

Dispositional and Situational Predictors of Anti-Racist Bystander Intervention on
Behalf of Indigenous Australians

Megan McKee

32163519



MURDOCH
UNIVERSITY
PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Supervisor: Anne Pedersen

Word Count: 11 951

Table of Contents

Title Page	p. 4
Declaration of Own Research	p.5
Copyright Acknowledgement	p.6
Abstract	p.7
Acknowledgement	p.8
Introduction	
Overview	p.9
Overview of Bystander Anti-Racism	p.12
Identity Theory	p. 12
Predictors of Bystander Anti-Racism:	
Dispositional Empathy and Indigenous Empathy	p. 15
Dispositional Self-Efficacy and Bystander Efficacy	p. 16
Socio-Demographic Variables	p. 17
The Present Study	p. 19
Method	
Participants	p. 21
Table 1 – 2011 Census Comparison	p. 23
Measures	p. 23
Procedure	p. 27
Results	
Factor Analysis	p. 28
Table 2 – Factor Structure	p. 29
Descriptive Statistics	p. 30
Table 3 – Descriptive Statistics for Each Scale	p. 31
Assumptions	p. 31
Nonparametric Tests	p. 32
Correlations	p. 32
Table 4 – Intercorrelations Among Variables	p. 34
Regression	p. 35
Table 5 – Regression Analysis	p. 38
Discussion	
Overview	p. 39

Hypothesis 1	p. 40
Hypothesis 2	p. 44
Research Aim	p. 46
Practical Implications	p. 47
Limitations and Future Research Directions	p. 48
Conclusion	p. 49
References	p. 51
Journal of Community Psychology Author Guidelines	p. 64
Appendix 1 – Participant Cover letter	p. 68
Appendix 2 – Pre-Pilot Test Survey	p. 69
Appendix 3 – Post-Pilot Test Survey	p. 77
Appendix 4 – Ethics Approval	Data File
Appendix 5 – Electronic Copy Ethics Approval	Data File
Appendix 6 – Electronic Copy Turn It In Report	Data File
Appendix 7 – Electronic Version of Thesis	Data File

Dispositional and Situational Predictors of Anti-Racist Bystander Intervention on
Behalf of Indigenous Australians



MURDOCH
UNIVERSITY
PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Megan McKee

Written for the Journal of Community Psychology

*This thesis is presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Psychology (Honours), Murdoch University, 2014.*

Declaration of Own Research

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 education institution.

Signed:

Megan Emilie McKee
13th October 2014

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:

Megan Emilie McKee
13th October 2014

Abstract

Racial discrimination towards Indigenous Australians is highly prevalent in today's society. Such discrimination is detrimental to Indigenous Australians mental and physical health and wellbeing (Paradies, Harris & Anderson, 2008). Bystander anti-racism is the positive action undertaken by a witness of a racist event to intervene in support of the victim (Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies, 2011). Utilising Identity Theory as a theoretical framework, the present study investigated the predictive utility of dispositional factors compared with situational factors in anticipating the likelihood of bystander anti-racist action. Dispositional Empathy and Dispositional Efficacy were compared with situation specific factors Indigenous Empathy and Bystander Efficacy. The sample comprised of 156 Australian participants who completed a questionnaire measuring how these variables were associated with the likelihood of bystander anti-racist action. To quantify likelihood of action, participants were presented with a safe scenario of racism unfolding in a restaurant with the perpetrator, an acquaintance, who makes racist comments. In line with Identity Theory, it was hypothesised likelihood of bystander anti-racism action would be predicted by situational specific factors over dispositional factors. Being able to predict when a bystander will enact such an identity role is important in advancing the bystander literature. The results indicate this finding is partially supported with Bystander Intervention Opportunity being the most predictive of bystander action intention. Practical implications include highlighting the need for bystander education and training programs that work towards reducing the prevalence of racism in society. As the current research is novel, future research into this area is required to confirm the findings of this study.

Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge Anne Pedersen for being a wonderfully knowledgeable and inspirational supervisor. Thank you for your patience, guidance and unwavering support throughout my thesis year, I could not have asked for a better supervisor and feel honoured to have been able to work with you.

Additionally I would like to thank all those involved in the pilot testing and proof reading stages for their invaluable feedback. Monique Mandarakas you have been a wonderful friend and advisor for all my little questions, thank you so much.

And finally, to my parents, Leanne and Brad, thank you for everything you have done in supporting me through this year. To Kara, thank you for being the best sister anyone could ask for. To Jack, thank you for encouragement and never ending support. And to my extended family and friends, thank you so much for being there for me, I feel so fortunate to have you all in my life.

Dispositional and Situational Predictors of Anti-Racist Bystander Intervention on
Behalf of Indigenous Australians

Since colonisation Indigenous Australians have been subject to considerable cultural dislocation and unjust government policy (Augoustinos, Tuffin, & Rapley, 1999). Among other reasons, this has perpetuated a contentious relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Augoustinos et al., 1999). As a minority group they continue to face considerable inequality. Government initiatives like the “Closing The Gap” program (Australian Government Department of Social Services, 2013) aim to equalise Indigenous Australians with their non-Indigenous counterparts in respect of health, education and employment. However, there are still discrepancies with Indigenous Australians more likely to suffer from high psychological stress (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010a), experience long-term health issues (ABS, 2013) and greater educational disadvantage (ABS, 2006) than their non-Indigenous counterparts.

