

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

PSY4039
Honours Thesis in Psychology

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers to intention to act

Word Count: 11, 973

Written for the Journal of Community Psychology

Karee Stewart, 31014589
Supervisor: Anne Pedersen

Table of Contents

Title Page	p.4
Declaration	p.5
Copyright acknowledgements	p.6
Abstract	p.7
Acknowledgements	p.8
Introduction	
Overview	p.9
Overview of bystander anti-prejudice	p.12
Obstacles to bystander anti-prejudice:	
Prejudice	p.13
Collective identity	p.14
Impression management	p.14
Risk/fear of reprisal	p.16
Incident not serious enough	p.16
Intervention ineffective	p.17
Not my role/pace	p.17
Entitled to own opinion	p.18
The present study	p.18
Method	
Participants	p.20
Measures	p.20
Procedure	p.24
Results	
Descriptive Statistics	p.27
Table 1-Descriptive statistics for each scale	p.28
T-test	p.29
Correlations	p.29
Table 2-Intercorrelations among variables	p.30
Regression	p.31
High risk	p.31
Table 3-High risk regression table	p.33
Low risk	p.34
Table 4-Low risk regression table	p.35
Qualitative data	p.36
Discussion	
Correlations	p.38
Aim	p.39

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

Hypothesis 1	p.42
Hypothesis 2	p.43
Qualitative data	p.44
Practical implications	p.47
Limitations and future research	p.48
Concluding remarks	p.49
References	p.52
Author's guidelines	p.60
Appendix 1	p.64
Appendix 2	p.65
Appendix 3	p.73

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

Bystander anti-prejudice: Exploring the obstacles and enablers to intention to act.

Karee Stewart

Bachelor of Psychology, Hons.

Bachelor of English and Creative Writing.

This thesis is presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts (Honours), Murdoch University, 2012.

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains as its main content work which has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary educational institution.

Karee Stewart

Copyright Acknowledgement

I acknowledge that a copy of this thesis will be held at the Murdoch University Library.

I understand that, under the provisions s51.2 of the Copyright Act 1968, all or part of this thesis may be copied without infringement of copyright where such a reproduction is for the purposes of study and research. This statement does not signal any transfer of copyright away from the author.

Signed:

Abstract

Bystander anti-prejudice (action taken in response to incidences of prejudice) has been identified as an important strategy in combating prejudice and discrimination against minority groups, including Australian refugees (Nelson et al., 2010). Several factors that have been identified as contributors and obstacles to the likelihood of bystander anti-prejudice are *Prejudice, Collective Identity, Risk/Fear of Reprisal, Incident Not Serious Enough, Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships/Impression Management, Intervention Ineffective, Not My Role/Place* and *Entitled To Own Opinion*. A total of 153 community participants completed a questionnaire addressing how each of these eight factors influenced a participant's intention to act when they were faced with two scenarios, one of which involved a confrontation on a train and the other of which involved the hearing of a prejudiced joke at a party. *Risk/Fear of Reprisal* was the major obstacle to intervention in the high risk/train scenario and *Incident Not Serious Enough* was most influential in the low-risk/joke scenario. Other variables that were significant obstacles of bystander intention to act were *Prejudice, Impression Management/Interpersonal Relationships, Intervention Ineffective* and *Not My Role/Place*. As expected, results found that participants were more likely to act in the low-risk scenario. A number of themes were identified by the qualitative data, including comments regarding false beliefs, freedom of speech and importance of action. Practical implications of bystander anti-prejudice, such as reducing and combating incidences of prejudice in the community, make it an important area of study. More research is required on the topic in order to effectively implement it as an anti-prejudice strategy.

Acknowledgements

For Anne Pedersen, for being wonderfully dependable and dependably wonderful. I couldn't have asked for a more supportive, organised, inspirational or knowledgeable supervisor. There are not enough words to express my gratitude for everything that you have done and for everything that you are. I hope I do you proud.

A big thanks to Yin Paradies for all his proofing, suggestions and all-round helpfulness. He has been a valuable asset and a huge help for the duration of this thesis.

For all my pilotes's and proofers, including my mum, Emily and Angela. Thank you for all your suggestions, your encouragement and your support.

And finally, to all my uni girls, for spending the year going crazy with me and also for helping to keep me sane! The last four years wouldn't have been the same without you.

Bystander anti-prejudice: Exploring the obstacles and enablers to intention to act

The issue of refugees obtaining residency in Australia has attracted much negative attention from the public in recent years (McKay, Thomas & Kneebone, 2011). Indeed, very few social justice issues have attracted as much controversy and hostility as the arrival of refugees into the Australian community (Suhnan, Pedersen, Hartley, in press). An individual is considered a refugee if their protection from a country is deemed necessary by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR, 2011). As a signatory to the United Nations Refugee Convention (United Nations, 2007) the protection of refugees is mandated by Australian law.

Prejudice against refugees remains a long-standing and on-going problem within the Australian community (Davidson, Murray, & Schweitzer, 2008). There are a number of issues that reinforce and maintain this prejudice including misinformation and lack of education (Baker et al., 2008), the acceptance and generation of false beliefs about refugees (Turoy-Smith, Kane & Pedersen, in press), and the way refugees are framed in community discourse as a threat or the 'other' (Marr & Wilkinson, 2003). This perception of threat in particular has been found to be the strongest predictor of prejudicial attitudes toward refugees (McKay & Pittam, 1993).

A lack of education, or misinformation, regarding refugee issues is a significant contributor to the rampant prejudice against this group. In one study, for example, the terms 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' were frequently interchanged, implying that the general public considered them one and the same (Baker et al., 2008). This was also true for 'immigrants', all three terms were used synonymously and any negative rhetoric associated with one group was consequently applied to the

other (Baker et al., 2008). Similarly, Turoy-Smith, Kane and Pedersen (in press) found that despite asking participants for specific references to experiences with refugees, respondents often referred to false beliefs generally associated with asylum seekers; that they were 'illegal', 'cashed up', get government hand-outs and so forth. In Turoy-Smith, Kane and Pedersen's study it was apparent that the negative attitudes towards asylum seekers were transferred to refugees, with false beliefs used as justifiers for any negative rhetoric. The misunderstanding of the Australian community at large in intertwining the definitions of and distinction between refugees and asylum seekers may continue to perpetuate this prejudice.

Additionally, people who are more highly prejudiced are more likely to significantly overestimate the extent of community consensus for their views (Watt & Larkin, 2010). Programs that educate participants on such false beliefs, on prejudice, and on cultural differences and similarities have had some success in reducing the incidence of prejudice (Hartley, Pedersen & Dandy, 2012) particularly when those programs have been tailored to bystander action specifically (Scully & Rowe, 2009). When knowledgeable bystanders speak out against acts of prejudice false consensus effects may be combated and prejudice in the community reduced (Pedersen, Walker, Paradies & Guerin, 2011).

Negative community discourse also serves to strengthen and maintain negative community attitudes towards refugees. One study found, for example, that refugees were associated with a 'water' metaphor, such as 'pour', 'flood' and 'stream', a tactic that served to dehumanise refugees and construct them as an 'out of control' phenomenon (Baker et al., 2008). Similarly, the terms 'economic burden' and 'economic threat' are also applied to refugees seeking residency (Baker et al., 2008). The negative connotations and rhetoric associated with refugees enables the

community to frame them as an 'enemy' and a threat to Australia's way of life. In so doing, the general opinion of refugees is degraded within the community. By positioning refugees as a threat to society, prejudice against them is justified and, in some cases, even warranted (McKay & Pittam, 1993).

Further research has shown that 'sympathy talk' enables an individual to appear caring and sympathetic whilst also justifying comments that could be seen as prejudiced. For instance, Hansen-Easy and Augoustinos (2011) found that sympathetic or accepting comments such as 'we welcome migrants' are often followed by statements such as 'but their way of life is backward/we are being swamped by them'. This 'sympathy talk' can be seen as a strategic element in validating complaints against refugees, and thus serves to further position them negatively in the community.

The media reinforces these negative attitudes and false beliefs by using a similar rhetoric in press releases and newspapers. Within this field, refugees are often characterised as 'deviant' and 'problematic' (Pedersen, Kenny, Briskman & Hoffman, 2008). Similarly, after the September 11 terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in America, arriving refugees were further positioned as 'terrorists' in the community (Colic-Peisker, 2005). This association increased the fear of many Australians that refugees claiming residency in the community would endanger our security and way of life, an attitude that persists today (Pedersen, Watt & Hansen, 2006).

There have been many suggested strategies in order to manage the arrival of refugees over time (Davidson, Murray, & Schweitzer, 2008). For example, during the early 2000s the Australian refugee policy allowed the granting of temporary

protection visas (TPVs); a strategy that was supported by both political parties (Colic-Peisker, 2005). TPVs became the subject of much controversy and criticism from refugee advocates because they did not allow for immediate family members to reunite with the refugee in Australia and a process of reapplication was required every three years (Briskman, Latham & Goddard, 2008). These policies also contributed to psychological issues; research has shown that TPVs were the strongest predictor of mental illness such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety and depression (Momartin et al., 2006; Davidson, Murray, & Schweitzer, 2008). TPVs were considered by many refugees to be a continual punishment, in addition to the adverse circumstances and prejudice they were already facing (Coffey, Kaplan, Sampson & Tucci, 2010).

Research has demonstrated that ‘out-groups’ who follow and practise different worldviews are considered threatening to the ‘in-group’ and are often disliked as a consequence (Stephan, Diaz-Loving & Duran, 2000). The positioning of refugees as ‘the other’ therefore automatically creates a hostility towards them, and results in negative community attitudes and prejudice (Sears & Henry, 2003). This, combined with political rhetoric and inaccurate media representations, further contributes to the prejudicial attitudes and unfavourable community sentiments toward refugees (Every & Augoustinos, 2008).

Overview of Bystander Anti-Prejudice

Despite the voluminous amount of research on community attitudes and prejudice toward minority groups there has been relatively little research that suggests how to counteract such prejudice within the community (Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley & Dunn, 2011). A potentially important and under-researched

strategy in combating prejudiced attitudes is bystander anti-prejudice. Bystander anti-prejudice can be defined as action taken in response to incidences of prejudice (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011) often by speaking out against prejudice when not directly involved (Nelson et al., 2010). Despite a lack of research, it has been hypothesized that this approach will successfully reduce the incidence of prejudice toward minority groups, including Australian refugees (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011).

Several factors have been identified as contributors and obstacles to the likelihood of bystander anti-prejudice. However, none of these have been extensively researched and there remains a large gap in the literature as a result (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). The following paragraphs explore several of these obstacles, all of which are identified in an extensive review of the subject by Nelson, Dunn and Paradies (2011).

Prejudice.

