination scenario. Next they were asked to indicate their level of fear and anger in response to each scenario. The results indicate that the variables related to action intentions differ according to the level of risk inherent in a given situation. Being older and having higher levels of empathic concern toward Indigenous Australians predicted the intention to engage in bystander anti-racism when intervention involved a low level of risk, while being older (alone) predicted the intention to engage when intervention involved a high level of risk. It is suggested that those who are older may be more likely to engage in bystander anti-racism because they feel more competent in their ability to effectively intervene.
Disadvantage on the basis of race is pervasive (Harris et al., 2006; Henry, Houston, & Mooney, 2004; Larson, Gilles, Howard, & Coffin, 2007; Paradies, 2006; Paradies, Harris, & Anderson, 2008; Williams et al., 2008). In Australia, Indigenous Australians have been marginalised since the arrival of the first fleet in 1788 (Bourke & Cox, 1994) and continue to face social and institutionalised racial discrimination (Henry et al., 2004; Mooney, 2003). To clarify, racism can be defined as “that which maintains or exacerbates inequality of opportunity among ethnoracial groups. Racism can be expressed through stereotypes (racist beliefs), prejudice (racist emotions/affect) or discrimination (racist behaviours and practices)” (Berman & Paradies, 2010, p. 4).

For Indigenous Australians, the effects of racial discrimination can be seen in a variety of outcomes, including poor levels of educational attainment (Australian Bureau of Statistics, ABS, 2008), reduced earning capacity (ABS, 2006a), difficulties with housing (Beresford, 2001), inferior quality of health care (Henry et al., 2004), over representation within the prison system (ABS, 2009), and significantly lower life expectancy than non-Indigenous Australians (ABS, 2006b). Discrimination also significantly impairs of the physical and psychological well being of Indigenous Australians (Larson et al., 2007; Paradies et al., 2008), with some responding to racial discrimination by withdrawing from society, engaging in drug and alcohol use, and by internalising racism (Mellor, 2004). Clearly, there is a great need to establish equality between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians, with a focus on putting an end to racism and discrimination.
Bystander Anti-Racism

The possibility of using bystanders to intervene in acts of discrimination has recently led to the investigation of bystander anti-prejudice (e.g. Swim & Hyers, 1999; Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012), and more specifically bystander anti-racism (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Hall, 2010; Hyers, 2007; Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies, 2011; Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley, & Dunn, 2011a; Pedersen & Thomas, under review; Pedersen, Walker, Paradies, Guerin, 2011b). Bystander anti-racism can be defined as action undertaken by a witnessing individual (not the target or perpetrator) to challenge and ultimately stop instances of interpersonal or institutionalised racism (Nelson et al., 2011). As bystander anti-racism involves the average person challenging instances of discrimination, it is especially well placed to target ‘everyday’ racism (Beagan, 2003; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003) which occurs at levels outside the reach of policy (Nelson et al., 2011).

Outcomes of Bystander Anti-Racism

Aside from the immediate aim to obstruct and stop racial discrimination, one of the suggested key and longer term outcomes of bystander anti-racism is its ability to establish anti-racism norms (Nelson et al., 2011). Researchers have long reported that people tend to behave in accordance with standard set by others (e.g. Asch, 1955, 1956; Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughn, 1991; Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994; Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002; Pereira, Monteiro, & Camino, 2009; Sechrist & Stangor, 2001; Stangor, Sechrist, & Jost, 2001). These standards are referred to as norms and are communicated through social interaction (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Norms inform us about what behaviours are and are not considered acceptable. Research suggests that hearing just one person express a given opinion
or attitude is sufficient to influence the opinions and behaviour of others (Blanchard et al., 1991). This has implications for the possible effect of bystander action as well as that of bystander inaction. When bystanders speak up, it may be possible to establish anti-racism norms. Yet on the other hand, bystander inaction means that the prejudiced opinions of the perpetrator are given ‘air time’ and may influence other witnesses and establish or maintain pro-racism norms (Masser & Phillips, 2003).

Other lines of study indicate that being confronted about racist behaviour triggers feelings of guilt, concerned for the welfare of the target, and apologetic responses from perpetrators (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). In addition, some researchers have found that being confronted about racist behaviour reduces the likelihood of such behaviour being repeated in the future, as well as a reduction in the prejudice levels of the perpetrator (Czopp et al., 2006). Thus, it seems probable that bystander anti-racism may not only provide the basis for anti-racism norms, but may also reduce the likelihood of future racist behaviours.

Finally, that highly prejudiced individuals tend to overestimate social support for their views (Nelson et al., 2011; Pedersen, Griffiths, & Watt, 2008; Pedersen & Hartley, 2012; Watt & Larkin, 2010; Sechrist & Stangor 2001; Strube & Rahimi, 2006) and are more willing to publicly behave in ways that reflect their prejudices (Miller, 1993; Watt & Larkin, 2010), implies that bystander anti-racism may be an effective tool for challenging the false consensus beliefs of highly prejudiced individuals. In summary, bystander anti-racism shows promise as a means of effectively challenging racial discrimination. Yet there is limited research that has explored its possible correlates and predictors.
Potential Predictors of Bystander Anti-Racism

As bystander anti-racism can be thought of as a specific form of pro-social behaviour, research on pro-social behaviour is well positioned to suggest potential predictor variables. Furthermore, as attitudes tend to direct behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005; Glasman & Albarracin, 2006), research on pro-social attitudes may also be relevant. Variables identified as possibly relevant to bystander anti-racism are discussed below.

**National identity.** Social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1986) explains that in social situations, we often operate according to our social identity. Tajfel (1974) defines this social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his [sic] knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 69). One’s group will from here on be referred to as the ‘ingroup’, while the ‘outgroup’ refers to a group whose membership one does not share. As individuals strive to feel good about themselves and their group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), they are motivated to act positively toward their ingroup. In support of this assumption, many researchers have indeed found that individuals are most likely to help those who belong to their ingroup (Cuddy, Rock, & Norton, 2007; Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005; Tarrant, Dazeley, & Cottom, 2009) and to engage in pro-social action on behalf of their ingroup (Klandermans, 2002; Levine & Thompson, 2004).

Of course individuals belong to a variety of social groups. For example, one may identify as a woman, a student, an Australian, and with a great deal of other social groups. One’s behaviour in a given context however, is influenced by the group identity which is salient in that moment (Terry & Hogg, 1996). With respect
to bystander anti-racism, it is possible that one’s racial identity might be most salient, as expressions of racism may trigger comparisons between the bystander and the target which make prominent their differences or similarities with respect to race. Research suggests that Indigenous Australians are not incorporated into the mainstream image of Australian national identity (Sibley & Barlow, 2009; Fraser & Islam, 2000). This implies that the Australian identity may be racially defined; differentiating between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Based on these assumptions, and at least within the Australian context, it is feasible that the likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism may depend on one’s level of national identification. This possibility however, is yet to be explored.

**Collective guilt.** Collective guilt refers to negative feelings which arise from the perception that the actions of other ingroup members are incongruent with the norms or values of the group (Doosje, Brandscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998). Rather than feeling personally responsible, individuals experience guilt on behalf of the group with which they identify (Iyer, Leach, & Pedersen, 2004, Thomas, McGarty, & Mavor, 2009). Given the history of discrimination and mistreatment of Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous Australians (Bourke & Collins, 1994), collective guilt is especially relevant to relations and interactions between these groups.