Whilst the 1967 Referendum began a movement toward constitutional change (Australian Government, 1967), the Australian Constitution on which government policy and initiatives are fundamentally based, still contains items pertaining to discrimination. In particular, this discrimination can be seen in Section 25 which allows the Government authority to revoke voting rights based on race, and Section 51 (xxvi) which grants the Government power to introduce race-based special laws (Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, 1900). By virtue of disregard, there is a fundamental denial of Indigenous people as existing members of the Australian population (Pearson, 2012).

Stemming from an unjust Constitution and a turbulent history between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Augoustinos et al., 1999), systemic

issues exist due to the racially based treatment of Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous Australians. This imbedded racism is one factor that continues to contribute to the inequality and related inequity of Indigenous Australians. Racism can be conceptualised into both attitudes and behaviours that work to oppress minority groups and promote power imbalances between socially defined racial groups within the community (Nelson et al., 2011). Racist attitudes include beliefs and prejudices that act to maintain social stratification and an unequal division of social power (Russell, Pennay, Webster, & Paradies, 2013). Racial discrimination involves unjust behavioural actions, both overt and subtle, towards individuals who identify as part of a minority racial group (Butrus & Witenburg, 2013).

Since 1975, when unjust treatment of an individual based on race became unlawful (Racial Discrimination Act, 1975), racial discrimination has been more commonly expressed in a covert manner. There are two identified types of covert racism: everyday racism and modern racism. Everyday racism (Essed, 1991) refers to racist acts, such as jokes, comments and exclusions that have become integrated and commonplace in everyday discourse and behaviours. Modern racism pertains to the belief that Indigenous Australians no longer experience racism, as well as feelings of resentment towards Indigenous Australians who receive perceived “special treatment” (Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter, 1995).

Racism is prominent in Australia with 25-27% of Indigenous Australians regularly experiencing instances of racial discrimination (ABS, 2010a; Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2011; Mansouri, Jenkins, Morgan & Taouk, 2009). Although these figures do not distinguish between overt and covert racism, they highlight the substantial existence of racial discrimination towards Indigenous Australians in society.

Effects of discrimination can be seen in a variety of domains. Similar to other harmful threats to oneself, individuals who are racially denigrated may experience an immediate fight or flight reaction involving negative physiological and emotional reactions to the situation (Mansouri, et al., 2009). Physiological reactions involve sweating palms, increased heart rate, trembling and muscle tension whereas emotional reactions can include feelings of sadness, anger and increased anxiety (Mansouri et al., 2009). From a community perspective, racial discrimination towards Indigenous Australians is associated with greater anxiety, stress, substance use and binge drinking (ABS, 2010a; Paradies et al., 2008). Racial discrimination is linked to depression, which in turn is linked to suicide (Zhang & Li, 2013). Strikingly, suicide rates of both male and female Indigenous Australians are twice that of non-Indigenous Australians (ABS, 2010b). Considering these rates, the severity of the impact of racism on Indigenous Australians mental health is extensive and requires attention.

Whilst there is a movement towards removing items of the constitution that permit race-based discrimination (National Centre of Indigenous Excellence, 2013), and there are private campaigns working towards highlighting the impacts of racism (see Beyond Blue, 2014), a movement towards a less racially-discriminative society is needed to improve the physical, social and psychological well-being of Indigenous Australians. Helping others during an instance of racism is beneficial for both the helper and the recipient (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). In terms of creating a less racist society, bystanders who challenge racist perpetrators may alter their prejudicial beliefs (Czopp & Monteith 2003; Czopp, Monteith & Mark, 2006). Considering the benefits of participating in bystander action, further research into this area may promote a more equitable and less racially discriminative society.

Overview of Bystander Anti-Racism

Advocates of Indigenous Australians can work towards creating equality between groups by taking action as a bystander when witnessing racial discrimination. Within bystander anti-racism, the bystander is defined as an individual present when a case of racial discrimination against another member of the public occurs (Nelson et al., 2011). In safe situations, bystander anti-racism is the action undertaken by the witness of a racist event to speak out, intervene or engage others in order to minimise the impact of the event on the victim (Nelson, et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2010). In potentially violent situations the bystander may act on behalf of the victim by alerting emergency services (Banyard, 2008). Czopp and Monteith (2003) found acts of confrontation were successful in eliciting negative feelings of guilt and self-criticism in the racist perpetrator. Additionally, Monteith (1993) reports that these negative feelings can act to suppress additional future prejudicial responses. With these positive effects in mind, efforts aimed at predicting bystander action and ultimately empowering bystanders to take anti-racist action are central to advancing the bystander intervention literature (Nelson et al., 2010).

Identity Theory

Understanding when individuals choose to engage as an active bystander is of considerable importance to enhancing the bystander literature. As a theoretical framework, Identity Theory offers considerable insight into the factors that motivate behaviour, and particularly for this research, bystander anti-racist action (Burke and Stets, 2009; Foote, 1951; McCall & Simmons, 1978). Foote (1951) initially conceptualised identity in terms of roles within society that act to maintain social structure. Each role has a unique set of prescriptions that dictate the relationships between individuals and the expected behaviours of the role (Foote, 1951). There are

two concepts of the self: the *Ideal Self* and the *Situational Self* that interact with the identity role to influence behaviour.

Each individual ascribes to multiple role identities that are hierarchically organized according to one's conception of self (Burke & Stets, 2009; McCall & Simmons, 1978). This hierarchy is labelled the prominence hierarchy of identity and dictates how individuals perceive themselves considering their personal ideals. This is a predominantly stable self-concept termed an individual's Ideal Self (Burke & Stets, 2009). The place in which a particular identity enters the prominence hierarchy is determined by three factors: the support and experience one has in the particular role; an individual's commitment to each specific role identity; and the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards gained from enacting the role (Burke & Stets, 2009).