The first factor, the level of prejudice against an individual, is a significant determinant of bystander action. Prejudice may be defined as the negative evaluation toward an out-group and can take the form of negative attitudes or opinions (Czopp, Monteith & Mark, 2006). In relation to prejudice, one study found that 'whites' were less likely to help 'blacks' when they were evaluated negatively (Saucier, Miller & Doucet, 2005). Similarly, discrimination against 'blacks' and therefore a lack of intention to act, was more likely when helping was lengthier, riskier, more difficult or more effortful. These authors concluded that prejudice may have significant detrimental effects on targets of that prejudice, particularly in emergency situations when the ability to control prejudicial responses is inhibited, or when not helping is

justified. A similar study found that high-prejudiced white females were less likely to help black individuals in an emergency situation than they were white individuals (Gaertner, Dovidio & Johnson, 1982). The level of prejudice against the target of a situation may mean that bystander anti-prejudice is less likely to occur, particularly in high-risk situations (Kunstman & Plant, 2008).

Collective identity.

Feelings of unity or collective identity also play a role in the intention to act on the part of a bystander (Saucier, Miller & Doucet, 2005). Because refugees are most often positioned as a threat to the stability of society, they are more often than not identified as the 'out-group' (Sears & Henry, 2003). By focusing on the differences between refugees and other Australians, an awareness of 'self' and 'other' is enforced (Goodman & Burke, 2011). Research has shown that bystanders are more likely to help those they see as similar to themselves and thus creating an 'in-group'-'out-group' distinction, makes it less likely that a bystander will intervene (Saucier, Miller & Doucet, 2005). Further research has suggested that categorising others as members of an 'in-group' leads to a greater feeling of connectedness and closeness, and an increased feeling of the responsibility for the welfare of those in that 'in-group' (Levine, Prosser, Evans & Reicher, 2005). Identifying with a victim of prejudice therefore makes it more likely that an individual will intervene in a specific scenario (Levine, Prosser, Evans & Reicher, 2005).

Interpersonal relationships/Impression management.

The desire to preserve interpersonal relationships has also been cited as an obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). The need to maintain relationships and/or avoid the dissolution of one is a powerful factor in

influencing certain behaviours (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This includes bystander anti-prejudice where the motivation to maintain interpersonal relationships has frequently been identified as a major reason for inaction (e.g. Scully & Rowe, 2009). The lack of bystander involvement of those who witnessed the beating and torture of a Somali man by members of the Canadian Airborne Regiment, for example, was attributed to unit cohesion and the motivation to maintain relationships within the regiment (Shorey, 2001). Thus, the need to maintain interpersonal relationships serves as a strong predictor of bystander inaction.

A related factor associated with preserving interpersonal relationships is that people may not engage in bystander anti-prejudice because of issues related to impression management (Hyers, 2007). Impression management may be defined as the deliberate attempt to alter a response in order to create a favourable impression of oneself to others (Barrick & Mount, 1996). Hyers (2007) found, for example, that women typically do not engage in bystander action because of issues related to impression management. In Hyers' study expectations for women to be passive and accommodating significantly impacted on a woman's decision to respond to a prejudiced situation. Participants indicated that they were more likely to contemplate or consider assertive responses to a prejudiced situation than to actually make such a response. Hyers (2007) concluded that gender role prescriptions, and therefore impression management, play a large part in this inaction. Similarly, threats to status may make it less likely that a bystander will speak out (Guerin & Guerin, 2007). Guerin and Guerin attributed inaction of bystanders in a school setting to the threat to social status. The role of relationships and impression management consequently plays a large role when making a decision to speak up against prejudice.

Risk/fear of reprisal.

A further reason for not engaging in bystander action is the perceived risk to the bystander that the perpetrator may instead turn on them (Aboud & Joong, 2008). Some studies have found, for example, that perpetrators feelings of shame that arise from being confronted may turn into anger directed at the person and result in a violent or aggressive situation (Baumeister & Campbell, 1999). Fear of this reprisal is a common reason cited for inaction (Hudson & Bruckman, 2004). Some studies have supportively found that the higher the level of fear for the negative effects of helping behaviour, the less likely it was that a bystander would intervene (Karakashian, Walter, Christopher & Lucas, 2006). Correspondingly, research has shown that in situations that have a low potential for danger, individuals are more likely to engage in helping behaviour than they are if the situation is more risky (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Pollozek & Frey, 2006).

Incident not serious enough.

An additional obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice is the evaluation that the incident a bystander witnessed is not serious enough to take action against (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). These situations may include such factors as prejudiced jokes or stereotypes which are often evaluated as too insignificant to respond to (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011) as well as verbal threats and non-violent aggression (Gracia, Garcia, & Lila, 2009). Some research has shown that certain levels of aggression are considered 'normal' or 'acceptable' within the community and there is therefore a higher level of tolerance for these behaviours. This is, in turn, associated with a negative correlation for intervention (Gracia & Herrero, 2006b). Similarly, some research has shown that when witnessing a prejudiced

situation, bystanders will actively minimize their reports of harm or severity, thereby warranting their inaction (Aboud & Joong, 2008).

Intervention ineffective.

In a study by Aboud & Joong (2008) it was found that bystander action may be inhibited by the perception that any intervention would be ineffective. Indeed, the belief that their input would do no good was among the top three reasons why a child would not intervene in a bullying situation, whether race-based or otherwise. While there has been little research on bystander anti-prejudice and this obstacle specifically, confidence in speaking out against prejudice and assurance of own self-efficacy and skill in doing so both increase the likelihood of bystander action (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Education about the benefits and effectiveness of bystander anti-prejudice may accordingly increase the incidence of it, as will building up confidence and skill in speaking out (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011).

Not my role/place.

A further reason identified as an obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice is the idea that it is not the individual's role or place to intervene in a prejudiced situation. In many situations where bystanders are present, lack of action has been attributed to a lack of personal responsibility (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). Evaluating an incident as 'none of my business' makes bystander action much less likely (Gracia, Garcia & Lila, 2008). This is also true when the victim is considered responsible for the attack, resulting in a state of mind that suggests the situation is 'not my problem' (Gracia, Garcia, & Lila, 2008). To this author's knowledge, there has, however, been little to no research on this phenomenon as it relates to prejudice against refugees in particular.

Entitled to own opinion.

The final factor identified as an obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice is the idea that everyone is entitled to their own opinion (Nelson et al., 2010). While, once again, there has been little research published on this matter, freedom of speech is often used as a reason to avoid engaging in bystander action and other anti-racism strategies (Witenberg, 2007). Additionally, it has been noted that appeals for ‘free speech’ or ‘right to own opinion’ become a particularly dominant obstacle with age (Witenberg, 2007).

The Present Study

There has been relatively little research conducted on a number of these factors and no research conducted on all of them combined. Although each one has been acknowledged as a significant influencer to bystander anti-prejudice it is unclear as to how or to what extent (Nelson et al., 2010). Similarly, there has been little research on what encourages bystander anti-prejudice when it comes to Australian refugees in particular. With this in mind, the following study was exploratory in its design, and aimed to identify the variables which most strongly influence bystander anti-prejudice. Each of the eight factors discussed above acted as the independent variables (IVs), with intention to act as the dependent variable (DV).

This study is based on Community Psychology principles and adopts an applied focus. It is the author’s hope that through an investigation of bystander principles and obstacles that real-world interventions can be targeted and prejudice reduced. Ultimately, the values of this paper are for an equal and just Australia, and

by researching strategies that reduce the incidence of prejudice in the community this goal may be achieved.

Participants in the current study were given two scenarios, one specifically regarding a confrontation with a verbally abusive man on a train (a high-risk situation) and one specifically involving a response to a prejudiced joke within a group of acquaintances (a low-risk situation). All items in these scenarios were adapted from a qualitative study by VicHealth (2011) which explored main reasons for why a participant would choose not to act in a prejudiced situation. Items were adapted from the comments made by these participants as they related to the obstacles found by Nelson, Dunn and Paradies (2011).

Each of the variables in the present study have been identified as obstacles to bystander anti-prejudice, and it is therefore ideal to distinguish which are most influential to a participants intention to act. Consequently, the primary aim of the present study was to determine, and explore, which variable/s most significantly predict/s intention to act in both a high- and low-risk situation. It was hypothesised that, consistent with previous research, participants would indicate a higher intention to act in the low-risk scenario overall (e.g. Fischer, Greitemeyer, Pollozek & Frey, 2006). It was also hypothesised that, on the whole, *Impression Management/Desire To Preserve Interpersonal Relationships* would most strongly influence bystander anti-prejudice, irrespective of type of scenario, because this variable has been commonly cited as a preventative factor in bystander research (e.g. Hyers, 2007; Guerin & Guerin, 2007). An exploratory approach to all other variables was also undertaken.

Method

Participants

A total of 153 participants were recruited via the Social and Community On-Line Research Database (SCORED) in Perth, Western Australia. SCORED is a psychological research database that allows willing participants to complete questionnaires posted online by researchers. Participants were aged between 21 and 84 years with a mean age of 45, 58% of which were female. The highest political standpoint was 'somewhat left' at 34% followed by somewhat right at 22%. Most participants had, or were in the process of completing, a bachelor degree (47%) followed by a higher degree (35%). 90.2% of the sample were Caucasian/European, 55.6% indicated no religion and 35% were Christian.

Measures

Demographics.

Participants were asked a series of questions pertaining to their demographics. Participants stated their age in years, their gender (1 = female, 2 = male), their ethnic background (1 = Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander, 2 = African, 3 = Asian, 4 = Caucasian/European, 5 = Indian, 6 = Middle Eastern, 7 = Pacific Islanders, Other), their religion (1 = Buddhist, 2 = Christian, 3 = Hindu, 4 = Jewish, 5 = Muslim, 6 = No Religion, Other), education level (1 = did not complete secondary school, 6 = higher degree, e.g. Masters, PhD) and their political preference (1 = strongly left, 5 = strongly right, 6 = don't care).

Attitudes towards refugees.

This scale, adapted from Turoy-Smith, Kane, & Pedersen (in press), was used to measure prejudice towards refugees. Participants indicated on a Likert scale ranging from 0 to 100 how they felt about refugees in general across five different conditions; ‘warm-cold’, ‘negative-positive’, ‘friendly-hostile’, ‘respect-contempt’ and ‘admiration-disgust’. Reliability using this scale in an Australian context has been found at $\alpha=.93$ (Turoy-Smith, Kane & Pedersen, in press). After appropriate recoding of the questions, higher scores indicated higher prejudice.

Collective identity.

In this measure, taken from Pedersen and Thomas (under review), participants indicated whether they supported the idea of promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians on five items. Examples of such items include “I feel a bond with other people who are committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians”. Responses were given according to a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 being strongly agree and 7 being strongly disagree. After appropriate recoding, higher scores indicated higher collective identity. Chronbachs alpha for this scale was estimated at $\alpha=.72$ (Pedersen & Thomas, under review).

Scenarios.