Collective guilt has been shown to predict support for gay and lesbian anti-violence programs (Karacanta & Fitness, 2006), the compensation of Indonesians in regards to disadvantage ensuing from Dutch colonisation (Doosje et al., 1998), government apology with respect to Australia’s history of discrimination toward Indigenous Australians (McGarty et al., 2005, studies 1 & 2), reconciliatory attitudes and behaviours within the context of Indigenous Australian history (Halloran, 2007),
and reparation attitudes with respect to the Indigenous Chilean history (Brown, Gonzalez, Zagefka, Manzi, & Cehajic, 2008). More recently, Pedersen & Thomas (under review) reported that collective guilt was one of the two emotions most cited by participants when reading about racial discrimination scenarios.

On the other hand, as collective guilt is a self focused emotion (Iyer et al., 2003), some authors argue that it may be limited when it comes to pro-social behaviour (e.g. Iyer et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2009). Collective guilt arises from a concern about the involvement of one’s group in the mistreatment of another, therefore it is focused on the self and not the ‘other’. For this reason, it may be that collective guilt can motivate behaviours which are aimed at reducing the aversive feelings of guilt for an individual (such as financial compensation), but not which are aimed at improving the long-term conditions for disadvantaged groups.

A factor related to collective guilt, which may have implications for bystander anti-racism, is the process of legitimisation of past wrongdoings. It has been proposed that those who strongly identify with their group, and therefore derive a great deal of satisfaction from it (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), are also most likely to defend the their ingroup when confronted with negative ingroup information (Iyer et al., 2004; McGarty et al., 2005; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). Legitimisation undermines the experience of collective guilt, and possibly the likelihood of engaging in pro-social behaviours such as bystander anti-racism.

**Empathic concern.** Empathic concern is the emotional response to the perceived welfare of another (Batson & Ahmad, 2009; Thomas et al., 2009; Stephen & Finlay, 1999) and specifically involves feeling for another and their plight (Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003). Unlike collective guilt, empathic concern is an other-
focused emotion (Iyer et al., 2003). As such, it should be especially effective in motivating behaviours that are aimed at restoring equality between advantaged and disadvantaged groups (Iyer et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2009).

As bystander anti-racism involves speaking up to stop the discrimination of another, it seems logical that concern for the welfare of the target might motivate bystanders to act. Supporting this logic, empathic concern has been shown to improve attitudes toward minority (Vescio Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003) and stigmatised groups (Batson, Chang, Orr, Rowland, 2002; Batson et al., 1997), and to be associated with or predict a variety of pro-social behaviours (Eisenberg, & Miller, 1987) such as volunteerism (Oswald, 1996), support for equal opportunity and compensatory programs for African Americans (Iyer et al., 2003, study 2), greater allocation of funds for target support services (Batson et al., 2002), and greater intentions to volunteer in gay and lesbian anti-violence programs (Karacanta & Fitness, 2006).

That empathic concern follows only when one is focused on the other (Harth, Kessler, & Leach, 2008; Iyer et al., 2003, study 2) may be especially pertinent within the bystander anti-racism context. By virtue of being a bystander to instances of racial discrimination, it is possible that one’s attention or focus may automatically be drawn to the target (other). It is suggested that this initial focus on the other leads to inter-group comparisons which result in the perception that, relative to the ingroup, the outgroup is disadvantaged (Leach, Snider, and Iyer, 2002). It is through this process that empathic concern is directed toward members of the outgroup (Thomas et al., 2009). Supporting the connection between empathic concern and bystander anti-racism, Pedersen and Thomas (under review) found that when asked about the
emotions they would feel when witnessing racial discrimination, empathy for the target was the second most common emotion reported by participants.

Given that in reality, Indigenous Australians are indeed disadvantaged relative to non-Indigenous Australians (ABS, 2006a, 2006b; 2008; Beresford, 2001; Henry et al., 2004; Mooney, 2003), the possibility arises that non-Indigenous Australians may also come to experience empathic concern through recognition of this ‘state’ of disadvantage. As such, empathic concern might be experienced in response to situational factors which make outgroup (relative to ingroup) disadvantage salient or in response to a general awareness that in comparison to the ingroup, the outgroup is indeed disadvantaged. Whatever the case, although Pedersen and Thomas (under review) noted the frequent report of empathic concern for the target of discrimination, due to their qualitative focus they did not assess its ability to predict bystander anti-racism. As such there are currently no studies that examine this possible relationship.

**Prejudice.** Prejudice can be conceptualised as negative opinions, feelings, and attitudes toward the outgroup and its members (Crandall et al., 2002). In line with this, prejudice toward an outgroup relates to negative attitudes toward outgroup affirmative action programs (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Ellis, Kitzinger, & Wilkinson, 2002) and a reduced likelihood of providing help to that group (Kluegel & Smith, 1983). Although these findings can be extrapolated to the bystander anti-racism context, it also appears ‘logical’ that individuals would need to experience little if any prejudice toward an outgroup in order to be motivated to speak up against their discrimination.

Also of interest are the relationships prejudice has with socio-demographic variables. For example, higher levels of prejudice have been significantly correlated
with lower levels of formal education (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012; Pedersen et al., 2008; Pedersen, Beven, Walker, & Griffiths, 2004; Pedersen, Griffiths, Contos, Bishop, & Walker, 2000; Pedersen & Walker, 1997), being older (Pedersen et al., 2008; Pedersen et al., 2004), and right-wing political preference (Hodson & Busseri, 2012; Pedersen & Hartley, 2012; Pedersen et al., 2004; Pedersen et al., 2000; Whitley, 1999). Being male has also been linked to greater prejudice levels (Pedersen & Walker, 1997; Pedersen et al., 2008; Pedersen et al., 2004), and is related to poorer attitudes toward affirmative action on behalf of minority groups (Kravitz & Plantania, 1993). In contrast however, other research has failed to find a correlation between gender and affirmative action attitudes (Awad et al., 2005). Finally, some research has also found correlations between age and helping behaviour (e.g. Amato, 1985). How and whether these socio-demographic variables may be linked to bystander anti-racism, however, is yet to be explored.

**Fear and anger.** It is suggested that contextual factors of discriminatory situations may have a bearing on the likelihood of bystander anti-racism (Nelson et al., 2011). Supporting this notion, fear of the perpetrator, or more specifically, of *retaliation* by the perpetrator has been linked to the reduced likelihood of confronting name-callers in schools (Aboud & Miller, 2007) and those who express sexism (Swim & Hyers, 1999). It appears that fear may reflect the appraisal of a situation as high risk. Under these circumstances, action is unlikely because the benefits of intervention are outweighed by the costs (Good et al., 2012; Kowalski, 1996). Additionally, some authors (e.g. Nelson et al., 2011) have also suggested that anger as a response to racial discrimination may motivate engagement in bystander action. As racial discrimination can be viewed as unfair, it is likely that anger as a response will be experienced (Mikula, Scherer, & Athenstaedt, 1998). Support for
this comes from Pedersen and Thomas (under review) who found that anger toward the perpetrator was one of the most commonly reported emotions with respect to instances of racial discrimination. Whether fear and anger are specifically able to predict bystander anti-racism, however, remains yet to be examined.

**Overview of the Present Study**

Although there is a large body of literature available with respect to various pro-social behaviours, the specific act of bystander anti-racism remains relatively unexplored (Nelson et al., 2011). As such there is a lack of direct evidence as to what factors may predict bystander anti-racism. This paper aims to address this need using an exploratory approach. Specifically, the first aim of the present study was to explore whether variables shown to be associated various pro-social behaviours and attitudes would also be associated with bystander anti-racism on behalf of Indigenous Australians. These variables included national identity, collective guilt, legitimisation, empathic concern, prejudice, socio-demographic variables such as age, gender, political preference, and level of education, and the context-related variables of fear and anger. Participants were provided with two scenarios (low risk and high risk) which differed according to the level of hostility displayed by the perpetrator and with respect to the overt nature and intensity of the racist remarks made.