The second concept of the self as proposed by Identity Theory is the Situational Self (Burke & Stets, 2009; McCall & Simmons, 1978). It is comparatively a malleable construct dependent on the individual's own situation. Interacting with the Ideal Self, the Situational Self is dictated by a salience hierarchy that determines the role identity most advantageous to the individual in the present situation (McCall & Simmons, 1978). The salience hierarchy is impacted on by four main factors: most relevantly for this thesis, the prominence of the role identity as according to the Ideal Self; support and experience within the situation identity; reward gained by enacting the identity; and finally an assessment of potential benefits achieved from enacting the role (McCall & Simmons, 1978). In essence, Identity Theory posits the Situational Self and the Ideal Self act in synergy to activate the most ideal and salient identity for each situation (Burke & Stets, 2009).

Bystander anti-racist action is contingent on the Ideal Self factors conducive to promoting action and specific factors associated with the Situational Self. In an

act of racial discrimination towards an Indigenous Australian (or another social group member), individuals who feel confident acting as a bystander and hold beliefs contradictory to those of the perpetrator would likely be motivated to take action.

Identity Theory predicts that bystander anti-racist behaviour should ensue if the individual has relevant experience in the role and if they perceive adequate rewards and benefits from the role enactment.

According to Identity Theory, the probability of a behaviour occurring is highly influenced by aspects of the Ideal Self. In relation to bystander action, factors such as high dispositional empathy (Butrus & Witenberg, 2013), high dispositional efficacy (Baumert, Halmberger & Schmitt, 2013) and socio-demographics increase the likelihood of bystander action occurring. Whilst, these factors may increase the probability, factors related to the Situational Self, such as situational bystander efficacy (Banyard, Moynihan, Cares, & Warner, 2014) and empathy towards Indigenous Australians (hereafter Indigenous empathy; Pedersen, Bevan, Walker & Griffiths, 2004) are required for action.

Whilst Identity Theory is yet to be explored in relation to bystander anti-racism, it has been investigated in the related topics of race in the work place (Thomas, Phillips and Brown, 1998) and most pertinently in relation to aspects of moral identity (Carter, 2013). Moral identity encapsulates experiences of anger, empathy, shame and/or guilt, when a moral or social norm is violated (Carter, 2013). Of these four factors, empathy is predominantly implicated as a factor that drives helping behaviours (Hardy, 2006). In terms of empathy and Identity Theory, if an individual's Ideal Self includes high empathetic concern for others, they are more inclined to feel guilt and shame in a situation that conflicts with their own beliefs (Stets & Carter, 2011). Dispositional efficacy is another important motivator of

behaviour in Identity Theory (Stets & Burke, 2000). This theory postulates that individuals take on role identities that they feel will be efficacious (Burke & Stets, 2009). Individuals with high dispositional efficacy in their Ideal Self are more likely to feel competent and are more willing to enact unknown and difficult role identities and behaviours (Burke & Stets, 2009).

Dispositional and Situational Predictors of Bystander Anti-Racism

Dispositional Empathy and Indigenous Empathy

In relation to bystander anti-racist action, both dispositional empathy (Ideal Self) and Indigenous empathy (Situational Self) must be combined for the individual to take on this active bystander identity role. Previous research suggests dispositional empathy is predictive of bystander anti-racist action (Nelson et al., 2011).

Dispositional empathy is conceptualised into two domains: cognitive and affective empathy (Gilet, Mella, Struder, Grün, & Labouvie-Vief, 2013). Cognitive empathy concerns an individual's ability to understand and reflect on the experience of another, whereas affective empathy relates to an individual's ability to emotionally comprehend the feelings of another (Gilet et al., 2013; Mansouri et al., 2009). In a situation of racial discrimination, a highly empathetic bystander may be prompted to intervene on behalf of the victim after recognising the victim's uncomfortable emotional reaction to the situation (Mansouri et al., 2009).

The *Interpersonal Reactivity Index* (IRI; Davis, 1980) is a measure of cognitive and affective dispositional empathy that has been widely used in empathy research due to the replication of its psychometric properties cross-culturally and cross-linguistically (Fernández, Dufey, & Kramp, 2011; Gilet et al., 2013). As a psychometric measure, the IRI has not been adequately tested for use in Australia. Previous Australian studies have involved either children (Garton & Gringart, 2005)

or violent offenders (Beven, O'Brien-Malone, & Hall, 2004), neither of which are representative of the wider Australian population. It is for this reason the IRI will be analysed within this research to ensure it exhibits similar psychometric properties to previous studies (Davis, 1980; Fernández et al., 2011).

Although dispositional empathy has been implicated in prosocial behaviours, Identity Theory proposes that specific empathy towards the minority group, in this case Indigenous empathy, is of greater importance in predicting likelihood of bystander action. Considering Australia's complex history regarding Indigenous Australian rights, some individuals who possess high dispositional empathy may harbour highly prejudiced views towards this minority group. Whilst previous research conducted by Pedersen and colleagues (2004) reports a lack of Indigenous empathy predicts negative attitudes towards Indigenous Australians, this is yet to be investigated in relation to bystander anti-racist action.

Dispositional Efficacy and Bystander Efficacy.