Two different prejudiced scenarios were given, one a high-risk and one a low-risk situation. The high-risk situation involved the possibility of a confrontation with an aggressive man on a train and the low-risk situation involved a male acquaintance telling an offensive joke at a party. Both scenarios were amended from Pedersen & Thomas (2011). Participants indicated how likely it was that they would intervene using a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being very likely and 5 being very unlikely.

After appropriate recoding, higher scores indicated higher intention to act. Participants were then asked a series of questions pertaining to each independent variable (IV) and asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement on how likely it was that this IV would influence their intention to act. Each of these questions were answered according to a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 being strongly agree and 7 being strongly disagree. All items were adapted from VicHealth (2011) with half of the items being reverse coded. An outline of each variable, including examples of items, can be seen below.

Risk/fear of reprisal.

This variable referred to the notion of danger, or fear of a reprisal if participants were to take action. In the high-risk scenario there were five questions for this variable including: “I wouldn’t do anything because there is a risk the man could physically harm me” and “I would take action even if I was worried that the man involved would turn on me”. Three of the five items were reverse coded. In the low-risk scenario there were four items, the fifth being removed because it was deemed irrelevant to the context (“I would report the situation to the police or other agency when I returned home”). All other items remained the same. Two of the four questions for this scenario were reverse coded.

Intervention ineffective.

This variable referred to the notion that any action taken would be ineffective. There were four items for this variable in both the high-risk and low-risk scenario, including: “I wouldn’t do anything because people usually don’t listen to a different point of view” and “I would take action because there is a chance I could

stop what was happening”. Once again, two of the four statements were reverse coded.

Impression management/desire to preserve interpersonal relationships.

This variable referred to the notion that any intervention had the possibility of reflecting badly on the bystander and was therefore not worth intervening. In the high-risk scenario there were five items to this scale, including: “I wouldn’t do anything because it would be too embarrassing” and “I would take action even if other people thought badly of me”. Three of the five items were reverse coded. In the low-risk scenario all questions remained the same bar the last item which was removed, once again, because it was deemed irrelevant to the context (“if somebody else acted first, I would publicly support them”). Of the four items remaining, two were reverse coded.

Incident not serious enough.

This variable referred to the notion that the scenario was not serious enough to do anything about and included such statements as: “I wouldn’t take action because the situation is too minor to do anything about” and “I would take action because the situation could be harmful”. In the high risk scenario there were four items, two of which were reverse coded. In the low-risk scenario an additional two items were added. These included: “I wouldn’t do anything as it’s just a joke and he wasn’t attacking anybody directly” and “I would act because even though it seems like humour, words can hurt”. Of the final six items for the low-risk scenario, three were reverse coded.

Not my role/place.

This variable referred to the notion that it was not the participant's role or place to intervene in the given situation. Both scenarios had four items, two were reverse coded, and examples of such are "I wouldn't take action because it's none of my business" and "In a situation like this, it's everybody's responsibility to stand up for what is right".

Entitled to own opinion.

The final variable referred to the notion that everybody was entitled to their own opinion. There were four items for each scenario, two of which were reverse coded, and included such examples as: "I would not do anything because Australia is a free country and people have the right to say what they want".

Items differed under certain variables in order to determine that the questions asked were appropriate to the scenario given, whilst still maintaining internal consistency. After appropriate recoding of the questions, higher scores indicated higher likelihood of intention to act.

Qualitative data.

Participants were asked at the end of the survey: 'Finally, are there any other comments you would like to make that would help me understand your views better?'.

Procedure

Initially, the survey was peer-reviewed by four experts in the field before it was submitted online. These experts included such academics as Associate Professor

Yin Paradies from Deakin University in Melbourne and Dr Jacqueline Nelson from the University of Western Sydney, both of whom have a large volume of work on prejudice in general, and towards certain minority groups in particular, including Australian refugees (e.g. Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011; Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley & Dunn, 2011). Similarly, both these experts have reviewed the concept of bystander anti-prejudice and therefore are knowledgeable about its obstacles and enablers (e.g. Nelson et al., 2010; Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Both Professor Craig McGarty and Dr Emma Thomas, from Murdoch University, were also recruited as subject matter experts because of their work on attitudes toward refugees and on collective identity and its influence on bystander action (e.g. Pedersen, Aly, Hartley & McGarty, 2009; Thomas, Maver & McGarty, 2011). Suggested changes to the wording of specific questions were made by these experts, and the items were altered accordingly.

Before the survey was launched a number of participants were recruited to pilot the study in order to determine if there were any flaws in its presentation. Similarly, these participants were asked to ensure that all questions made sense in a community context, given the survey was intended for a community demographic. The sample size for the pilot study consisted of 10 participants, with a mean age of 37.5. The age range was between 18 and 75, 80% of whom were female.

No participant from the pilot group had a master's degree or higher, but 30% indicated they had a bachelor degree, part or completed. 10% indicated that they had not completed secondary school and the remaining 60% were spread out evenly with 20% each in 'completed secondary school' 'vocational training' and 'undergraduate diploma'. Three members of the pilot group indicated they did not care, or had no, political preference, three indicated a left-wing political standpoint, one indicated a

‘central’ political preference, two indicated they were ‘somewhat right’ and no participant indicated that they were ‘right wing’. One participant chose not to answer this question.

Suggested changes from the pilot study included adding more detail into the high-risk scenario. This was so that the participant could make a more informed decision and relate better with either the victim or the perpetrator, depending on their stance. An additional change made by the pilot group was to break the questions up into blocks by variables. This involved including a brief description of the variable directly preceding the questions asked.

For the final survey, potential participants were contacted through the SCORED administrator via email. This email included an outline of the study, the web address to access the questionnaire and the researchers’ contact details. Before beginning the survey, participants were directed to a webpage and required to read the covering letter explaining the purpose and intent of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). This was followed by a declaration paragraph whereby participants acknowledged that they were free to stop the survey at any time, and indicated their consent, before moving on to the full survey. The questionnaire pre-piloting can be seen in Appendix 2, and post-piloting in Appendix 3. It was intended that participants would be able to access the questionnaire for a period of approximately 2 months (July to September, 2012), however due to the high volume of responses, the survey was closed only a week after it was launched.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for each scale including scale means, standard deviations, the number of items in each scale, the potential range of scores for each scale and the alpha coefficients. As can be seen, reliability for all scales was satisfactory. Intention to act was higher in the high risk situation. The variable *Risk/Fear of Reprisal* was the only variable with a mean higher in the low risk situation. *Intervention Ineffective* was slightly higher for the high risk scenario, as was *Impression Management/Interpersonal Relationships*, *Incident Not Serious Enough*, *Not My Role/Place* and *Entitled to Own Opinion*. Both *Collective Identity* and *Prejudice* scored means around the midpoint.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics including means (M), standard deviations (SD), range of scores, number of items and Chronbach's alpha (α).

	M/SD	Range	Number of items	α
Intention to act				
High Risk	3.74 (1.19)	1-5	1	-
Low Risk	3.10 (1.19)	1-5	1	-
Risk				
High Risk	4.55 (1.40)	1-7	5	.84
Low Risk	5.03 (1.10)	1-7	4	.68
Ineffective				
High Risk	4.98 (1.44)	1-7	4	.91
Low Risk	4.66 (1.31)	1-7	4	.78
Impression management				
High Risk	5.48 (1.16)	1-7	5	.84
Low Risk	4.91 (1.33)	1-7	4	.85
Seriousness				
High Risk	5.18 (1.24)	1-7	4	.90
Low Risk	3.96 (1.56)	1-7	6	.95
Place				
High Risk	5.28 (1.28)	1-7	4	.90
Low Risk	4.75 (1.33)	1-7	4	.90
Right to own Opinion				
High Risk	5.27 (1.16)	1-7	4	.85
Low Risk	4.71 (1.30)	1-7	4	.87
Prejudice	35.66 (2.06)	0-100	5	.93
Collective Identity	3.85 (1.35)	1-7	5	.87

T-Test

A paired samples *t*-test was used to compare mean scores on intention to act for the high and low risk scenarios. On average, participant's intention to act scores for the low risk scenario were .63 points higher than their scores for their intention to act in the high risk scenario, 95% CI (0.43, 0.84). This difference was statistically significant, $t(152) = 6.1, p < .001$, indicating that participants were more likely to act in the low-risk scenario.

Correlations

Correlations among the predictor variables are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, intention to act/bystander action was significantly correlated with each of the predictor variables for both the high- and low-risk scenarios. The only demographic variables, however, that correlated with intention to act were age and political standpoint. Age was positively correlated in the low risk scenario such that older respondents indicated that they were more likely to act. Political standpoint was negatively correlated. It appears that those with a strongly right-wing political standpoint are less likely to act in both scenarios. Consistently, participants with this political preference score highest on the prejudice scale. Intention to act was also negatively correlated with prejudice. Participants who scored high on the prejudice scale were less likely to engage in bystander action. This was true for both the high- and low-risk scenarios.

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

Table 2: Intercorrelations among variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Intention	-	.823**	.808**	.730**	.700**	.692**	.653**	-.398**	-.046	.177*	.061	-.286**	.030
2.Risk	.589**	-	.808**	.691**	.750**	.722**	.645**	-.304**	-.058	.179*	.128	-.247**	.068
3.Ineffective	.727**	.637**	-	.717**	.761**	.755**	.709**	-.353**	-.078	.100	-.009	-.228**	.075
4.Impression	.594**	.681**	.648**	-	.687**	.734**	.701**	-.369**	-.092	.067	-.040	-.200*	.137
5.Seriousness	.791**	.618**	.800**	.583**	-	.782**	.758**	-.449**	-.131	.051	-.021	-.281**	.159
6.Role	.751**	.699**	.754**	.624**	.832**	-	.750**	-.394**	-.138	.151	-.067	-.324**	.157
7.Right to own Opinion	.731**	.658**	.707**	.600**	.826**	.880**	-	-.431**	-.151	.069	-.054	-.202*	.240**
8.Prejudice	-.398**	-.351**	-.322**	-.342**	-.385**	-.459**	-.431**	-	.370**	-.028	.119	.265**	-.136
9.Collective Identity	-.172	-.083	-.112	-.125	-.116	-.169*	-.212	.370**	-	-.043	.013	.163*	-.109
10.Age	.206**	.071	.137	.196*	.254**	.135	.153	-.028	-.043	-	.036	-.106	-.235**
11.Gender	-.096	-.051	-.043	.019	-.068	-.161*	-.107	.119	.013	.036	-	.056	.022
12.Political	-.317**	-.280**	-.236*	-.185*	-.276**	-.312**	-.275**	.265**	.163*	-.106	.056	-	-.058
13.Education	.301	.212**	.081	.110	.118	.197*	.175*	-.136	-.109	-.235**	.022	-.058	-

Right diagonal – High Risk Left diagonal—Low Risk ** = Correlation significant at .01 * = Correlation significant at .05

Regression

To test the variables for the most significant predictors of intention to act when a participant is faced with a prejudiced scenario, two hierarchical multiple regression equations were employed. One regression examined the predictors of intention to act in a high-risk situation, and the other examined predictors of intention to act in a low-risk situation.