The second aim was to ascertain which related variables might predict the intention to engage in bystander anti-racism. Using the independent variables which showed significant initial correlations with action intentions, hierarchical multiple regression was used to build equations to separately predict high and low risk bystander anti-racism. Finally, the third aim of the present study was to explore whether the correlates and predictors of bystander anti-racism differ depending on
the level of risk inherent to intervening in a given context. It was predicted (P1) that participants would experience more fear and anger in the high risk scenario than in the low risk scenario, and that based on cost-benefit arguments (e.g. Good et al., 2012), (P2) intentions to engage in bystander anti-racism would be greater in the low risk scenario than in the high risk scenario. As the nature of the present study was exploratory, no other predictions were made.

**Method**

**Social and Community On-line Research Database (SCORED)**

The sample was recruited from Murdoch University’s SCORED. Individuals must live in Australia and be over 18 years of age to register with SCORED. Only non-Indigenous Australians were eligible to participate in the survey. Individuals who are registered with SCORED receive points for every survey they complete. When they have accumulated a given number of points they are able to redeem their points for a prize, such as a supermarket voucher. Individuals were contacted via an email which informed them that the survey was open for participation. Participants provided implicit consent by completing and submitting the survey.

**Participants**

150 participants were recruited from SCORED, however one participant’s data was removed from analysis as they indicated that they were Indigenous Australian, leaving 149 participants. The mean age of the sample was 44 years ($SD = 14.37$, range = 19 - 73 years) and there were slightly more female (54.9%) than male participants (45.1%). The majority of participants reported Anglo-Saxon ancestry (75.9%), followed by European (12.8%) and Asian (6.4%) ancestry, while the remaining five percent indicated they were of ‘mixed’. The sample lived
predominantly in Western Australia (71.2%), New South Wales (9.4%) and Victoria (7.9%), with the remainder (11.5%) of participants being distributed throughout the Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania. 60.4% of those in Western Australia lived in the Perth metropolitan area.

The sample leaned largely toward left-wing (51.1%) as opposed to right-wing politics (24.4%), while 24.5% of participants reported being ‘neither’. The sample was well educated, with 77.8% having completed or at least commenced some form of post-school education. Data collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, 2010; 2011) show that in 2009, of the Western Australian population aged between 25-64 years, 62% had obtained a non-school qualification, while the 2011 census reported a larger population of males (50.3%) than females (49.7%) in Western Australia. In comparison, the present study’s sample contained more females and was more educated than the general population.

**Materials**

**Information letter.** An information letter was constructed, inviting participants to take part in a survey exploring attitudes toward Indigenous Australians and acts of discrimination (see Appendix A). The letter stated that the survey was anonymous, that consent was implied through the completion of the survey, relayed instructions on how to complete the survey, and indicated that the survey would take 15 minutes to complete.

**Construction of survey.** The survey consisted of four primary sections that included socio-demographics, social-psychological, action intention, and context-related emotion measures. All of the following scales were presented as an on-line survey via the SCORED website, and in the order in which they are described below. The complete survey can be found in Appendix B, where negatively worded items
which were reverse scored are noted. A 7-point scale which ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) was used for the items in each scale, such that higher scores reflect higher levels of each construct.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender (1 = male, 2 = female), political preference (1 = left, 2 = right), education level (1 = pre-school, 11 = higher degree such as PhD or Masters, part or complete), ancestry/cultural background, and state and city of residence.

**National identity.** The ingroup identification scale constructed by Leach et al., (2008) was used to measure participants’ level of national identification. The scale includes five facets of ingroup identification and has been shown to be reliable (see Leach et al., 2008, p. 150). Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with various items in the scale. An example of items used include; “I feel a bond with Australians” and “I think that Australians have a lot to be proud of”.

**Collective guilt.** A five item collective guilt scale was constructed based on that of Doosje and colleagues (1998). The items were rewritten to reflect the Indigenous Australian/Australian context. The scale has been shown to be reliable ($\alpha = .84$). Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with various items in the scale. An example of the items used include; “I feel regret for the harmful past actions of Australians toward Indigenous Australians” and “I don’t think that Australians today should feel guilty about the negative things done to Indigenous Australians”.

**Legitimisation.** The two item legitimisation scale used by Leach et al., (2008) was adapted and used to measure the degree to which participants legitimimized, or justified the past mistreatment of Indigenous Australians. This scale
has been shown to be reliable ($\alpha = .83$), and included the following statement; “Although mistakes may have been made, Indigenous Australians have been and continue to be sufficiently compensated”.

**Empathic concern.** The five item empathic concern scale used by Pedersen et al., (2004) was used to measure the degree to which participants empathised with and were concerned about Indigenous Australians. Some items were slightly reworded for clarity. This scale has been shown to be satisfactory ($\alpha = .69$). Example items include; “I often empathise with Indigenous Australians” and “I don’t have much sympathy for Indigenous Australians”.

**Attitudes Toward Indigenous Australians (ATIA).** This scale was taken from Pedersen et al., (2004), and was used to measure participants’ prejudice levels toward Indigenous Australians. The ATIA is comprised of 18 items which are a mix of “old fashioned” and “modern” statements, and has been shown to be very reliable ($\alpha = .93$). An example of the statements used in the ATIA include; “Indigenous Australians would be lost without white Australians in today’s society”, and “Indigenous people work as hard as anyone else”.

**Intention to engage in bystander anti-racism.** Two bystander scenarios were adapted from Pedersen et al. (2011a), and were used to gauge how likely participants were to intervene when witnessing an instance of racial discrimination against Indigenous Australians. Scenario 1 involved a low risk interpersonal context, where participants would have to speak up against their work colleagues, while scenario 2 involved a high risk public confrontation with an aggressive stranger. Using a 7-point scale which ranged from extremely unlikely (1) to extremely likely (7), participants indicated how likely it was that they would speak up or intervene in each
scenario. Each scenario was analysed independently, such that each participant had
one score for each scenario, rather than forming a scale.

**Fear & anger.** To measure level of fear in response to each scenario,
participants were required to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed
with four statements such as “This situation makes me feel afraid”. Level of anger in
response to each scenario was measured in the same way, with statements such as
“This situation makes me feel furious”. Both the fear and anger scales were adapted
from those used by Mackie, Smith and Devos (2000), and have been shown to be
reliable ($\alpha = .89$ and $\alpha = .87$, respectively).

**Procedure**

Participants were given a survey link which directed them to the information
letter (Appendix A). Participants read the letter and then ticked a box to indicate that
they wished to take part in the research by completing the survey. Next, participants
were taken to the first page of the survey which reiterated the terms of implicit
consent (Appendix B). After clicking ‘next’, participants began completing the
survey.

**Results**

**Descriptives**

Composite scores ranged from 1-7 and were calculated by averaging item
scores for each scale. Higher scores reflect higher levels of the relative construct.
The descriptive statistics for each scale are displayed in Table 1 and include the
reliability coefficients, the scale means and standard deviations, the number of items
in each scale (k), and the percentage (%) of participants who scored above the
midpoint (4) for each scale. Alpha coefficients were very good for all scales. Due to
the difference in level of risk between the scenarios, anger and fear were measured
separately for each scenario. As such there are two anger and two fear scales in
Table 1.