Similarly to the comparison of dispositional versus situational empathy, Identity Theory proposes high dispositional efficacy and situational bystander efficacy are both required for bystander action to occur. Both dispositional efficacy and bystander efficacy have been highlighted in the prevention of sexual violence literature to predict bystander intervention and measure the success of bystander training programs; however, these are yet to be directly compared. As related to one's perception of their Ideal Self, dispositional efficacy is proposed to be a personality trait-like dimension that is measured by one's self-belief in their ability to perform and succeed at a range of tasks (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). As found in the Identity Theory literature, high dispositional efficacy is related to an individual's increased ability to attempt new and difficult tasks (Burke & Stets, 2009). Although

not studied in relation to anti-racism, high dispositional efficacy has been previously linked with prosocial bystander helping behaviours related to high school bullying (Tsang, Hui & Law, 2011) and sexual violence (Banyard, 2008). As far as the literature suggests, studies of dispositional efficacy and bystander efficacy as related to bystander anti-racist intention to act in Australia is yet to be explored.

In line with Identity Theory, situational bystander efficacy represents aspects of the Situational Self that are required for bystander action to occur. Situational bystander efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to intervene as a bystander and induce positive change from the perspective of the target (Banyard et al., 2014). Identity Theory suggests individuals will enact role identities in which they can succeed and feel efficacious (Stets & Burke, 2000). As a measure of the Situational Self, bystander efficacy has been studied in relation to the effectiveness of college anti-sexual assault bystander training programs (McMahon, Postmus & Koenick, 2011). Individuals who have attended such programs reported higher levels of bystander efficacy and consequently increased bystander action (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007). At present this construct has not been studied in an Australian racial context, so may provide insight to inform the development of future bystander anti-racist intervention programs.

Socio-Demographic Variables.

In terms of Identity Theory, the socio-demographic variables of age, gender, education and political preference are related to the concept of one's Ideal Self. These variables are often implicated in bystander anti-racist action; however the findings are not robust (Pedersen et al., 2004). Aligned with Stewart's (2012) finding that older individuals are less worried about impression management than their younger counterparts, previous research suggests the older an individual is the more

likely they will engage in bystander action (Pedersen et al., 2004; Pennay, & Powell, 2012). Alternatively, Dunn and Forrest (2004) found elderly Australians were more likely to have established racist beliefs; this would therefore discourage bystander action. Given these inconsistencies, further research is required to investigate the relationship between likelihood of bystander action and age.

Previous research suggests there is a relationship between higher dispositional empathy and being female (Davis, 1980). Consistent with this proposed relationship, bystander action by females is found to be more commonplace when compared to males (Neto & Pedersen, 2013; Redmond, Pedersen & Paradies, in press; Russell, et al., 2013). However, this is not a robust finding of the bystander literature and when reported, the effect sizes are often small (Pedersen et al., 2004). Eagly and Crowley's (1986) meta-analysis of gender and prosocial behaviours show gender differences in action are determined by a variety of factors, including the level of risk in the situation, gender of the victim and the perceived gender role of the individual. Drawing on this meta-analysis, it can be argued that male individuals in a high-risk scenario would be most likely to act, with females in a low-risk scenario most likely to act (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). However, recent studies have revealed no significant correlation between scenario risk, gender and bystander action (Stewart, Pedersen, & Paradies, 2014). Additional research is required to establish whether or not gender is influential in bystander action intention.

A lack of formal education has previously been linked to higher levels of prejudice (Hodson & Busseri, 2012), and consequently lower levels of bystander action (Russell et al., 2013). As critical thinking and evaluation skills are one of the learning outcomes fundamental to higher education, with regards to racism individuals lacking these skills may choose to unwittingly accept the status quo,

siding with the dominant group over the minority group (Duron, Limbach & Waugh, 2006). In keeping with this line of thought, individuals with higher levels of education may be more likely to challenge typically racist beliefs. This is reflected in the finding that higher education is a significant predictor of bystander action (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012). However, this relationship is not duplicated in all bystander research, with Neto and Pedersen (2013), and Redmond and colleagues (in press) reporting level of education did not significantly predict bystander anti-racist action.

Political preference can be conceptualised on a spectrum from left to right. In Australia, left political affiliation generally refers to a preference for progressive political policies, whereas right political affiliation indicates a preference for conservative political policies (Lukes, 2003). A political preference towards the left is found to correlate with increased bystander anti-racist action (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012; Stewart, 2012). Considering individuals with this viewpoint are more likely to oppose political conservatism (Sanson et al., 1997) and desire equality for all (Lukes, 2003), lower levels of prejudice are found to correlate with a left political preference (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012). Subsequently, lower levels of prejudice are predictive of higher instances of bystander action (Redmond et al., in press; Stewart et al., 2014).

The Present Study.

Bystander anti-racism is a limited but growing area of study. To our knowledge, no Australian research currently compares dispositional to specific empathy and efficacy as predictors of bystander anti-racism behaviours. To contribute to the literature, this exploratory study has the central aim of identifying the most significant predictor variable/s of bystander anti-racist intention to act. Due to ethical reasons associated with placing individuals as bystanders in experimental, racist

situations, most bystander research measures bystander intention to act, rather than action itself (Banyard et al., 2007; Neto & Pedersen, 2013). The current study adopts this approach to measure the relationship between the independent variables of dispositional empathy, Indigenous empathy, dispositional efficacy, bystander efficacy and demographic factors, and the dependent variable likelihood of bystander action.

With the aim of promoting social change and situating the research in context, this study is cross-sectional in design and based on the research conventions of community psychology (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005). As this research is primarily interested in assessing participant attitudes, self-report measures using Likert-type scale item responses are established as an appropriate tool for assessment (Wakita, Ueshinma & Noguchi, 2012).

From a theoretical perspective, this research has the potential to advance both the Identity Theory and bystander anti-racism literature. From a pragmatic perspective, this research may potentially inform and guide the creation and implementation of anti-racist bystander action intervention programs that work towards reducing racial discrimination towards Indigenous Australians in society (Russell et al., 2013).