As two socio-demographic variables—age and political preference—were significantly correlated with intention to act, they were entered into the regression equation on Step 1. Following this, *Prejudice* was entered into the regression equation on Step 2. *Risk/Fear of Reprisal*, *Intervention Ineffective*, *Intervention Not Serious Enough*, *Impression Management/Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships*, *Not My Role/Place* and *Entitled to Own Opinion* were added on Step 3. Before interpreting the results of the regression a number of assumptions first had to be met. An inspection of normal and detrended normal Q-Q plots suggested that the scales were normally distributed. A further inspection of relevant plots indicated that the assumptions of normality of distributed residuals and the normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of residuals were met. Finally, relatively high tolerances for all predictor variables in the final regression model indicated that multicollinearity would not be an issue when interpreting the outcome of the regression.

High Risk.

On Step 1 of the regression model for the high-risk scenario, age and political standpoint collectively accounted for a statistically significant 9% of the variability in intention to act, adjusted $R^2 = .09$, $F(2, 146) = 8.07$, $p < .001$. At Step 2 prejudice accounted for an additional 20.5% of variability in intention to act, above and

beyond that already accounted for by age and political standpoint. This incremental increase in adjusted R^2 at Step 2 was statistically significant $\Delta F(1, 145) = 22.67, p < .001$. At Step 3 of the regression model, *Risk/Fear of Reprisal*, *Impression Management/Interpersonal Relationships*, *Intervention Ineffective*, *Incident Not Serious Enough*, *Not My Role/Place* and *Entitled to Own Opinion* were added. These variables accounted for an additional significant 75.3% of variability in intention to act, adjusted $R^2 = .75, \Delta F(6, 139) = 54.72, p < .001$. In combination, the nine predictor variables accounted for a statistically significant proportion of variance in intention to act, $F(9, 139) = 46.8, p < .001$.

In Step one, only political preference was statistically significant $t(142) = -3.44, p < .001$. Age could not account for variance in intention to act beyond that which could also be explained by political standpoint, $t(142) = 1.70, p = .09$. At the end of Step 2 political standpoint remained significant, $t(142) = -2.29, p = .02$. *Prejudice* also significantly predicted participants intention to act $t(142) = -4.76, p < .001$. When all nine variables were combined in Step 3, *Prejudice*, *Risk/Fear of Reprisal*, *Intervention Ineffective* and *Impression Management/Interpersonal Relationships* emerged as the strongest predictor variables capable of explaining a significant proportion of unique variance in a participants intention to act in a high-risk scenario; $t(142) = -1.99, p < .05$; $t(142) = 5.48, p < .001$; $t(142) = 4.00, p < .001$; $t(142) = 3.21, p < .05$. The multiple regression equation for the high-risk scenario can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Hierarchical multiple regressions predicting intention to act/bystander action in a high-risk scenario.

Variables	<i>r</i>	β^a	β^b	β^c	<i>R</i> ² change	Total <i>R</i> ²
High Risk						
Step 1						
Political Standpoint	-.29**	-.27**	-.18*	-.06		
Age	.18*	.13	.14	.05	.10**	
Step 2						
Prejudice	-.40**		-.36**	-.09*	.12**	
Step 3						
Impression	.73**			.22**		
Risk/Fear	.81**			.42**		
Right to own Opinion	.65**			.04		
Place	.69**			-.07		
Ineffective	.81**			.32**		
Seriousness	.70**			-.06	.55**	.77**

** = Correlation significant at .01 * = Correlation significant at .05 ^a denotes beta weights obtained on step 1 of the regression; ^b denotes beta weights obtained on step 2 of the regression; ^c denotes beta weights obtained on step 3 of the regression.

Low Risk.

In step one of the regression model for the low risk scenario the predictor variables age and political standpoint collectively accounted for a statistically significant 11.6% of the variability in intention to act, adjusted $R^2 = .116$, $F(2, 146) = 10.68$, $p < .001$. When *Prejudice* was entered into the regression model on Step 2 this variable accounted for an additional significant 24% of variability in intention to act, above and beyond that already accounted for by age and political standpoint, adjusted $R^2 = .24$, $\Delta F(2, 145) = 24.85$, $p < .001$. When each of the other predictor variables were entered into the regression model at Step 3, these variables accounted for an additional significant 69.3%, adjusted $R^2 = .69$, $\Delta F(6, 139) = 36.70$, $p < .001$. The nine variables collectively accounted for a statistically significant proportion of variance in intention to act, $F(9, 139) = 38.14$, $p < .001$.

In Step one of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, both political preference and age were statistically significant, $t(142) = -3.86$, $p < .001$; $t(142) = 2.12$, $p = .04$. At the end of Step 2, both age and political standpoint remained significant at $t(142) = 2.33$, $p = .02$; $t(142) = -2.69$, $p = .01$. *Prejudice* was also a significant predictor for intention to act, $t(142) = -4.99$, $p < .001$. When all nine variables were combined in Step 3, only *Incident Not Serious Enough* and *Not My Role/Place* emerged as the strongest predictor variables capable of explaining a significant proportion of unique variance in a participants intention to act in a low risk situation, $t(142) = 4.25$, $p < .001$; $t(142) = 1.98$, $p = .05$. The regression equation for the low-risk situation can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Hierarchical multiple regressions predicting intention to act/bystander action in a low-risk scenario

Variables	<i>r</i>	β^a	β^b	β^c	<i>R</i> ² change	Total <i>R</i> ²
Low Risk						
Step 1						
Political Standpoint	-.32**	-.30**	-.20*	-.07		
Age	.21**	.17*	.17*	.01	.13**	
Step 2						
Prejudice	-.40**		-.37**	-.08	.13**	
Step 3						
Impression	.59**			.13		
Risk/Fear	.59**			-.03		
Right to own Opinion	.73**			-.04		
Place	.75**			.22*		
Ineffective	.73**			.13		
Seriousness	.79**			-.43**	.46**	.72**

** = Correlation significant at .01 * = Correlation significant at .05 ^a denotes beta weights obtained on step 1 of the regression; ^b denotes beta weights obtained on step 2 of the regression; ^c denotes beta weights obtained on step 3 of the regression.

As can be seen, different variables were significant in both scenarios. *Prejudice, Impression Management/Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships, Risk/Fear of Reprisal, and Intervention Ineffective* were all significant at Step 3 of the regression model for the high-risk scenario, indicating that these areas are most influential for this situation. Conversely, in the low-risk scenario the areas of major significance were only *Not My Role/Place* and *Incident Not Serious Enough*. The differences between the two scenarios have potential implications for policy development.

Qualitative Data

To analyse the qualitative dataset, a thematic analysis was conducted (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Three major themes were identified and are described in order of prevalence (from highest to lowest). The first involved the acceptance of *false beliefs* about refugees, that they were ‘illegal immigrants’, ‘queue jumpers’ and ‘criminals’. Participants stated that they had trouble accepting, supporting and standing up for ‘illegal refugees’ but had no problem with ‘genuine refugees’. For example one comment from a participant number 39 is as follows “You should make the distinction between genuine refugees who deserve consideration and the majority who have come here in the last few years who are illegal immigrants who falsly (sic) claim refugee status and are basically welfare cheats”.

These false beliefs about refugees were applicable to asylum seekers, and participant’s often blurred the distinction between the two groups. For example, “overall its (sic) not refugees per se that people dislike its (sic) the boat people and the way they come in and get free services and benefits which is wrong when genuine people who need to come here cant (sic) get admissiion (sic) no one should

jump the queue no matter who they are and this is why people don't like refugees” (from participant 57).

The second major theme was in direct contrast with the first theme and involved the *importance of action*. These comments involved standing up for the people/groups being victimised, for example, from participant 19: “I would always put a stop to someone being intimidating or threatening to another person, especially a refugee who is vulnerable (sic) to such attacks due to racism (sic) and ignorance”.

In relation to this theme, a sub-theme that is also worth noting is that many participants stated that, in the high risk scenario, they were more likely to support the woman than confront the man. For example, participant 101 stated the following: “In the first scenario, rather than saying anything to the man (who I would ignore), I would be more likely to offer support directly to the woman by smiling encouragingly, or asking her if she was OK. I would probably also apologise and let her know that not all Australians are like that or hold those views.”

Finally, participants wrote of the importance of *free speech*. This theme is divided into two subthemes: One, that it was used as a justification for the perpetrators actions such as, “A person has a right to be free to express their opinions in a reasonable way, even if I do not agree with them” (participant 5) and Two, a condemnation of these actions; “I believe that we have the right to free speech unless that speech is used to take away someone else's rights” (participant 10).

Discussion

This study examined the major obstacles and enablers to bystander anti-prejudice by looking at the factors which most strongly impacted on a participant's

intention to act. Participants indicated how likely they were to intervene when faced with two situations; one involving a confrontation with an aggressive man on a train and one involving a response to a prejudiced joke at a party. Following from this, participants were asked a series of questions pertaining to each of the eight IVs; *Prejudice*, *Collective Identity*, *Risk/Fear of Reprisal*, *Incident Not Serious Enough*, *Intervention Ineffective*, *Not My Role/Place*, *Impression Management/Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships* and *Entitled to Own Opinion*. The primary aim of the present study was to determine which variable/s most significantly predict/s intention to act in both a high- and low-risk situation.

Correlations

In both scenarios, only two socio-demographic variables were significantly correlated with intention to act. Participants who identified with a right-wing political standpoint were less likely to indicate action. This finding is consistent with literature that has suggested that individuals with right-wing values are significantly more likely to hold prejudiced views (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012), and thus are less likely to take action against prejudice. Age was the only other socio-demographic variable that was significantly correlated with intention to act, with older respondents more likely to indicate action. As participant 47 (aged 72) from the present study notes “it is easier to speak out when you are old and no longer care much what other people think”.

Each of the predictor variables, except *Collective Identity*, were also significantly correlated with intention to act. According to the correlation matrix, results revealed that intention to act and prejudice were negatively correlated, indicating that participants who were more highly prejudiced were less likely to

intervene. This was true for both scenarios. This result is consistent with previous research which suggests that prejudice is a significant barrier to bystander anti-prejudice (Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies 2011). It is also consistent with the above finding that individuals with a right-wing political standpoint are less likely to take action, because they are more likely to hold prejudiced attitudes. *Collective identity* was not correlated with intention to act. This finding is surprising given the research which suggests that identifying with victims of prejudice increases the likelihood of bystander intervention (Levine, Prosser, Evans & Reicher, 2005).

Risk/Fear of Reprisal, Incident Not Serious Enough, Intervention Ineffective, Not My Role/Place, Impression Management/Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships and *Entitled to Own Opinion* were all positively correlated with intention to act in both scenarios. As noted in the introduction, each of these six variables were identified as significant obstacles to a participants inclination to consider intervening in a prejudiced situation.