Table 1.

*Descriptives For All Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>κ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Identity</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Guilt</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimisation</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Concern</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Scene Anger</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Scene Anger</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Scene Fear</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Scene Fear</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Action</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Action</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. LR = low risk, HR = high risk.*

**Correlations**

Table 2 presents the correlations among the predictor variables. Most important are the correlations between the predictor variables and the two criterion variables (low risk and high risk action). Level of education was not correlated with action intentions in either the low risk (work colleague) or high risk (train) scenarios. Gender was significantly correlated with action intentions in the low risk scenario, such that female participants indicated a greater intention to engage in bystander anti-racism than did males. This pattern however, did not exist for the high risk scenario.
Table 2
*Inter-Correlations Among Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Low Risk Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High Risk Action</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political Preference</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. National Identity</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collective Guilt</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legitimisation</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Empathic Concern</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>-.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prejudice</td>
<td>-.61***</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.64***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>-.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Low Risk Anger</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>-.61***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-.75***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High Risk Anger</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-.64***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Low Risk Fear</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. High Risk Fear</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *= p ≤ .05; **= p ≤ .01; ***= p ≤ .001, all 2-tailed.*
Participants who reported lower levels of national identification indicated a greater likelihood to intervene in the low risk scenario than participants who reported higher levels. Again, this pattern was not found for the high risk scenario.

Being older, politically left inclined, feeling a greater level of collective guilt about historical wrongdoings, and a greater level of empathic concern toward Indigenous Australians was significantly correlated with action intentions in both scenarios. Additionally, participants who reported less prejudice toward Indigenous Australians and who engaged in less legitimisation of historical wrongdoings toward Indigenous Australians also indicated a greater likelihood of intervening in both scenarios. Relative to the scenarios themselves, those who felt greater levels of anger reported a greater intention to act in both scenarios. Unexpectedly however, participants who felt greater fear in response to the low risk scenario indicated a greater likelihood of intervening than participants who reported lower levels of fear. There was no relationship between fear and action intentions for the high risk scenario. Action intentions for the low risk and high risk scenarios were significantly correlated, indicating that the intention to intervene in one scenario was associated with the intention to intervene in the other.

**Differences Between Low and High Risk Scenarios**

Supporting the present study’s first prediction (P1), repeated measures $t$ tests indicated that participants reported greater anger and fear in the high risk scenario than the low risk scenario, $t (138) = -5.91, p < .001$, and $t (142) = -7.67, p < .001$, respectively. In contrast to the second prediction (P2) however, an independent samples $t$ test indicated that although the sample may have perceived greater risk (as indicated by greater fear) in the high risk scenario, participants were not less likely to act in the high risk than in the low risk scenario, $t (148) = -.39, p = .696$. 
Nevertheless, the aforementioned correlations indicate that action may be predicted by a different combination of variables when the context varies from low to high risk.

**Predictors of Bystander Anti-Racism**

Two hierarchical multiple regression equations were employed to explore what proportion of variance in low and high risk action could be both uniquely and collectively accounted for by the predictor variables. Only the predictor variables which showed significant correlations with action intentions were included in the relative regression equation. All the variables except education were used in the low risk equation, while all variables except for education, gender, national identity, and fear were used in the high risk equation. As previous research indicates that socio-demographic variables are less predictive of prejudice than social-psychological variables (e.g. Pedersen et al., 2004), socio-demographic variables were entered into step one. Social-psychological variables were entered into step two, and context-related variables were entered into step three. Entering the context-related variables last enabled insight as to whether anger and/or fear in response to the scenarios predicts action intentions once all other predictor variables are accounted for. Table 3 presents the equations for the low and high risk action intentions.

In the regression equation predicting low risk action intentions, the socio-demographic variables entered on step 1 collectively accounted for a significant 14% ($F (3,110) = 6.02, p = .001$) of the variance in action intentions, while age and political preference each uniquely accounted for a significant proportion of the variance (5%, $t (110) = 2.49, p = .01$, and 6%, $t (110) = -2.77, p = .007$, respectively). On step 2, the inclusion of the five psychological variables accounted for an additional and significant 24% of the variance,
Table 3.  
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Equations for Low Risk and High Risk Action Intentions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>sr²</th>
<th>β(a)</th>
<th>β(b)</th>
<th>β(c)</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 - Low Risk Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Preference</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Identity</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective guilt</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimisation</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic concern</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 - High Risk Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Preference</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective guilt</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimisation</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic concern</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001 (all two tailed). β(a) denotes beta weight for variables after step 1; β(b) denotes beta weights for variables after step 2; β(c) denotes beta weights for variables after step 3.
bringing the shared variance to a significant 38% (F (8, 105) = 7.99, p < .001). Of all the variables included at step 2, only empathic concern and prejudice uniquely accounted for a significant proportion of variance (3%, t (105) = 2.37, p = .02, and 2%, t (105) = -2.01, p = .047, respectively). On step 3, the increase in shared variance accounted for by fear and anger was non-significant, but the total shared variance was (40%, F (10, 103) = 6.79, p < .001). Cohen (1988) suggests that a combined effect of this magnitude can be considered large (f^2 = .67). In the final equation only age and empathic concern had significant beta weights, uniquely explaining 2% (t (103) = 2.05, p = .04) and 4%, (t (103) = 2.52, p = .01) of the variance in low risk action intentions, respectively.

In the regression equation predicting high risk action intentions, the demographic variables entered on step 1 collectively explained a significant 14% (F (2,120) = 10.00, p <.001) of variance in action intentions. As in the low risk action equation, age and political preference each uniquely accounted for a significant proportion of the variance (5%, t (120) = 2.53, p = .01, and 10%, t (120) = -3.83, p < .001, respectively). On step 2, the inclusion of the four psychological variables accounted for an additional and significant 13% of the variance, bringing the shared variance to a significant 27% (F (6,116) = 7.24, p < .001). Only age had a significant beta weight on step 2, uniquely explaining 3% (sr^2 = .03, t (116) = 2.20, p = .03) of the variance in action intentions. On step 3, the increase in shared variance accounted for anger was non-significant, but the total shared variance was (29%, F (7, 115) = 6.54, p < .001). A combined effect of this magnitude can also be considered large (f^2 = .40, Cohen, 1988). In the final equation, only age had a significant beta weight, uniquely explaining 3% (t (103) = 2.35, p < .02) of the variance in high risk action intentions.
A comparison of the results from the low risk and high risk equations, shows that being older and having a greater level of empathic concern for Indigenous Australians uniquely predicted intentions to engage in bystander anti-racism when the scenario was relatively low risk, however it was being older alone which uniquely predicted intentions to engage in bystander anti-racism when the scenario was one of high risk.

Discussion

The present study had three main aims. The first aim was to explore whether variables which have previously been associated with pro-social behaviours and attitudes might also be associated with bystander anti-racism on behalf of Indigenous Australians. The second aim was to ascertain whether the associated variables which were revealed during the exploration of Aim 1 might predict bystander anti-racism. Finally, the third aim was to explore whether the variables which correlate with or predict bystander anti-racism differ depending on the level of risk inherent in a given context. Relevant to Aim 3, the prediction (P1) that participants would report greater fear and anger in response to the high risk (train) scenario than they would in response to the low risk (work colleagues) scenario was supported. The prediction (P2) that intentions to engage in bystander anti-racism would be greater in the low risk scenario than in the high risk scenario was not supported. Evidence pertaining to these aims and predictions will now be discussed.