Modelled on previous research conducted by Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley and Dunn (2011), participants in the current study were asked to respond to a hypothetical low-risk scenario of racism involving a group of colleagues and a group of Indigenous Australians from an Indigenous rights organisation. Utilizing this scenario as a catalyst to measure potential bystander action, this study is an exploratory investigation into the relative predictive power of dispositional and situational empathy and efficacy in predicting likelihood of bystander anti-racism. Although this study is novel, consistent with Identity Theory it is hypothesised that

Indigenous empathy and bystander efficacy will positively predict bystander anti-racist action when compared to dispositional empathy and dispositional efficacy.

Aligned with previous research on demographic determinants, it is hypothesised that individuals who are female, older, highly educated and hold left political preferences will be more likely to engage in bystander anti-racist action over others (Hodson & Busseri, 2012; Neto & Pedersen, 2013; Pedersen & Hartley, 2012). A minor research aim of the present study is to psychometrically evaluate the IRI (Davis, 1980) as an appropriate measure of dispositional empathy in a sample of Australian adults.

Method

Participants

The sample comprised 156 Australian adult participants recruited using the online Qualtrics software platform. The Qualtrics database contacts participants Australia-wide by email, providing them with opportunities to engage with research via online questionnaires. Abiding by ethical conventions to do no harm (Australian Psychological Society, 2007), as the scenario may be distressing for Indigenous Australians, individuals identifying as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander were prevented from participating in this research. The sample contained 50% males, and ranged in age between 18 and 89 years with an average of 46 years ($SD = 15.67$). This is comparatively younger than the average age of 51 years represented in the census (ABS, 2011). Of the sample, 36% indicated a centred political preference followed by 17% indicating they were somewhat left and 16% indicating they were somewhat right, 6% indicated they were strongly left and the remaining 6% were strongly right. Twenty-six participants indicated no political preference by selecting the *Don't Care* option; these individuals were removed from analyses involving this viewpoint. Of the sample, 28% had completed secondary school, 21% had completed

or were completing vocational training followed by 17% indicating they had completed or were completing a bachelor degree. Of the remaining participants, 10% indicated they were completing or had completed a higher postgraduate degree and 7% indicated they had not finished secondary schooling. As shown by Table 1, the current sample is less educated than the wider Australian population. The majority of participants (88%) indicated they were of Caucasian/European background, with the next largest group (8%) indicating they were of Asian descent. Of the remaining participants, five indicated their nationality to be Indian, two indicated Middle Eastern, one indicated African and one indicated Maori. As shown by Table 1 below, in terms of participant background, the sample is relatively representative of the wider Australian population (ABS, 2011). Forty-eight per cent of the study sample identified as Christian, followed by 42% indicating no religious affiliation. Of the remaining participants, five indicated Muslim, three indicated Hindu, two indicated Buddhist, one indicated Jewish, one Sikh and one Asatru. As shown by Table 1, in comparison to the wider Australian population, this sample represents lower Christian religious beliefs and higher levels of no religious affiliation.

Table 1

Top Percentages of the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011 Census Data as Related to the Socio-demographic Determinants of Education, Background and Religion

Socio-Demographic Determinant	2011 Census
Education Level	
Completed Tertiary or Higher Education	36%
Completed Vocational Education or Training	32%
Background	
Caucasian/European	83%
Asian	8%
African	2%
Religion	
Christian	61%
No Religion	22%
Islam	2%
Buddhist	2%

Measures

Demographics.

Participants entered their age in numerals, and indicated their sex (1 = *male*, 2 = *female*), ethnic background (1 = *Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander*, 2 = *African*, 3 = *Asian*, 4 = *Caucasian/European*, 5 = *Indian*, 6 = *Middle Eastern*, 7 = *Pacific Islander*), religious affiliation (1 = *Buddhist*, 2 = *Christian*, 3 = *Hindu*, 4 = *Jewish*, 5 = *Muslim*, 6 = *No religion*), level of education (1 = *did not complete secondary school*, 6 = *part or completed higher degree – Masters or PhD*) and

political preference (1 = *strongly left*, 5 = *strongly right*, 6 = *don't care*). Participants were also provided with the option of selecting *Other* to enter text in the ethnic background and religious affiliation questions.

Dispositional Empathy.

The IRI (Davis, 1980) is a 4-subscale, 28-item instrument with 7-items per subscale. The IRI measures dispositional empathy in terms of the following four facets: *Perspective Taking*, *Personal Distress*, *Fantasy*, and *Empathetic Concern*. Using a seven-point Likert scale, participants rate from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* on items such as Perspective Taking: “I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision”, Personal Distress: “When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm”, Fantasy: “I daydream and fantasise, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me” and Empathetic Concern: “I am often quite touched by things that I see happen”. To the author’s knowledge, the IRI has not been used to measure dispositional empathy in a mainstream Australian population. Reliability of each subscale has previously been indicated in an American context at: Perspective Taking, $\alpha = .77$, Personal Distress, $\alpha = .78$, Fantasy: $\alpha = .77$, and Empathetic Concern: $\alpha = .71$ (Davis, 1980). Following the recoding of the relevant items and summing the four scales, higher scores on each subscale indicate increased levels of dispositional empathy.

Indigenous Empathy.

The *Indigenous Empathy* scale (Pedersen et al., 2004) is a 5-item instrument measuring individual feelings of empathetic concern towards Indigenous Australians. Using a seven-point Likert scale, participants indicated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* on items such as “I often feel empathy with Indigenous Australians”. The scale was created specifically for use in an Australian

context and has an established reliability of $\alpha = .69$. After appropriate recoding, higher ratings demonstrate higher levels of empathetic feelings towards Indigenous Australians.