Aim

The primary aim of the present study was to determine which variable/s most significantly predict/s intention to act in both a high- and low-risk situation. Results revealed that in the high-risk scenario, *Risk/Fear of Reprisal* was, according to the regression, the strongest obstacle to intention to act. This finding is consistent with a study by Aboud and Joong (2008) who found that ‘fear the bully would turn on me’ was among the top four obstacles for why a child would not intervene in a race-based bullying situation. The higher the level of fear for any negative effects of intervention, the less likely it is that a bystander will take action because the danger

to the bystander will outweigh the benefits of any helping behaviour (Karakashian, Walter, Christopher & Lucas, 2006).

Results of the regression equation also indicated that in the low-risk scenario, the incident not being serious enough to warrant response was the major obstacle to intention to act. Prejudiced jokes or 'light-hearted' comments are often evaluated as too insignificant to warrant an assertive response and are usually ignored or endorsed (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Indeed, many prejudiced jokes and/or comments are defended according to 'free speech', under which bystander action may be judged as an excessive level of political correctness. Any action against such a joke/comment is therefore not taken as seriously (Witenberg, 2007).

Surprisingly, and in contrast to such research, *Entitled to Own Opinion* was not a significant predictor of inaction in either scenario, despite being a major theme in the qualitative data. This finding was unexpected, especially given past research highlighting this obstacle's importance (e.g. Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley & Dunn, 2011; Witenberg, 2007). Witenberg found for example that 'freedom of speech' or 'right to own opinion' was presented as a major obstacle to engaging in anti-prejudice strategies. Based on this research, it was expected that participants in the present study would also indicate this as an obstacle to action. Participants did, however, frequently mention the importance of free speech in the qualitative data. While not significant in the quantitative results it may be reasoned that *Entitled to Own Opinion* is still of major concern to participants, and a significant obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice. This theme will be further discussed below.

As aforementioned, results revealed that prejudice was significantly correlated with intention to act, indicating that higher levels of prejudice may equate to lower

levels of bystander action. The regression equation supported this finding, revealing that prejudice was a significant obstacle in the high-risk scenario only. This finding supports those of Saucier, Miller and Doucet (2005). Their study also revealed that in emergency or high-risk scenarios, a white person generally offered less help to a black person when compared with another white person. Kunstman & Plant (2008) contributed similar findings. In their study, blacks received help less often, and more slowly, than did whites in comparable scenarios. Additionally, emergency situations involving blacks were judged as less severe thereby warranting inaction. Both these studies attribute their findings to the idea that the ability to control prejudicial responses is inhibited in risky situations. Thus, it may be speculated that in the high-risk scenario participants of the present study found that prejudice against refugees was harder to control, and they therefore indicated that they were not likely to act. While prejudice plays a significant role in bystander action (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011), this role may be more pronounced in certain scenarios and thus more detrimental to the victim of prejudice. This is particularly evident in high-risk, dangerous or emergency situations.

Intervention Ineffective was identified as a significant obstacle in the high-risk scenario only. While there has been relatively little research on this topic, studies on bullying have found this variable to be particularly influential. The belief that their input would be ineffective, or pointless, was a significant barrier for a child to intervene in a bullying situation (Aboud & Joong, 2008). Similarly, *Not My Role/Place* was found to be a significant obstacle in the low-risk scenario. Past research has indicated that in many situations where bystanders are present, lack of personal responsibility has played an influential role in lack of action (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). In the present study, this perceived diffusion of

responsibility may have resulted in participants adopting a frame of mind that suggested the incidence was ‘none of their business’ and thus not their place to intervene.

Both *Intervention Ineffective* and *Not My Role/Place* may be related to a participant’s confidence in speaking out against acts of prejudice. Confidence, and perception of skill or ability in speaking out, have both been identified as important strategies in combating prejudice (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Providing bystanders with these skills, and educating them about the value and importance of confrontation, will contribute to the enabling of bystander anti-prejudice (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011).

Hypothesis 1: Higher Intention to Act in the Low-Risk Scenario

Results of the paired samples *t*-test supported the hypothesis that participants would report a higher intention to act in the low-risk scenario. This finding is consistent with research showing that the riskier or more dangerous a situation is, the less likely bystander intervention becomes. As suggested by Fischer et al. (2006) bystanders are less likely to take action in high-risk scenarios when the costs of helping exceed the costs of not helping. When a scenario is more dangerous or effortful the costs for intervention are higher for the bystander and they are less likely to intervene. Correspondingly, Saucier, Miller & Doucet (2005) found that helping behaviour toward black people was less likely from white people when helping was considered more effortful, more difficult or riskier. Thus, in a high-risk scenario, it may be that the costs of not helping a refugee outweigh the reward of helping, and the likelihood of bystander anti-prejudice is lessened.

The phenomenon of participants being less likely to intervene in a risky situation has also been coupled with that of the ‘bystander effect’ whereby individuals are less likely to intervene if they are surrounded by several other witnesses (Fischer et al., 2006). While the present study did not specifically test for the bystander effect, it may have had a certain confounding effect on results. It can be reasoned that because both scenarios were public, participants may have visualised other people around them when contemplating their actions and thus based their answers on this.

Hypothesis 2: Impression Management will be Most Significant Overall

Impression Management/Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships was, according to the regression, a particularly significant obstacle in the high-risk scenario. Contrary to expectations, however, this variable was not significant in the low-risk scenario, despite research suggesting that this variable is a major obstacle to bystander anti-prejudice in any situation (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Alternatively, there is certain literature that suggests it is especially difficult to speak out in front of strangers in a public setting than friends or family or small groups of acquaintances (e.g. Hyers, 2007). Findings from the present study are thus consistent with this research.

Impression Management and *Desire to Preserve Interpersonal Relationships* were combined as one variable in the present study and may somewhat confound results. Further research may wish to distinguish between the two, in order to gain a greater understanding of the determining variable in each scenario. It can be speculated that impression management may have played a more prominent role in the high-risk, ‘public’ scenario and desire to preserve interpersonal relationships in

the low-risk and 'private' scenario, as this is consistent with previous research (e.g. Guerin & Guerin, 2007; Hyers, 2007). Questions specifically targeting the desire to preserve relationships may show it to be a significant barrier to bystander anti-prejudice in low-risk scenarios.

The differences in each scenario result in implications for bystander training. Because of these discrepancies, different variables may need to be focused on in order for bystander anti-prejudice to be effective, depending on the situation that is to be targeted. Banyard (2008) suggests training bystanders in the specific type of situation in which a bystander may be required to act, and thus by focusing on the certain obstacles that are most significant in either scenario, the effectiveness of intervention may be more pronounced.

Qualitative Data

Several major themes were identified through thematic analysis. Comments regarding false beliefs about refugees were particularly prominent, followed by the importance of action, and finally comments regarding the importance of free speech. Of particular interest is that despite the current study's focus on refugees, participants frequently referenced false beliefs regarding asylum seekers. While an asylum seeker is defined as an individual who is seeking protection from another country, but whose claim for a refugee status has not yet been confirmed (UNHCR, 2011), a refugee is an individual whose claim for refuge has been accepted and validated. Despite being separate groups, participants described refugees using terms such as 'illegal vs. genuine', 'criminals' and 'welfare cheats', all of which have been identified as false beliefs in studies about asylum seekers (Baker et al., 2008; Pedersen, Watt & Hansen, 2006). Participants particularly confused 'refugee' with

‘asylum seeker’, often interchanging the terms or using one to describe the other. As two participants note; “this Survey is rigged to give favourable awnsers (sic) to the refugee problem. It does not differentiate between genuine refugees arriving lawfully to those unlawful economic refugees arriving by boat, which is a completely different circumstance...” (participant 42) and “you should make the distinction between genuine refugees who deserve consideration and the majority who have come here in the last few years who are illegal immigrants who falsly (sic) claim refugee status and are basically welfare cheats” (participant 39).

The misinformed understanding of refugee and asylum seeker terminology is consistent with past research which has also found that participants often interchange ‘refugee’ and ‘asylum seeker’ and apply false beliefs and negative rhetoric about one group to the other (Baker et al., 2008). It is particularly consistent with Turoy-Smith, Kane and Pedersen’s study (in press) which also asked for participants to report their experiences with refugees. Instead, participants cited many myths and false beliefs regarding asylum seekers. Community attitudes toward both groups are not only negative in stance, but are also confused and misinformed. Education practices have proven to be particularly useful in this area (Pedersen, Walker, Paradies & Guerin, 2011), and policies targeting prejudice may need to keep this confusion in mind when developing strategies to reduce it.

Another prominent, and encouraging, theme was that many participants believed in the importance of action and standing up for groups/people being victimised. A sub-theme of this was that in the high-risk scenario particularly, participants suggested that they were more likely to support the woman being targeted than confront the man. As participant 101 notes, “In the first scenario, rather than saying anything to the man (who I would ignore), I would be more likely to

offer support directly to the woman by smiling encouragingly, or asking her if she was OK. I would probably also apologise and let her know that not all Australians are like that or hold those views.”

This theme suggests that bystander anti-prejudice does not always need to take the form of a confrontation. Overall, many participants stated that they thought it was important to ‘protect’ vulnerable groups, and condemn ‘racist’ points of view. This stance is particularly encouraging because whilst most research has shown a negative opinion of ‘out-groups’, such as refugees, over time (e.g. Davidson, Murray, & Schweitzer, 2008; Marr & Wilkinson, 2003; Baker et al., 2008), the present study also found a strong portion of positive attitudes, amalgamated with the negative. This finding may lead to rather optimistic speculation that community attitudes may be slowly changing over time. However, participants of the current study generally indicated a higher level of education. The positive attitudes of the current study are thus consistent with previous research which suggests that lower education equates to stronger prejudicial attitudes (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012).

The final theme, the importance of ‘free speech’, was frequently mentioned as a justification for not intervening in either scenario. As discussed earlier, assertive responses to prejudiced jokes are often considered as excessive levels of political correctness and appeals for freedom of speech are given in defence (Witenberg, 2007). As participant 23 stated, in defence for not intervening, “sometimes a joke is just a joke and when political correctness controls everything we do and say then I think it lessons (sic) people's reactions to the big issues that really do need to be dealt with”. The perceived importance of ‘free speech’ is thus a significant barrier to bystander anti-prejudice and a common theme that emerges from bystander research (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011).

A sub-theme regarding freedom of speech, which is in direct contrast to that above, is that many participants used ‘free speech’ as a condemnation for the perpetrator’s actions. It was essentially specified that there was a time and place for free speech, and that it should never be used to hurt another person. In support of this, participant 96 states that “even though everyone is entitled to their own opinion, it is not right to express it to hurt others”. Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley and Dunn (2011) found that the theme ‘the right to have an opinion’ was absent after education. It was speculated that this theme lost its value after participants understood that prejudiced opinions should be responded to as prejudice first and opinions second. Whilst participants in the current study did not undergo any education, this theme was largely used to condemn prejudice rather than support it.