Correlates of Bystander Anti-Racism (Aim 1)

Social-psychological variables. Participants who reported less identification with being ‘Australian’, greater levels of collective guilt for the past mistreatment of Indigenous Australians, less legitimization of the past and present mistreatment of
Indigenous Australians, greater levels of empathic concern for Indigenous Australians, and less prejudice toward Indigenous Australians, where also those who reported a greater likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism in the low risk scenario. The correlations for the high risk scenario were similar to that observed in the low risk scenario, with the exception of national identification.

With respect to the low risk scenario, the finding that those who identified with being Australian to a greater extent reported a lesser likelihood to intervene on behalf of Indigenous Australians supports previous research (Cuddy et al., 2007; Levine et al., 2005; Tarrant et al., 2009) and an assumption of SIT. That individuals are less likely to help those who do not belong to their ingroup than those who do (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). On the other hand, why lower levels of national identity were related to greater intention to intervene is not exactly clear. SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) states that because the groups we belong to are perceived as extensions of ourselves, we are motivated to help those who are like us and who belong to our groups in order to derive positive affect about the self.

However, simply because one identifies to a lesser extent with being Australian, does not mean that they identified strongly with Indigenous Australians. As such, it could be that those who identified to a lesser extent with being Australian might have identified to a greater extent with another group (not measured) which was either inclusive of Indigenous Australians, or whose values prescribe pro-social behaviour such as bystander anti-racism. A similar suggestion was made by McGarty and colleagues (2005), where the authors argued that at least in Australia, where the national identity construct is complex and even ambiguous, an opinion-based group identity may be more relevant. Important to note here, is that although significant,
the correlation between nation identity and action intentions was rather weak, it is possible that a more relevant group identity would result in a stronger correlation.

In line with previous research which explored the relationship between collective guilt and pro-social attitudes and behaviours (Doosje et al., 1998; Halloran, 2007; Pedersen & Thomas, under review), greater levels of collective guilt were associated with a greater likelihood to engage in bystander anti-racism in both scenarios. Less legitimization was also related to an increased likelihood to engage in bystander anti-racism on behalf of Indigenous Australians. Reflecting the findings of other authors (e.g. Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Karancanta & Fitness, 2006; Oswald, 1996), greater empathic concern was related to a greater intention to engage in bystander anti-racism. Finally, also in support of previous research (e.g. Awad et al., 2005; Ellis et al., 2002; Kluegel & Smith, 1983); prejudice toward Indigenous Australians was negatively correlated with action intentions in both scenarios. Those who scored higher on prejudice indicated that they were less likely to engage in bystander anti-racism.

**Context-related variables.** In contrast to the assertions of previous research (Aboud & Miller, 2007; Swim & Hyers, 1999), a positive correlation between fear and action intentions emerged with respect to the low risk scenario. That is, greater fear was significantly associated with greater intent to engage in bystander anti-racism. This finding is very much contrary to arguments regarding the effect of cost-benefit appraisals on action, which suggest that when the cost of action outweighs the possible benefits, the likelihood of such action is reduced (Good et al., 2012; Kowalski, 1996). Attempting to apply this argument would mean that as participants felt more fearful, the perceived benefits to intervening also increased, yet this seems unlikely. As such, it is unclear why this relationship emerged. Finally, the
correlations between anger and action intentions for both scenarios were significant and in line with the suggestions of Nelson and colleagues (2011), and Pedersen and Thomas (under review). Participants who indicated greater anger in response to the discrimination scenarios also reported a greater likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism.

**Socio-demographic variables.** Participants who were older, more politically left inclined, and female reported a greater likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism in the low risk scenario; however, only those who were older and more politically left inclined reported a significantly greater likelihood of intervening in the high risk scenario. These findings are in the same direction as previous findings, and build on those which have found correlations between age and helping behaviour (e.g. Amato, 1985), between gender and attitudes toward affirmative action programs for minority groups (e.g. Kravitz & Plantania, 1993), and between political preference and prejudice (e.g. Hodson & Busseri, 2012; Pedersen & Hartley, 2012). Level of formal education did not correlate with action intentions in either scenario.

In summary, intention to engage in bystander anti-racism in the low risk scenario was significantly associated with age, political preference, gender, national identity, collective guilt, legitimization, empathic concern, prejudice, anger and fear. In contrast, intention to engage in bystander anti-racism in the high risk scenario was significantly associated with age, political preference, collective guilt, legitimization, empathic concern, prejudice, and anger. The difference between the two scenarios is that while gender, national identity, and fear were correlated with low risk action intentions, they did not correlate with high risk action intentions. The fact that differences between the correlations for each scenario emerged, implies that the scenarios were in fact viewed as different by participants. Furthermore, these
differences suggest that bystander anti-racism may well depend on a differing set of factors when speaking up against a perpetrator involves a low verses a high level of risk.

**Predicting Bystander Anti-Racism (Aim 2)**

**Work colleague/low risk scenario.** When it came to predicting bystander anti-racism in the low risk scenario, only age and political preference emerged as unique predictors on step 1. When the social-psychological variables were entered on step 2, age and political preference were no longer unique predictors. Of the social-psychological variables included, only empathic concern and prejudice significantly accounted for a unique proportion of variance in action intentions. When anger and fear were added to the equation on step 3, however, political preference and prejudice did not emerge as unique predictors, nor did anger or fear. The only significant predictors were age and empathy. In other words, being older predicted a greater likelihood of engaging in low risk bystander anti-racism, as did greater empathic concern for Indigenous Australians.

Although some of the included variables did not on any step account for a unique proportion of variance in action intentions, it is important to note that at every step in the regression, the proportion of variance accounted for by the combination of variables was significant. This indicates that although only age and empathic concern uniquely predict the intention to engage in (low risk) bystander anti-racism, the other variables included in this regression equation such as political preference, gender, national identity, collective guilt, legitimization, prejudice, anger, and fear, are nevertheless important. This is further supported by the aforementioned significant correlations. Moreover, the significant beta weights of political preference on step 1,
and of prejudice on step 2, indicate that these variables are perhaps more relevant than the non significant variables, but less so than age and empathic concern.

That age was found to be predictive of action intentions supports the findings of authors such as Amato (1985) who found that being older predicted helping behaviours which occur on a day to day basis. Amato argued that there might be times in one’s life cycle that are associated with greater readiness to help others. It may be the case that older individuals, as a result of having greater ‘life’ experience, are better prepared and therefore more confident in their ability to effectively speak up in discriminatory situations. Furthermore, while younger individuals might refrain from speaking up out of concern for how they might be perceived by others, older individuals may be less concerned with the perceptions of others and are therefore more likely to speak up than their younger counterparts.

The finding that one’s level of empathic concern can predict their likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism is in line with the findings of previous authors who have explored empathic concern for the homosexual community (Karacanta & Fitness, 2006), for fellow students (Oswald,1996), and for African Americans (Iyer et al., 2003, study 2). It appears that concern for the welfare of another serves as motivation to act in a way that may benefit that person or the group to which they belong.