Dispositional Efficacy.

The *New Generalised Self-Efficacy* scale (Chen et al., 2001) is an 8-item self-report measure used to quantify dispositional efficacy. This refers to one's perceived capability of achieving in a variety of situations. On a five-point Likert scale participants indicated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* on items such as "I believe I can succeed at most any endeavour to which I set my mind." The scale has previously been used in Australia and found to have a reliability of $\alpha = .87$ (Ng & Earl, 2008). A higher score indicates a higher level of dispositional efficacy.

Situational Bystander Efficacy.

The *Bystander Efficacy* scale is an 8-item measure in total, consisting of two 4-item subscales. This was appropriated for an Australian racism context from the original 10-item Bystander Behaviour Scale – Revised (BBS-R) initially published to measure bystander efficacy in regards to sexual assault (McMahon et al., 2014). The scale used in the current study discarded the following two items due to irrelevancy in a situation of racism: "Confront a male friend who is hooking up with someone who was passed out" and "Call for help (ie, call 000) if I saw a group of guys bothering a girl in the parking lot". The *Bystander Intervention Opportunity* subscale measures an individuals' belief in their ability to intervene in an immediate situation of racism. The *Bystander Proactive Opportunity* subscale measures proactive behaviours of individuals promoting bystander action. Items are measured on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* with items such as Bystander Intervention Opportunity: "I would feel comfortable

confronting a friend who is being derogatory towards Indigenous Australians” and Bystander Proactive Opportunity: “I have taken a class to learn more about Indigenous Australians”. As this scale was appropriated for use in an Australian racism context, there have been no previously established reliability coefficients. However, the original Bystander Intervention Opportunity subscale was found to have a reliability of $\alpha = .77$ and the original Bystander Proactive Opportunity Subscale was found to have a reliability of $\alpha = .82$. A higher score indicates higher levels of bystander efficacy.

Scenario.

The intergroup bystander scenario created for the purpose of this study was based on a similar scenario previously used by Pedersen and colleagues (2011). The scenario takes place in a restaurant and involves a hypothetical colleague reacting to a group of Indigenous Australians entering the situation. The colleague makes comments pertaining to acts of modern racism, in particular that racism does not exist anymore and the belief that Indigenous Australian’s are guaranteed government benefits. Participants were asked to clarify their view on the situation by answering if they supported the perpetrator by selecting 1 = *your acquaintance’s view* or the victim by selecting 2 = *an alternative viewpoint*. Participants were asked to quantify their likelihood of intervening as the bystander by answering the question: “Which value on the scale below best represents how *likely* you are to speak up in this scenario, either in support of your colleague’s view or an alternative view” using a seven-point Likert scale with the points 1 = *extremely unlikely* and 7 = *extremely likely*, and mid point coded as 4 = *unsure*. A higher score indicated a greater likelihood of action. Only data gathered from individuals who indicated they were in support of the victim was utilised in predicting bystander intention to action.

Procedure

All surveys were pilot tested to check errors in online presentation, graphics and item wording. The pilot group consisted of seventeen individuals and was comprised of 7 males and 10 females with an age range of 19 – 82 and average age of 47 years old ($SD = 22.14$). The pilot group was more likely to hold the view of a left skewed political preference with 65% of the group indicating they were either strongly left or somewhat left in political terms. Of the group members, 47% had partly or wholly completed a bachelor degree, with 18% possessing part or completed a Masters or PhD degree, and the remaining 35% obtaining vocational education qualifications. Sixty-five per cent of the sample indicated no religious affiliation, followed by 35% identifying as Christian. In comparison to the study sample, the pilot test group was educated to a higher level, more likely to have a left political preference and were less likely to have any religious affiliation.

The pilot testing revealed errors in question sequence when presented on a computer screen, as well as the need to alter some items to reflect Australian English conventions and gender neutrality. These minor changes are exemplified in the following alteration from: “I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the *"other guy's"* point of view” to “I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the *"other person's"* point of view.

The final survey was distributed to participants via email by the Qualtrics software platform in June 2014. The email included the title of the study and a secure link to the survey website. Question One of the survey contained information traditionally found in the cover letter (see Appendix 1). Participants were informed about the topic of the survey, the researcher contact details and that their anonymous responses may be used in published research. Participants were advised that they

could withdraw their consent at any time during the survey by selecting that they did not wish to continue or merely ceasing participation. Participants were provided with an email address if they desired to contact the researchers regarding the study. The pre-test survey and post-test survey are shown in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 respectively. As per the current Qualtrics licence, the questionnaire was closed after a sample of approximately 150 wholly completed surveys was achieved.

Results

The minor research aim will be addressed first to ensure the dispositional empathy measure, the IRI, is appropriate for use in this sample with the factor structure findings utilised throughout the following analyses. The descriptive statistics are presented to contextualise the data and Independent samples *t*-tests are utilised to compare the perpetrator support to the victim support group. Considering the nature of this research, only participants who supported the victim were included in the subsequent analyses. Relatedness between variables is measured using Pearson's *r* correlation. A hierarchical regression is utilised to establish the most influential variable/s responsible for predicting bystander anti-racist action intention. All tests of significance are evaluated according to a *p*-value of $p < 0.05$. Bootstrapping has been used throughout the analysis in an attempt to minimise bias and normalise the distribution (Field, 2007).