Practical Implications

Studies have shown that changes in behaviour can lead to changes in attitudes which then modify future behaviours (Pedersen, Walker & Wise, 2005). Bystander action against prejudice has the potential to change public behaviour and community attitudes by demonstrating intolerance to prejudiced actions. This may be achieved through potentially changing subsequent acts of prejudice and discrimination and even influencing attitudes through social norms (Czopp, Monteith & Mark, 2006). People who are highly prejudiced are more likely to significantly overestimate the extent of community consensus for their views, and are therefore more forthright in their opinions and less likely to compromise or change their stance (Watt & Larkin, 2010). If bystanders speak up against incidences of prejudice then these incidences may be reduced as false consensus effects are combated (Pedersen, Walker, Paradies & Guerin, 2011). Bystanders who take action are, additionally, more likely to report positive feelings of satisfaction compared to those who don’t take action at all

(Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Similarly, victims of prejudice and discrimination are more likely to report positive effects on their sense of belonging and acceptance when someone intervenes on their behalf (Scully & Rowe, 2009). These practical implications and benefits of bystander action make it an important area of further study.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several potential limitations to the methodology of the present study. One such limitation includes the omission of definitions of specific terminology such as 'refugee' within the questionnaire. Resultantly, effects may be confounded by participant's own interpretations and misinformation about this group. This can be seen in the qualitative data where many participants confused 'refugee' with 'asylum seeker'. In future research, the term 'refugee' may need to be more adequately defined in the questionnaire, as it is clear from studies such as the present one that common or community definitions and connotations of refugees are also confused with asylum seekers.

An additional limitation involves the structuring of questions. Some participants commented that items of the questionnaire were double-barreled. One participant stated that, "When it came to answering the questions that said I wouldn't act because...I could answer them easily, however the other questions were redundant. For example, if you say I acted because I felt the situation was out of hand, then do I say agree because I agree the situation was out of hand, or disagree because I would not act?". In other words, some participants had trouble distinguishing what the question was asking of them. To use the example given by this participant, they were unsure whether they were agreeing that the situation was

out of hand, or agreeing that they would act. While both the pilots and academic experts who reviewed the questionnaire did not highlight this point as problematic, future research may need to be more explicit in the wording of certain items.

Future research on bystander anti-prejudice is a necessity to further identify and solidify its obstacles and enablers and thus implement such strategies into the community. In the present study a male figure was used as the perpetrator in both scenarios because it was decided that a male would seem more threatening and thus riskier to both genders. It would be interesting to explore a similar study with a female perpetrator, and explore the differences in obstacles that arise. Similarly, focusing on enablers rather than obstacles to bystander anti-prejudice would also be useful. These enablers may include knowledge and education regarding prejudice, awareness of the harm caused by prejudice, the perception of responsibility in intervening in a prejudiced situation and the skill or confidence to intervene (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Extending such research to a real-life setting would also be ideal to more accurately capture a participant's motivating factors to intervene. A further area of future research would be to apply bystander anti-prejudice to other minority groups including Indigenous Australians and Muslim Australians. A comparison of intention to act for each of these groups would be particularly interesting.

Concluding remarks

The current study has provided an overview of an under-researched but important strategy in reducing prejudice against minorities, and has made a valuable contribution to the voluminous amount of existing research on this issue. It is the first study to directly analyse and compare each of the major variables that have

been identified as influential to bystander anti-prejudice. It has, accordingly, extended the knowledge of such a strategy in combating prejudicial attitudes in the Australian community.

This study found several significant obstacles to bystander anti-prejudice that may need to be targeted in a community setting in order for bystander intervention to be fully effective. Bystander anti-prejudice has several significant and important benefits and thus, by discovering the motivating factors, the likelihood of success in implementing such a strategy into the community is heightened. It has been suggested, for example, that many of the obstacles identified in this study, and in other bystander research, can be overcome through appropriate training (Scully & Rowe, 2009). This may involve observing and practicing bystander behaviour, as well as being trained in the specific type of situation in which a bystander may be required to act (Scully & Rowe, 2008; Banyard, 2008). Developing these skills in bystander action is important, but so is the perception that action will be effective (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Education on all aspects of bystander anti-prejudice is, accordingly, ideal in order to utilise the full effectiveness of this strategy in combating prejudice.

Although psychology has an emphasis on the experiences and attitudes of the individual, it is the view of this paper that social and community structures inform individual experience. Looking solely at the individual then is a far too simplistic view when discussing or exploring negative attitudes towards refugees (Pedersen, Kenny, Briskman & Hoffman, 2008). Other factors may be influential; for instance, societal prejudice may play a significant role in affecting an individual's opinions, values and responses (Pedersen, Kenny, Briskman, & Hoffman, 2008). Having said this, the individual still plays an important role, because, as previous research has

suggested, one bystander can influence many onlookers (Pedersen, Walker & Wise, 2005; Pedersen, Walker, Paradies & Guerin, 2011).

Prejudice against refugees has been a significant and ongoing problem within the Australian community for well over the last decade, and is likely to continue unabated for some time to come (Davidson, Murray & Schweitzer, 2008). The negative discourse and rhetoric in the community, the way refugees are framed by the media and the misinformation and lack of education about such a group serves to polarise and encourage division in the wider community. Devising strategies and policies that reduce the incidence of prejudice against this group is thus a necessity for the benefit of both refugees in general and the community at large. This is where bystander anti-prejudice plays an important role, as it has been identified as an imperative strategy in combating prejudice and discrimination against minority groups, including Australian refugees (Nelson, Dunn & Paradies, 2011). Community Psychology is concerned with the understanding and reduction of incidences of oppression and prejudice (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005). It is hoped that this study has, in some way, contributed to this understanding whilst also emphasising the importance of bystander anti-prejudice as a tool in combating prejudice against minority groups.

References

- Aboud, F.E., & Joong, A. (2008). Intergroup name-calling and conditions for creating assertive bystanders. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 249–260). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baker., P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse Society, 19*, 273–306.
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims, 23* (1), 83–97.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81* (3), 26–272.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Campbell, W. K. (1999). The intrinsic appeal of evil: Sadism, sensational thrills, and threatened egotism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 210–221.
- Baumeister, R.F., & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117* (3), 497–529.
- Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. (2005). To act or not to act: the dilemma faced by sexual harassment. *The Academy of Management Review, 30* (2), 288–306.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3* (2), 77–101.
- Briskman, L., Latham, S., & Goddard, C. (2008). *Human Rights Overboard: Seeking Asylum in Australia*. Melbourne: Scribe Publishing.
- Coffey, G. J., Kaplan, I., Sampson, R. C., & Tucci, M. M. (2010). The meaning and mental health consequences of long-term immigration detention for people seeking asylum. *Social Science and Medicine, 70*, 2070–2079.
- Colic-Peisker, V. (2005). ‘At least you’re the right colour’: Identity and social inclusion of Bosnian refugees in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31* (4), 615–638.
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90* (5), 784–803.
- Davidson, J.H., Murray, K.E., & Schweitzer, R. (2008). Review of refugee mental health and wellbeing: Australian perspectives. *Australian Psychologist, 43* (3), 160–174.
- Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2008). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society, 18* (4), 411–436.
- Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., Pollozek, F., & Frey, D. (2006). The unresponsive bystander: Are bystanders more responsive in dangerous emergencies? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 267–278.

- Gaertner, S.L., Dovidio, J.F., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race of victim, nonresponsive bystanders, and helping behaviours. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*, 69–77.
- Goodman, S., & Burke, S. (2011). Discursive deracialization in talk about asylum seeking. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 111–123.
- Gracia, E., Garcia, F., & Lila, M. (2008). Police involvement in cases of intimate partner violence against women: The influence of perceived severity and personal responsibility. *Violence Against Women, 14* (6), 697–714.
- Gracia, E., Garcia, F., & Lila, M. (2009). Public responses to intimate partner violence against women: the influence of perceived severity and personal responsibility. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 12* (2), 648–656.
- Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006b). Public attitudes toward reporting partner violence against women and reporting behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*, 759–768.
- Guerin, B., & Guerin, P. (2007). Research with refugee communities: Going around in circles with methodology. *The Australian Community Psychologist, 19*, 150–162.
- Hanson-Easey, S., & Augoustinos, M. (2011). Complaining about humanitarian refugees: The role of sympathy talk in the design of complaints on talkback radio. *Discourse & Communication, 5* (3), 247–271.
- Hartley, L.K., Pedersen, A., & Dandy, J. (2012). Attitudes towards asylum seekers: An evaluation of a mature-aged community education programme. *Racial Equality Teaching, 30*, 34–38.

- Hudson, J.M., & Bruckman, A.S. (2004). The bystander effect: a lens for understanding patterns of participation. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13* (2), 165–195.
- Hyers, L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles, 56* (1), 1–12.
- Karakashian, L.M., Walter, M.I., Christopher, A.N., Lucas, T. (2006). Fear of negative evaluation affects helping behaviour: the bystander effect revisited. *North American Journal of Psychology, 8* (1), 13–32.
- Kunstman, J.W., & Plant, E.A. (2008). Racing to help: Racial bias emergency helping situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95* (6), 1499–1510.
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behaviour. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 31*, 443–453.
- Marr, D., & Wilkinson, M. (2003). *Dark Victory*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- McKay, F.H., Thomas, S.L., & Kneebone, S. (2011). 'It would be okay if they came through the proper channels': Community perceptions and attitudes toward asylum seekers in Australia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*.
- McKay, S. & Pittam, J. (1993). Determinants of Anglo-Australian stereotypes of the Vietnamese in Australia. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 45*, 17–23.

- Momartin, S., Steel, Z., Coello, M., Aroche, J., Silove, D., & Brooks, R. (2006). A comparison of the mental health of refugees with temporary versus permanent protection visas. *Medical Journal of Australia, 185*, 357–361.
- Nelson, J.K., Dunn, K.M., & Paradies, Y. (2011). Bystander anti-racism: a review of the literature. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 11* (1), 263–284.
- Nelson, J., Dunn, K., Paradies, Y., Pedersen, A., Sharpe, S., Hynes, M., & Guerin, B. (2010). *Review of bystander approaches in support of preventing race-based discrimination*. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth).
- Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (2005). *Community Psychology: In Pursuit of Liberation and Well-Being*. New York: McMillan.
- Pedersen, A., Aly, A., Hartley, L., & McGarty, C. (2009). An intervention to increase positive attitudes and address misconceptions about Australian Muslims: A call for education and open mindedness. *The Australian Community Psychologist, 21*, 81–93.
- Pederson, A., Hartley, L.K. (2012). Prejudice against Muslim Australians: The role of values, gender and consensus. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 239–255.
- Pedersen, A., Kenny, M.A., Briskman, L., & Hoffman, S. (2008). Working with Wasim: A convergence of community. *The Australian Community Psychologist, 20*, 57–72.
- Pedersen, A., Paradies, Y., Hartley, L., & Dunn, K. (2011). Bystander anti-prejudice: Cross-cultural education, links with positivity towards cultural

‘outgroups’ and preparedness to speak out. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 5 (1), 19–30.