Some might question whether the empathic concern measured in the present study, could in reality be a trait/personality empathic concern; that people who are generally empathic might be more empathic toward others irrespective of the target’s group membership. Admittedly this possibility cannot be conclusively ruled out; however, the results of Pedersen and colleagues (2004) suggest this not to be the
Comparing the results from their two studies, Pedersen and colleagues found that although both were significant, the relationship between general trait/personality empathic concern and prejudice toward Indigenous Australians was much weaker \((r = -0.28)\) than the relationship between empathic concern specifically for Indigenous Australians and prejudice toward them \((r = -0.63)\). Likewise, the present study found that the strength of the relationship between empathic concern toward Indigenous Australians and prejudice toward Indigenous Australians was of a similar magnitude. This offers some support to the idea that it was empathic concern specifically for Indigenous Australians that was measured in the present study.

**Train/high risk scenario.** With respect to action intentions in the high risk scenario, both age and political preference emerged as predictors on step 1, but only age remained a predictor on step 2 and 3. None of the social-psychological (collective guilt, legitimization, empathic concern, or prejudice) or context-related variables (fear and anger) predicted action intentions at any step in the regression equation which is in contrast to the low risk equation. As such, it was only being older which predicted a greater likelihood of engaging in high risk bystander anti-racism. Yet, as in the low risk equation, at every step in the regression, the proportion of variance accounted for by the combination of variables was significant.

As signified by the correlations, this indicates that although only age uniquely predicted the intention to engage in bystander anti-racism; political preference, collective guilt, legitimization, empathic concern, prejudice, and anger, were nevertheless important. The high risk regression also resulted in a significant beta weight for political preference on step 1, which indicates that it is relevant to a greater extent than the aforementioned non significant variables, but less so than age. As made clear for the low risk scenario; that being older predicted the intention to
engage in bystander anti-racism supports previous research on helping behaviours (Amato, 1985). The finding that a left-wing political preference predicted action intentions on step 1 (both scenarios) builds on previous attitude based research, which indicates that such a political preference predicts more positive attitudes toward minority groups (Hodson & Busseri, 2012; Pedersen & Hartley, 2012; Pedersen et al., 2004; Whitley, 1999).

It must be said, however, that the fact that a socio-demographic variable (age) has proven to be predictive of the intention to engage in bystander anti-racism over and above many social-psychological variables (for both scenarios) is somewhat surprising. Previous research has generally indicated that social-psychological variables are more predictive of prejudice toward minority groups than socio-demographic ones (e.g. Pedersen et al., 2004; Pedersen & Walker, 1997). As attitudes and behaviours are closely related (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005; Glasman & Albarracin, 2006), one might expect that social-psychological variables would be more predictive of action on behalf of a minority group also; yet our results indicate otherwise. It is unclear why age emerged as most important, however a focus on qualitative data in the future may clarify this finding.

**Differences Between High and Low Risk Scenarios (Aim 3).**

Supporting the present paper’s first prediction (P1), it was found that participants reported greater anger and fear toward the high risk (train) scenario than toward the low risk (work colleague) scenario. This finding suggests that the work colleague scenario was perceived as being lower in risk than the train scenario, as reflected by fear ratings, and was perhaps also perceived as less intensely discriminatory than the train scenario, as reflected by anger ratings. The second
prediction (P2), however, was not supported; participants did not report a greater
likelihood of engaging in bystander anti-racism in the low risk scenario than in the
high risk scenario. This is contrary to the cost-benefit hypothesis for helping
purported by some authors (e.g. Good et al., 2012; Kowalski, 1996). Specifically,
that help will be more forthcoming when benefits outweigh the costs. This finding,
however, may be due to a design limitation.

The fact that action intentions were measured one after the other means that
rather than responding in ways that were directed by their risk assessment
evaluations of each scenario, it is possible that participants instead responded in
ways that allowed them to appear consistent across the two scenarios. Had there been
greater space and time between the measurements of action intentions in each
scenario, it is possible that the expected prediction may have been observed.

With respect to differences in the variables which predicted action intentions;
age and empathy emerged as unique predictors of action intentions in the low risk
scenario, while age alone uniquely predicted action intentions in the high risk
scenario. It is suggested that this difference occurred as a result of the increase in
fear observed for the high risk scenario. Relevant is that while just over a quarter of
the sample reported fear levels above the midpoint in the low risk scenario, more
than half of the sample did so in the high risk scenario. It is possible that one’s level
of empathic concern may no longer be relevant when the riskiness of a situation
reaches a certain degree.

In such situations, it may be that because older individuals have had more life
experience, they feel more competent in their ability to effectively (and safely)
intervene. Finally, the combination of variables in the low risk regression accounted
for a great deal more variance in action intentions than did the combination of variables in the high risk regression. This suggests that more variables in general (including others not measured in the survey) need to be taken into account in order to better predict the likelihood of bystander anti-racism when intervention involves a higher degree of risk.

**Strengths, Limitations, & Future Research**

There are some limitations to the present study that should be considered. In comparison to the population data collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010), the present sample was a good deal more educated than the general Western Australian community. As such, this sample may not adequately reflect the sentiment held with respect to Indigenous Australians in the general population. Unfortunately, this may be a problem which is inherent to using participant databases where sign-up is voluntary. On the other hand because community response rates continue to decline (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012), participant databases offer a method in which to gather relatively large samples. Nevertheless, the fact that the present sample was well educated does not exclude them from being important; their thoughts, feelings and intentions are as important and relevant as those of the population who they may not adequately represent. Furthermore, given the relationship which has previously been found between education and prejudice (e.g. Pedersen et al., 2000), it may be those who are represented by the present sample that are best positioned to engage in bystander anti-racism.

The contrary finding that fear was positively correlated with action intentions in the low risk scenario needs to be further investigated to ascertain whether this result reflected the reality of the relationship between those variables in that context.
This can be achieved through replication of the present study. Finally, because the action intention measures were presented one after the other, consistency effects may have affected the way participants responded to these items. Future research should ensure there is space and/or time between the presentation of multiple action intention measures to minimise potential consistency effects.

Strengths of the present study include that the present paper responds to the need for more research to be carried out within the specific field of bystander anti-racism. In fact, this study is the first to examine the correlates and predictors of bystander anti-racism specifically. This is especially important given that ‘everyday’ racisms (such as that seen in the work colleague scenario) are the forms most often encountered on a daily basis by minority groups (Beagan, 2003; Swim et al., 2003), and it is these ‘everyday’ racisms which bystanders are best positioned to combat because they occur in contexts which individuals can affect, but policy cannot (Nelson et al., 2011). Furthermore, in the present study a broad range of variables known to be associated with or to predict pro-social attitudes or behaviours were included for analysis. Now that some of the variables which predict bystander anti-racism have been empirically identified, future research may look to focus on a smaller selection of these, in the hopes to better explain their underlying mechanisms.

For example, future research could explore why age, a socio-demographic variable, emerged as pertinent over and above most of the social-psychological variables; a finding that is in contrast to past research (e.g. Pedersen et al., 2004). A focus on qualitative data may help to clarify this. It was suggested that older individuals may be more likely to engage in bystander anti-racism because they are less concerned with how they are perceived by others and because through greater
life experience, they may better possess the skills required to successfully intervene. Future research should look to ascertain whether this is in fact the case. As mentioned earlier, it may be that opinion-based identities, such as an activist identity for example, may better relate to bystander anti-racism than did national identity. This possibility should also be explored in the future. Finally, researchers should also aim to replicate the present study with different target groups.

**Practical Implications**

Understanding the predictors of bystander anti-racism relates to the possibility of increasing its occurrence through targeted intervention. A possible interpretation for the finding that being older predicted intentions to intervene in both scenarios, is that younger individuals may not perceive themselves as well equipped enough to intervene in instances of racial discrimination. As such, it may be possible to provide younger people with the necessary skills to effectively engage in bystander anti-racism through educational interventions (Nelson et al., 2011). In fact, a few studies have already begun evaluating such programs (Pedersen & Thomas, under review; Pedersen et al., 2011a) and they appear to be successful.