Factor Analysis

The underlying structure of the dispositional empathy measure, the IRI (Davis, 1980), was investigated for use in the Australian social climate using data collected from 156 participants. The questionnaire consists of 4 subscales of 7-items each; Fantasy, Personal Distress, Perspective Taking and Empathetic Concern, each measuring an aspect of dispositional empathy. The domain of each subscale is

strongly established in similar western cultures (Davis, 1980; Pulos, Elison & Lennon, 2004). The predicted four-subscale structure of the IRI will be investigated. To check for subscale uni-dimensionality and to determine that the factors do not cross-load, scale-level factor analysis was preferred over item-level analysis in this case (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Because the scales are correlated, principal component factoring with direct Oblimin rotation was used to conduct the factor analysis. As specified by Field (2007), the delta value remained at zero.

Prior to running the principal component factoring, inspection of the Shapiro-Wilk statistic and visual inspection of the normal Q-Q and detrended Q-Q plots indicated each subscale was normally distributed and no violations of linearity were found. Two factors (with Eigenvalues exceeding 1) were identified as underlying the 4 subscale, 28-item questionnaire (see Table 2). This suggests the four subscales are not uni-dimensional in nature and share considerable variance. In total, the two factors accounted for 75.66% of the variance in the questionnaire data.

Table 2

Direct Oblimin Rotated Factor Structure of the 28-item, 4-subscale Interpersonal Reactivity Index Questionnaire

Subscale	Loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
1. Fantasy		.673
2. Personal Distress		.902
3. Perspective Taking	.901	
4. Empathetic Concern	.840	
Percentage of Variance	45.72%	29.94%

Consequently, in all future analysis, the Fantasy and Personal Distress subscales were combined to form the *Fantasy-Personal Distress* subscale, and the Empathetic Concern and Perspective Taking subscales were combined to form the *Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking* subscale.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 3. As shown, the reliability is satisfactory for all scales as $\alpha > .80$ (Field, 2007). All scales remained as initially proposed, as scale reliabilities did not increase substantially with any item removal. The perpetrator support group consisted of 36 participants and the victim support group consisted of 120 participants. As shown below, the victim support group scored consistently higher than the perpetrator support group on all variables except for Dispositional Efficacy, where both groups obtained a similar mean score.

Table 3

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

	M(SD)		Range	Items	α
	Victim	Perpetrator			
	Support	Support			
Dispositional Empathy					
Empathetic Concern-	5.16 (.70)	4.89 (.66)	1 - 7	14	.82
Perspective Taking					
Fantasy-Personal Distress	3.95 (.87)	3.90 (.62)	1 - 7	14	.81
Indigenous Empathy	4.40 (1.13)	3.24 (1.22)	1 - 7	5	.83
Dispositional Self-Efficacy	3.77 (.65)	3.78 (.62)	1 - 5	8	.92
Situational Bystander Efficacy					
Intervention Opportunity	3.99 (.68)	3.43 (.81)	1 - 5	4	.82
Proactive Opportunity	2.47 (.81)	1.95 (.84)	1 - 5	4	.80
Likelihood of Action	5.10 (1.39)	3.86 (1.57)	1 - 7	1	

Assumptions

Prior to conducting the *t*-tests, a comparison of both the perpetrator support group and the victim support group in terms of likelihood of action was required. Normality of the sample was tested and the Shapiro-Wilk statistic revealed the perpetrator support group was normally distributed ($S-W = .95$, $df = 36$, $p = .084$), while the victim support group was not ($S-W = .91$, $df = 120$, $p < .001$). Due to this violation nonparametric tests were carried out to compare the groups.

Nonparametric Tests

An independent-samples median test was used to compare the victim support group with the perpetrator support group on the median value of likelihood of bystander action. The independent-samples median test revealed likelihood of action was significantly higher for those supporting the victim compared with those supporting the perpetrator, *test statistic* = 9.85, *df* = 1, *p* = .003. An independent-samples Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to compare the distribution of both groups. This test also confirmed the group distributions were significantly different, with the likelihood of action in the victim support group (*mean rank* = 86.79) significantly higher compared to the perpetrator support group (*mean rank* = 50.86), *U* = 1165.00, *z* = -4.271, *p* < .001, *r* = -.34. Although this is a moderate effect size (Cohen, 1988), both the independent-samples median test and independent samples Mann-Whitney *U* test indicate those who supported the victim were more likely to speak up compared to those who supported the perpetrator.

Correlations

Prior to the correlation analysis the appropriate assumptions were checked. The assumptions of normality and independence were met by the large sample size of the collected data and the restriction of only one survey submission per participant (Field, 2007). Inspection of the relevant scatterplots revealed the data did not violate the assumptions of linearity or homoscedasticity.

As shown below, Table 4 reflects the calculated bootstrapped bivariate Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient (*r*) indicating the size and direction between all continuous linear predictor variables. As gender is dichotomous, a point-biserial correlation was alternatively conducted to measure this variable. As per Cohen's effect size conventions, *r* = .1 indicates a small effect size,

$r = .3$ indicates a medium effect size and $r = .5$ indicates a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). Significant positive correlations indicated likelihood of bystander action was weakly correlated with Bystander Proactive Opportunity, moderately correlated with Indigenous Empathy and Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking, and strongly correlated with Bystander Intervention Opportunity. No demographic variables were revealed as significantly related to bystander action intention in the hypothetical bystander scenario.