Pedersen, A., & Thomas, E. (under review). Taking action against the prejudice and discrimination of Muslim people: The role of collective identity and emotion. *Social Influence*.

Pedersen, A., & Thomas, E. (2011). Bystander anti-prejudice, Muslim Australians and the role of emotion. *Unpublished*.

Pedersen, A., Walker, I., Paradies, Y., & Guerin, B. (2011). How to cook rice: A review of ingredients for teaching anti-prejudice. *Australian Psychologist*, 46 (1), 55–63.

Pedersen, A., Walker, I., & Wise, M. (2005). “Talk does not cook rice”: Beyond anti-racism rhetoric to strategies for social action. *Australian Psychologist*, 40 (1), 20–30.

Pedersen, A., Watt, S., & Hansen, S. (2006). The role of false beliefs in the community’s and the federal government’s attitudes toward Australian asylum seekers. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 41 (1), 105–124.

Saucier, D.A., Miller, C.T., & Doucet, N. (2005). Differences in helping whites and blacks: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9 (1), 2–16.

Scully, M., & Rowe, M. (2009). Bystander training within organizations. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, 2 (1), 1–9.

- Sears, D.O. & Henry, P.J. (2003). The Origins of Symbolic Racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85 (2), 259–275.
- Shorey, G. (2001). Bystander non-intervention and the Somalia incident. *Canadian Military Journal*, 19–28.
- Stephan, W.G., Diaz-Loving, R. & Duran, A. (2000). Integrated threat theory and intercultural attitudes: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 31 (2), 240–249.
- Suhnan, A., Pedersen, A., & Hartley, L.K. (in press). Prejudice against asylum seekers in Australia: The role of people smugglers, the perception of threat, and acceptance of false beliefs. *The Australian Community Psychologist*.
- Thomas, E.F., Mavor, K.I., & McGarty, C. (2011). Social identities facilitate and encapsulate action-relevant constructs : A test of the social identity model of collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15 (1), 75–88.
- Turoy-Smith, K., Kane, R., & Pedersen, A. (in press). The willingness of a society to act on behalf of Indigenous Australians and refugees: The role of contact, intergroup anxiety, prejudice and support for legislative change. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*.
- UNHCR (2011). *Asylum seeker levels and trends in industrialised countries 2010*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- United Nations (2007, September 1). *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: The UN Refugee Agency. Retrieved from:

<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendocPDFViewer.html?docid=3b66c2aa10&query>

VicHealth. (2011). Survey of bystander knowledge, attitudes and behaviours preventing race-based discrimination. Unpublished.

Watt, S.E., & Larkin, C. (2010). Prejudiced people perceive more community support for their views: The role of own, media, and peer attitudes in perceived consensus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40* (3), 710–731.

Witenberg, R.T. (2007). The moral dimension of children's and adolescents' conceptualisation of tolerance to human diversity. *Journal of Moral Education, 36* (4), 433–451.

Author Guidelines

Instructions to Authors

The *Journal of Community Psychology* is a peer-reviewed journal devoted to research, evaluation, assessment, and intervention. Although review articles that deal with human behavior in community settings are occasionally accepted, the journal's primary emphasis is on empirical work that is based in or informs studies to understand community factors that influence, positively and negatively, human development, interaction, and functioning. Articles of interest include descriptions and evaluations of service programs and projects; studies of youth, parenting, and family development; methodological studies for the identification and systematic alteration of risks; and protective factors for emotional and behavioral disorders and for positive development. The journal also publishes the results of projects that inform processes relevant to the design of community-based interventions including strategies for gaining entry, engaging a community in participatory action research, and creating sustainable interventions that remain after project development and empirical work are completed.

Types of manuscripts: Three types of contributions are considered for publication: full-length articles, brief reports of preliminary and pilot studies that have particular heuristic importance and, occasionally, commentaries on conceptual or practical issues related to the discipline's theoretical and methodological foundations.

Typically, empirical articles are approximately 30 pages including tables, references, etc; brief reports cannot exceed 12 pages; and commentaries should not, in general, exceed 20 pages. All material submitted will be acknowledged on receipt, assigned a manuscript number, and subject to peer review. Copies of the referees' comments

will be forwarded to the author along with the editor's decision. The review process ranges from 12 to 16 weeks, and the journal makes every effort to publish accepted material within 12 months.

Manuscript submission: *The Journal of Community Psychology* has adopted an online submission process, available at mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jcop

Format of submitted material: All copy, including references and captions, must be typed double-spaced. An abstract of 150 words or less is required for articles and brief reports.

Style: Authors should follow the stylistic guidelines detailed in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition*, available from the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC. References should also follow APA style.

Title Page: The title page should contain the complete title of the manuscript, names and affiliations of all authors, institution(s) at which the work was performed, and name, address (including e-mail address), telephone and telefax numbers of the author responsible for correspondence. Authors should also provide a short title of not more than 45 characters (including spaces), and five to ten key words, that will highlight the subject matter of the article. Please submit the title page as a separate document within the attachment to facilitate the anonymous peer review process.

Figures: Figures should be professionally prepared and submitted in electronic TIFF or EPS format (if possible) along with high-quality printed hard copies. Good glossy black and white photographs are required for halftone reproduction. Figures should appear at the end of the manuscript, after the text.

Copyright: No article can be published unless accompanied by a signed publication agreement, which serves as a transfer of copyright from author to publisher. A publication agreement may be obtained from the editor or publisher. A copy of the publication agreement appears in most issues of the journal. Only original papers will be accepted and copyright in published papers will be vested in the publisher. It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to reproduce material that has appeared in another publication. A Permission Request Form may be obtained [here](#). Additional information on copyrights and permissions is available at the Journal Author's Site of the Wiley website, <http://www.wiley.com>. Forms can also be downloaded from the journal's For Authors page, see <http://www.interscience.wiley.com>. Completed forms can be faxed or e-mailed directly to A. Elder at 201-748-8852/aelder@wiley.com.

Reprints: Reprints of articles may be ordered from the publisher when the corrected proofs are returned. Authors should return the Reprint Order Forms with the proofs.

Guidelines for Electronic Submission

Software and format: Microsoft Word 6.0 is preferred, although manuscripts prepared with any other microcomputer word processor are acceptable. Refrain from complex formatting; the Publisher will style your manuscript according to the Journal design specifications. Do not use desktop publishing software such as Adobe PageMaker or Quark XPress. If you prepared your manuscript with one of these programs, export the text to a word processing format. Please make sure your word processing program's "fast save" feature is turned off. Please do not deliver files that contain hidden text: for example, do not use your word processor's automated features to create footnotes or reference lists.

Illustrations : All print reproduction requires files for full color images to be in a CMYK color space. If possible, ICC or ColorSync profiles of your output device should accompany all digital image submissions.

Software and format : All illustration files should be in TIFF or EPS (with preview) formats. Do not submit native application formats.

Resolution : Journal quality reproduction will require greyscale and color files at resolutions yielding approximately 300 ppi. Bitmapped line art should be submitted at resolutions yielding 600-1200 ppi. These resolutions refer to the output size of the file; if you anticipate that your images will be enlarged or reduced, resolutions should be adjusted accordingly.

File names : Illustration files should be given the 2- or 3-letter extension that identifies the file format used (i.e., .tif, .eps).

Appendix 1

Opening letter to participants.

Attitudes towards refugees in Australia

For almost 20 years, researchers in the Murdoch University School of Psychology have been learning what members of the Australian community think about different social groups. There is ongoing debate and a range of views about refugees in Australia. In this study, we are interested in the views and opinions in relation to refugees. We are particularly interested in what people may do when faced with certain situations. The scenarios and statements in this study are 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.

We are inviting you to participate in our research. Participation in this research is relatively simple. You only need to fill out a short online survey which should take about 20-25 minutes to complete. You must be aged 18 years or over to take part.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and the responses you provide will be kept strictly confidential. If you choose to participate, please do not type your name anywhere on the survey. You can stop participating at any time during the survey.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Karee Stuart at karee.stuart@hotmail.com or 0412254167 or A/Professor Suzanne Dziurawiec at S.Dziurawiec@murdoch.edu.au.

Your participation in this research would be greatly appreciated.

Karee Stuart

B.Psych Honours candidate

Dr Suzanne Dziurawiec

A/Professor, Murdoch School of Psychology

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2012/110). 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 3960 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 2

Declaration and survey, pre-piloting.

Participant consent

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 the survey by mail, 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. 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.

SECTION 1

Demographics

First, we would like to know a little about you. We are aiming for a diverse community group and the information below will help us to achieve this goal. Please mark the box most appropriate to you. All information is anonymous and confidential. **We do not need to know who you are!**

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

 Somewhat left

 Centre

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

- Somewhat right
- Strongly right
- Don't care

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., Masters, PhD) (part or completed)

5. Ethnic/Cultural Background

- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander
- African
- Asian
- Caucasian/European
- Indian
- Middle Eastern
- Pacific Islander
- Other _____

6. What is your religion?

- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

- Jewish
- Muslim
- No religion
- Other _____

SECTION 2
ATTITUDES TOWARDS REFUGEES

Now, please describe how you feel about refugees in general by selecting the appropriate number.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Warm										Cold
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Negative										Positive
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Friendly										Hostile
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Respect										Contempt
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Admiration										Disgust

SECTION 3

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF IN RELATION TO REFUGEES?

Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.

In the questions below, we would like to know whether you support (or don't support) the idea of promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians. This is not about whether you undertake activism or give donations in support of this goal, but whether you support the idea of better relations.

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

1. _____ I feel a bond with other people who are committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians
2. _____ I am glad to be someone who is committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
3. _____ I often think about the fact that I am committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
4. _____ I have a lot in common with the average person who is committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
5. _____ People who are committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians have a lot in common with each other

SECTION 4

SCENARIO ONE: WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF...

You are on a train seated across the aisle from a Middle Eastern woman who is reading a book about refugees. The man seated next to her is reading over her shoulder with a frown on his face. He asks the woman if she is a refugee and when the woman says “yes”, he tells her in a loud and forceful voice that refugees are law-breaking criminals and get too many government hand-outs for doing nothing. On the scale below please indicate how likely it is that you would do, or say something, in response to this.

- 1 = very likely**
- 2 = likely**
- 3 = unsure**
- 4 = unlikely**
- 5 = very unlikely**

We are now interested in the reasons behind why you would act or not. 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.