These educational programs may also address the other predictor which emerged with respect to the low risk scenario. Reporting greater empathic concern for Indigenous Australians was also predictive of intentions to engage in bystander anti-racism. Educational interventions which involve learning about the cultures and histories of minority groups are likely to improve one’s ability to focus on the ‘other’ and as such, increase the experience of empathic concern for the relative group (Pedersen et al., 2011b).
Concluding Statements

In conclusion, the present study demonstrated that many of the variables associated with pro-social attitudes and behaviours are also associated with bystander anti-racism specifically. Furthermore, it was revealed that age and empathic concern uniquely predicted the intention to engage in bystander anti-racism on behalf of Indigenous Australians when the context for intervention was of low risk, but that age alone was a unique predictor when the context for intervention was of high risk. The findings of the present study, however, are by no means conclusive and require continued research and replication.

As racial discrimination has the capacity to cause significant harm to a target (Larson et al., 2007; Paradies et al., 2008), their group, and to a community as a whole, it is pertinent that ways of effectively reducing racial discrimination are investigated. Bystander anti-racism has the immediate effect of stopping racial discrimination, while possibly also resulting in longer term benefits such as the establishment of anti-racism norms and the reduction of future discriminatory behaviour (Blanchard et al., 1991; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2011). The findings from this research may be used to inform the design of educational intervention programs (e.g. Pedersen et al., 2011a; Pedersen & Thomas, under review) aimed at providing the necessary skills for individuals to feel confident in speaking up against racial discrimination. By increasing the likelihood of bystander anti-racism, closing the gap between the advantaged and disadvantaged may be just that step closer.
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Endnotes

1. Initially, a comparison of the variables within the present study was planned according to whether or not participants read an empathy inducing narrative. There was an objective, other-perspective, and control condition. The survey present in Appendix B contains the narrative that was given to participants in the manipulated conditions. As there were no effects however, this aspect has not been included in the main study. This is noted in an attempt to minimise the ‘bottom drawer problem’.
Appendix A

Information Letter

Attitudes towards Indigenous Australians and Acts of Discrimination

You are invited to participate in a research study currently being conducted by researchers from the School of Psychology at Murdoch University. In our study, we are interested in the views and opinions that the Australian community have in relation to Indigenous Australians, and in relation to acts of discrimination towards them. The statements within this survey come from a wide range of sources and do not reflect the view of any person or organisation connected to the survey. We simply want to understand your point of view.

Our survey includes a number of questions asking about how you think and feel in response to issue pertaining to Indigenous Australians. You will then need to give your response by marking the option which best represent your opinion. The survey will take 15 minutes to complete.

Please do not type any information that may identify you as an individual on the survey pages, unless given instructions to do so (i.e. on the demographics page) – the researchers would like to protect your anonymity. Although we would like to hear your views on the matter, you have the right to withdraw your consent for participation in this study at any time, simply by choosing not to submit the survey during the completion process. If you do decide to continue with participation, all of the data that we have collected from you will be kept in the strictest of confidentiality, and will not be released to a third-party, unless required to do so by law.

Completing and submitting the completed questionnaire will indicate to us that you are willing to participate in this study and that you are providing us with your consent for the researchers to continue using your data as part of this research study. After you submit your completed survey, it may not be possible to withdraw your data if you later choose not to participate. In using your data, we assure you that information that can specifically identify you will not be published in the final study.
There are no specific risks anticipated with participation in this study. However if you find that you are becoming distressed, you are eligible to see a counsellor at the Murdoch University Psychology Clinic at no cost to you. You can contact the clinic on 9360 2570, or visit their website at www.psychology.murdoch.edu.au/clinic/referral.html

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Yara Neto at yaramusic@hotmail.com or Dr Suzanne Dziurawiec (School Dean) at S.Dziurawiec@murdoch.edu.au.

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2012/101). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University’s Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 (for overseas studies, +61 8 9360 6677) or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix B

Survey

Please note: Headings were removed prior to participants completing the survey, and the layout shown here differs to that presented online due to space constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have read the Information letter about the nature and scope of this survey. Any questions I have about the research process have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this research. By submitting this survey over the internet, I give my consent for the results to be used in the research. I am aware that this survey is anonymous and no personal details are being collected or used. I know that I may change my mind, withdraw my consent, and stop participating at any time, and I acknowledge that once my survey has been submitted, it may not be possible to withdraw my data.

I understand that all information provided is treated as confidential by the researchers and will not be released to a third party unless required to do so by law.

I understand that the findings of this study may be published and that no information which can specifically identify me will be published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

First, we would like to know a little about you so we can establish the demographics of the people who take part in this survey. We are aiming for a diverse community group and this information will be helpful to establish whether we were successful. Please mark the box most appropriate to you. All information is anonymous and confidential.

1. What is your age? ________________ years

2. Your sex
   □ Male
   □ Female
3. How would you describe your political preferences on most issues? Please tick one box that comes closest to your view. ‘Right or right-wing’ views mean a conservative political viewpoint; and ‘Left or left-wing’ means the opposite.

- Strongly left
- Moderately left
- Slightly left
- Neither
- Slightly right
- Moderately right
- Strongly right

4. Your education level?

- Did not complete Secondary School
- Completed Secondary School
- Vocational Training (part or completed)
- Undergraduate Diploma (part or completed)
- Bachelor Degree (part or completed)
- Higher Degree (e.g., PhD, Masters) (part or completed)

5. Ancestry/Cultural Background?_____________________

6. In what town/city do you usually reside (or the closest town/city if you live in a rural area)? ______________________

7. In what state or territory is that town/city? ______________________

### National Identification

In the following section we would like to get an idea of how you think and feel about being Australian. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.
7 = strongly agree
6 = moderately agree
5 = slightly agree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
3 = slightly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

1. I feel a bond with Australians.
2. I feel solidarity with Australians.
3. I feel committed to Australians.
4. I am glad to be Australian.
5. I think that Australians have a lot to be proud of.
6. It is pleasant to be Australian.
7. Being Australian gives me a good feeling.
8. I often think about the fact that I am Australian
9. The fact that I am Australian is an important part of my identity.
10. Being Australian is an important part of how I see myself.
11. I have a lot in common with the average Australian.
12. I am similar to the average Australian.
13. Australians have a lot in common with each other.
14. Australians are very similar to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for manipulation conditions only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would now like you to read the passage below before completing the rest of the questionnaire. The narrative has been taken from the autobiography; “Back on the Block: Bill Simon’s Story”.

**Instruction for other-perspective condition:** When reading the narrative we ask that you consider the perspective of the writer, and place yourself in their shoes. Try to imagine the full impact of what is described, how the writer feels about events that have happened and how their experiences have impacted on their life.
Instruction for objective condition: When reading the narrative we ask that you remain objective about the experiences of the writer. Try not to get caught up in how the writer feels; instead remain objective and detached.

“I am one of the ‘Stolen Generations’ and my life has been directly affected by that fact right up to the present day. Before I was taken from my family and put in a ‘home’, I lived on a mission with my mother, my father and my three younger brothers. Living on mission was not voluntary, it was the law, and meant living by the rules of the Aborigines Welfare Board; an organisation created by the Australian government to deal with the assimilation of Aborigines. The board outlawed all traditional Aboriginal activities, effectively destroying our identities. All of the things which we valued were taken away from us, not to mention our freedom. This was extremely degrading and humiliating.