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

1. _____ I wouldn't do anything because there is a risk the man could physically harm me
2. _____ I would take action even if I was worried that the man involved would turn on me
(R)
3. _____ I wouldn't do anything because the man involved might threaten me
4. _____ I would act even though I could be at risk from the man (R)
5. _____ I would report the situation to the police or other agency when I returned home (R)
6. _____ I wouldn't do anything because people usually don't listen to a different point of view
7. _____ I would take action because there is a chance I could stop what was happening (R)
8. _____ There would be no point taking action because it wouldn't make any difference
9. _____ I would act as this could encourage other people to speak out (R)
10. _____ I wouldn't do anything because it would be too embarrassing
11. _____ I would take action even if other people thought badly of me (R)
12. _____ I would not take action because of the potential humiliation in publicly disagreeing with the man involved.
13. _____ I would act regardless of other people's opinions (R)

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

14. _____ If somebody else acted first, I would publicly support them (R)
15. _____ This situation is not serious enough to require action on my part.
16. _____ I would take action because the situation could be harmful (R)
17. _____ I wouldn't take action because the situation is too minor to do anything about
18. _____ I would act because the situation is serious (R)
19. _____ It wouldn't be my place to do anything
20. _____ In a situation like this, it's everybody's responsibility to stand up for what is right (R)
21. _____ I wouldn't take action because it's none of my business
22. _____ It is my responsibility to take action rather than be a spectator in this situation (R)
23. _____ I would not do anything because Australia is a free country and people have the right to say what they want.
24. _____ I would take action because respect for different cultures is an important Australian value (R)
25. _____ People have the right to their own opinions so I would not take action
26. _____ I would say something because free speech doesn't include the right to hurt anybody (R)

SECTION 5

SCENARIO TWO: WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF...

You are at a social gathering when a male Caucasian acquaintance begins to tell a joke. You have heard the joke before and know that it involves derogatory stereotypes of refugees. On the scale below please indicate how likely it is that you would do, or say, something in response to this.

- 1 = very likely**
- 2 = likely**
- 3 = unsure**
- 4 = unlikely**
- 5 = very unlikely**

We are now interested in the reasons behind why you would act or not. 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.

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

1. _____ I wouldn't do anything because there is a risk the man could physically harm me
2. _____ I would take action even if I was worried that the man involved would turn on me (R)
3. _____ I wouldn't do anything because the man involved might threaten me
4. _____ I would act even though I could be at risk from the man (R)
5. _____ I wouldn't do anything because people usually don't listen to a different point of view
6. _____ I would take action because there is a chance I could stop what was happening (R)
7. _____ There would be no point taking action because it wouldn't make any difference
8. _____ I would act as this could encourage other people to speak out (R)
9. _____ I wouldn't do anything because it would be too embarrassing
10. _____ I would take action even if other people thought badly of me (R)
11. _____ I would not take action because of the potential humiliation in publicly disagreeing with the man involved.
12. _____ I would act regardless of other people's opinions (R)
13. _____ This situation is not serious enough to require action on my part.
14. _____ I would take action because the situation could be harmful (R)
15. _____ I wouldn't take action because this situation is too minor to do anything about.
16. _____ I would act because the situation is serious (R)
17. _____ I wouldn't do anything as it's just a joke and he wasn't attacking anybody directly

18. _____ I would act because even though it seems like humour, words can hurt
19. _____ It wouldn't be my place to do anything
20. _____ In a situation like this, it's everybody's responsibility to stand up for what is right (R)
21. _____ I wouldn't take action because it's none of my business
22. _____ It is my responsibility to take action rather than be a spectator in this situation (R)
23. _____ I would not do anything because Australia is a free country and people have the right to say what they want.
24. _____ I would take action because respect for different cultures is an important Australian value (R)
25. _____ People have the right to their own opinions so I would not take action
26. _____ I would say something because free speech doesn't include the right to hurt anybody (R)

SECTION 6

Your Final Comments

Finally, are there any **other comments you would like to make** to help us understand your views in more detail?

**THAT COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU
VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.**

Appendix 3

Final survey, post-piloting and declaration

Participant consent

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 the survey by mail, 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. 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.

SECTION 1

Demographics

First, we would like to know a little about you. We are aiming for a diverse community group and the information below will help us to achieve this goal. Please mark the box most appropriate to you. All information is anonymous and confidential. **We do not need to know who you are!**

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
 - Somewhat left
 - Centre
 - Somewhat right

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

- Strongly right
- Don't care

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., Masters, PhD) (part or completed)

5. Ethnic/Cultural Background

- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander
- African
- Asian
- Caucasian/European
- Indian
- Middle Eastern
- Pacific Islander
- Other_____

6. What is your religion?

- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu
- Jewish

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

- Muslim
- No religion
- Other _____

SECTION 2

ATTITUDES TOWARDS REFUGEES

Now, please describe how you feel about refugees in general by selecting the appropriate number.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Warm										Cold
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Negative										Positive
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Friendly										Hostile
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Respect										Contempt
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
<hr/>										
Admiration										Disgust

SECTION 3

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF IN RELATION TO REFUGEES?

Using the 1 - 7 scale below, please indicate your agreement with each item by writing the appropriate number on the line next to that item.

In the questions below, we would like to know whether you support (or don't support) the idea of promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians. This is not about whether you undertake activism or give donations in support of this goal, but whether you support the idea of better relations.

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

1. _____ I feel a bond with other people who are committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians
2. _____ I am glad to be someone who is committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
3. _____ I often think about the fact that I am committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
4. _____ I have a lot in common with the average person who is committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians.
5. _____ People who are committed to promoting better relations between refugees and other Australians have a lot in common with each other

SECTION 4

SCENARIO ONE: WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF...

You are on a train seated across the aisle from a Middle Eastern woman who is reading a book about refugees. The man seated next to her is reading over her shoulder with a frown on his face. He asks the woman if she is a refugee and when the woman says “yes”, he tells her in a loud and forceful voice that refugees are law-breaking criminals and get too many government hand-outs for doing nothing. He says that Australians are too ‘soft’ and we need to send ‘these people’ back before they take over our country. He is quite aggressive in his opinions and is yelling at the woman, who is clearly embarrassed and afraid. On the scale below please indicate how likely it is that you would do, or say something, in response to this.

- 1 = very likely**
- 2 = likely**
- 3 = unsure**
- 4 = unlikely**
- 5 = very unlikely**

We are now interested in the reasons behind why you would act or not. 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.

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

The following set of questions refer to the idea of 'risk'; in other words: danger.

- 27. _____ I wouldn't do anything because there is a risk the man could physically harm me
- 28. _____ I would take action even if I was worried that the man involved would turn on me (R)
- 29. _____ I wouldn't do anything because the man involved might threaten me
- 30. _____ I would act even though I could be at risk from the man (R)
- 31. _____ I would report the situation to the police or other agency when I returned home (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea of any action being ineffective.

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

32. _____ I wouldn't do anything because people usually don't listen to a different point of view
33. _____ I would take action because there is a chance I could stop what was happening (R)
34. _____ There would be no point taking action because it wouldn't make any difference
35. _____ I would act as this could encourage other people to speak out (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea that taking action could reflect badly on you or jeopardize your relationships with other people.

36. _____ I wouldn't do anything because it would be too embarrassing
37. _____ I would take action even if other people thought badly of me (R)
38. _____ I would not take action because of the potential humiliation in publicly disagreeing with the man involved.
39. _____ I would act regardless of other people's opinions (R)
40. _____ If somebody else acted first, I would publicly support them (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea of the incident not being 'serious enough'.

41. _____ This situation is not serious enough to require action on my part.
42. _____ I would take action because the situation could be harmful (R)
43. _____ I wouldn't take action because the situation is too minor to do anything about
44. _____ I would act because the situation is serious (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea that it is not 'your place' or 'role' to do anything.

45. _____ It wouldn't be my place to do anything
46. _____ In a situation like this, it's everybody's responsibility to stand up for what is right (R)
47. _____ I wouldn't take action because it's none of my business
48. _____ It is my responsibility to take action rather than be a spectator in this situation (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea that everybody has the right to their own opinion.

49. _____ I would not do anything because Australia is a free country and people have the right to say what they want.
50. _____ I would take action because respect for different cultures is an important Australian value (R)
51. _____ People have the right to their own opinions so I would not take action
52. _____ I would say something because free speech doesn't include the right to hurt anybody (R)

SECTION 5

SCENARIO TWO: WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF...

You are at a social gathering when a male Caucasian acquaintance begins to tell a joke. You have heard the joke before and know that it involves derogatory stereotypes of refugees. On the scale below please indicate how likely it is that you would do, or say, something in response to this.

- 1 = very likely**
- 2 = likely**
- 3 = unsure**
- 4 = unlikely**
- 5 = very unlikely**

We are now interested in the reasons behind why you would act or not. 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.

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

The following set of questions refer to the idea of 'risk'; in other words: danger.

- 6. _____ I wouldn't do anything because there is a risk the man could physically harm me
- 7. _____ I would take action even if I was worried that the man involved would turn on me (R)
- 8. _____ I wouldn't do anything because the man involved might threaten me
- 9. _____ I would act even though I could be at risk from the man (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea of any action being ineffective.

- 10. _____ I wouldn't do anything because people usually don't listen to a different point of view
- 11. _____ I would take action because there is a chance I could stop what was happening (R)
- 12. _____ There would be no point taking action because it wouldn't make any difference
- 13. _____ I would act as this could encourage other people to speak out (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea that taking action could reflect badly on you or jeopardize your relationships with other people.

- 14. _____ I wouldn't do anything because it would be too embarrassing

Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers

15. ____ I would take action even if other people thought badly of me (R)
16. ____ I would not take action because of the potential humiliation in publicly disagreeing with the man involved.
17. ____ I would act regardless of other people's opinions (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea of the incident not being 'serious enough'.

18. ____ This situation is not serious enough to require action on my part.
19. ____ I would take action because the situation could be harmful (R)
20. ____ I wouldn't take action because this situation is too minor to do anything about.
21. ____ I would act because the situation is serious (R)
22. ____ I wouldn't do anything as it's just a joke and he wasn't attacking anybody directly
23. ____ I would act because even though it seems like humour, words can hurt

The following set of questions refer to the idea that it is not 'your place' or 'role' to do anything.

24. ____ It wouldn't be my place to do anything
25. ____ In a situation like this, it's everybody's responsibility to stand up for what is right (R)
26. ____ I wouldn't take action because it's none of my business
27. ____ It is my responsibility to take action rather than be a spectator in this situation (R)

The following set of questions refer to the idea that everybody has the right to their own opinion.

28. ____ I would not do anything because Australia is a free country and people have the right to say what they want.
29. ____ I would take action because respect for different cultures is an important Australian value (R)
30. ____ People have the right to their own opinions so I would not take action
31. ____ I would say something because free speech doesn't include the right to hurt anybody (R)