When I was ten years old, my brothers and I were taken from our parents and put in the Kinchela Boy’s home, under the pretence that we were neglected children. In reality however, like the other boys in the home, we had a loving and warm family who cared deeply for us and we were forcibly removed from them. It was nearly eight years before I saw or heard from my mother again, but unfortunately I never saw my father again as he passed away while I was at Kinchela. At Kinchela we were innocent prisoners; we were psychologically, physically, and some were even sexually abused. We were brainwashed into believing that our families did not care for us, and that it was in our best interest not to associate with our own people. We were not there because we had no homes or no parents. We were not orphans, or neglected, or abused. We were not there because the government wanted us to have a better education. We were there simply because we were black.

On many occasions my thoughts and actions have been manipulated and determined by my earlier experiences. In my life I have had to deal with a lot of anger, sadness and resentment for the things that happened to me. Naturally this has had a profound effect on my life and much heartache has been caused to me and to so many others who have been a part of my life. The deep distressing pain we [of the stolen generation] feel day in day out shows itself in so many different ways. Sometimes it’s in the form of violence, alcohol and drugs, and other times it is displayed in
relationship behaviour. No reason, however well intentioned will ever justify what happened to us. To say that Aboriginal children were taken away from their parents for their own good is a lie. I was taken over forty years ago and nothing good has ever come out of that decision.”

**Instruction for other-perspective condition only:** Now that you have read the passage we ask that you write a few lines to reflect on how you believe the writer feels in regards to their history and experiences. Try to put yourself in their shoes while doing this.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

**Collective Guilt &Legitimization**

The following section contains statements which relate to feelings and thoughts about the history between *Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians*. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.

7 = strongly agree
6 = moderately agree
5 = slightly agree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
3 = slightly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

**Collective Guilt**

1. I feel guilty about the negative things that have been done to Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous Australians.
2. I don’t think that Australians today should feel guilty about the negative things done to Indigenous Australians (reverse scored).
3. I feel regret for the harmful past actions of Australians toward Indigenous Australians.
4. I believe that Australians should repair the damage caused to Indigenous Australians.
5. I feel guilty about the past and present social problems of Indigenous Australians that were brought about by their past mistreatment.

Legitimization
6. Although mistakes may have been made, Indigenous Australians have been and continue to be sufficiently compensated.
7. The Australian government now deals with Indigenous Australians in a fair and appropriate manner.

Empathic Concern

The following section contains statements about feelings which you may or may not experience in regards to Indigenous Australians. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.

7 = strongly agree
6 = moderately agree
5 = slightly agree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
3 = slightly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

1. I don’t have much sympathy for Indigenous Australians (reverse scored).
2. I tend to get emotionally involved when I think about Indigenous Australian issues.
3. I often empathise with Indigenous Australians.
4. I try to understand Indigenous Australian issues by imagining how things look to them.

5. I don’t spend a lot of time imagining how I would feel if I were an Indigenous Australian (reverse scored).

**Attitudes Toward Indigenous Australians**

The following section contains a number of statements about Indigenous Australians which respondents from previous studies have made. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.

7 = strongly agree
6 = moderately agree
5 = slightly agree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
3 = slightly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

1. Indigenous Australians would be lost without white Australians in today’s society.
2. Indigenous people work as hard as anyone else (reverse scored).
3. Indigenous people are more racist than just about any other group in Australia.
4. We should all be working toward better cultural understanding (reverse scored).
5. Indigenous people have no regard for their own or anybody else’s property.
6. Urban Aborigines are not real Aborigines.
7. Indigenous people are a proud people (reverse scored).
8. Indigenous people really have no sense of what’s right and what’s wrong.
9. Urban Aborigines tend to be pretty hostile.
10. I respect the Indigenous dreaming (e.g., creation stories; reverse scored).
11. Indigenous people are too vocal and loud about their rights.
12. Indigenous people should try harder to fit in with western society.
13. The media is often biased against Indigenous people (reverse scored).
14. Land rights for Indigenous Australians are just a way of them getting more than they deserve.
15. Indigenous people get given more government money than they should
16. The only racial discrimination in Australia these days is in favour of Indigenous people.
17. Politically correct do-gooders allow Indigenous people to get away with just about anything.
18. All Australians need to understand Indigenous history and culture (reverse scored).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In this section we would like you to consider each of the following scenarios and think about what you would do in response to each one. Then using the scale below please indicate how likely it is that you would do, or say something, in response to each scenario.

- 7 = extremely likely
- 6 = very likely
- 5 = somewhat likely
- 4 = unsure
- 3 = somewhat unlikely
- 2 = very unlikely
- 1 = extremely unlikely

**Scenario 1.**
You are having lunch with several non-Indigenous colleagues. At one point, the conversation turns to issues regarding Indigenous Australians. One of your colleagues says: ‘They mostly are a bunch of lazy bastards’. The conversation continues along these lines, and your colleagues are quite incensed displaying a very negative view of Indigenous people in general.

- Which value on the above scale best represents how likely you are to intervene/speak up in this scenario?
Scenario 2.
You are catching a train and find yourself sitting opposite an Indigenous woman. A non-Indigenous man gets on the train and sits next to you. He looks at the Indigenous woman and immediately says to you in a loud voice: ‘I can’t believe they want an apology from us! Abo’s need to get over it and stop asking for handouts! All they want is for everyone else to pay their way. Why don’t they get a job instead of wasting taxpayer’s hard earned money on booze! They need to learn how to live like the rest of us!’

• Which value on the above scale best represents how likely you are to intervene/speak up in this scenario? __________

Context-Related Emotions

In this section we would like you to again consider each of the same scenarios, but this time we ask that think about how you feel in response to each one. Then using the 1-7 scale below, please indicate the degree to which you experience each of the listed feelings in response to each scenario.

7 = strongly agree  
6 = moderately agree  
5 = slightly agree  
4 = neither agree nor disagree  
3 = slightly disagree  
2 = moderately disagree  
1 = strongly disagree

Scenario 1.
You are having lunch with several non-Indigenous colleagues. At one point, the conversation turns to issues regarding Indigenous Australians. One of your colleagues says: ‘They mostly are a bunch of lazy bastards’. The conversation continues along these lines, and your colleagues are quite incensed displaying a very negative view of Indigenous people in general.

1. This situation makes me feel angry.
2. This situation makes me feel displeased.
3. This situation makes me feel irritated.
4. This situation makes me feel furious.
5. This situation makes me feel worried.
6. This situation makes me feel anxious.
7. This situation makes me feel afraid.
8. This situation makes me feel fearful.

Scenario 2.
You are catching a train and find yourself sitting opposite an Indigenous woman. A non-Indigenous man gets on the train and sits next to you. He looks at the Indigenous woman and immediately says to you in a loud voice: ‘I can’t believe they want an apology from us! Abo’s need to get over it and stop asking for handouts! All they want is for everyone else to pay their way. Why don’t they get a job instead of wasting taxpayer’s hard earned money on booze! They need to learn how to live like the rest of us!'

1. This situation makes me feel angry.
2. This situation makes me feel displeased.
3. This situation makes me feel irritated.
4. This situation makes me feel furious.
5. This situation makes me feel worried.
6. This situation makes me feel anxious.
7. This situation makes me feel afraid.
8. This situation makes me feel fearful.

**Suspicion Check**

Do you know what this study was about?

Yes ☐

No ☐
If yes, please tell us in your own words.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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