Table 4

Pearson r Intercorrelations of All Predictor Variables with 95% Confidence Intervals Noted

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Likelihood of action	-										
2. Indigenous Empathy	.30** [.10, .50]	-									
3. Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking	.36** [.20, .50]	.46** [.30, .59]	-								
4. Fantasy and Personal-Distress	.13 [-.06, .31]	.27** [.11, .42]	.25** [.02, .44]	-							
5. Dispositional Self-Efficacy	.17 [-.05, .39]	-.02 [-.23, .20]	.34** [.19, .48]	-.33** [-.51, -.15]	-						
6. Bystander Intervention Opportunity	.50** [.37, .63]	.45** [.26, .60]	.39** [.22, .53]	.11 [-.07, .27]	.14 [-.07, -.35]	-					
7. Bystander Proactive Opportunity	.29** [.13, .45]	.67** [.57, .76]	.35** [.19, .49]	.16 [-.05, .37]	.12 [-.06, .30]	.47** [.32, .59]	-				
8. Age ^a	.05 [-.17, .26]	.02 [-.17, .21]	.12 [-.07, .30]	-.33** [-.49, -.18]	.19* [-.01, .36]	.05 [-.15, .22]	-.03 [-.23, .16]	-			
9. Gender	.18 [.00, .35]	.06 [-.12, .24]	.11 [-.08, .29]	.30** [.13, .46]	-.18 [-.33, -.00]	.05 [-.13, .23]	.07 [-.10, .24]	-.25** [-.42, -.06]	-		
10. Political Preference ^o	-.04 [-.29, .17]	-.15 [-.38, .06]	-.05 [-.22, .13]	-.15 [-.33, .03]	.16 [-.05, .35]	-.14 [-.34, .04]	-.14 [-.33, .05]	.35** [.13, .55]	-.01 [-.20, .19]	-	
11. Education	-.01 [-.17, .16]	.13 [-.05, .31]	.17 [-.00, .33]	-.08 [-.25, .08]	.25** [.07, .41]	.28** [.08, .45]	.19** [.03, .36]	-.06 [-.23, .12]	-.02 [-.21, .16]	-.12 [-.33, .09]	-

Note: * $p < .05$ ^a indicates sample size of 119
 ** $p < .01$ ^o indicates sample size of 98

Regression

A hierarchical regression was employed to determine the most significant predictors of bystander action intention in the hypothetical scenario. As per hierarchical regression conventions purported by Howell (2010), the variables that needed to be controlled were entered into the hierarchical regression model at Step 1, followed by the remaining variables at Step 2. As no demographic variables were significant in the correlation analysis, the regression only involved the dispositional and situational measures of empathy and efficacy. In accordance with Identity Theory, bystander action requires synergy between the dispositional factors relating to ones Ideal Self, and situational factors relating to ones Situational Self (Burke & Stets, 2009). The dispositional variables of dispositional empathy (Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking and Fantasy-Personal Distress) and Dispositional Efficacy were entered into the regression equation at Step 1. Subsequently, the variables related to the Situational Self: Indigenous Empathy, Bystander Intervention Opportunity and Bystander Proactive Opportunity, were entered at Step 2.

A number of assumptions were assessed before the results were interpreted. It was important that the sample size comprised an adequate ratio of cases to predictor variables. As there are six predictor variables in this study, the number of cases should exceed 98 for a reliable regression ($50 + 8k$; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As there are six variables and 120 cases, this assumption was not violated. The assumption of variable normality was determined as met in relation to the large sample size and each variable being continuous in nature (Field, 2007).

The residuals were checked for linearity, error distribution, homoscedasticity and independence. Visual inspection of the normal P-P plot of standardised regression indicated a slight pattern in the data. However, bootstrapping has been

employed to address this violation. The scatterplot of standardised residuals revealed the data met the assumptions of homoscedasticity and linearity. The independence of errors was evaluated by the computed Durbin-Watson statistic ($D-W = 2.26$). As this value was deemed acceptable (Field, 2007), the data were considered to have met the assumption of independent errors.

Using Mahalanobis distance and Cook's distance the data was screened for significant outliers. While the Mahalanobis distance of some cases did exceed the critical χ^2 for $df = 6$ (at $\alpha = .01$) of 16.81, their corresponding Cook's distance was less than 1, indicating they did not significantly impact the regression analysis (Stevens, 2002). From these values it can be assumed multivariate outliers were not a concern.

Finally, multicollinearity diagnostics revealed Variance Inflation Factor values of less than 10 with the average value not substantially greater than 1. As tolerance values were also well above .20, this indicated that multicollinearity would not impact the interpretations of the hierarchical regression analysis (Bowerman & O'Connell, 1990).

As shown by Table 5, at Step 1 of the hierarchical regression, Generalised Self-Efficacy, Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking and Fantasy-Personal Distress accounted for a significant 14% of the variance in likelihood of bystander action, $F(3, 116) = 6.05, p = .001, R^2 = .14$. At Step 2 of the hierarchical regression Bystander Intervention Opportunity, Bystander Proactive Opportunity and Indigenous Empathy were added to the regression equation and accounted for an additional significant 16% of the variance in bystander action, $\Delta F(3, 113) = 8.38, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .16$. In combination, the six predictor variables explained 30% of the variance in bystander action, $F(6, 113) = 7.79, p < .001, R^2 = .30, \text{adjusted } R^2 = .26$.

By Cohen's (1988) conventions, a combined effect of this size can be considered large ($f^2 = .41$). A post-hoc power analysis was conducted utilising the G*Power software package (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang & Buchner, 2007) with $N = 120$, $p = .05$ and the previously established effect size of $f^2 = .41$. This analysis indicates the statistical power for the study was large at .71 (Cohen, 1988), with the power exceeding .99. Considering convention indicates power should exceed .80 (Field, 2007), it is safe to assume this study adequately detected the existing effect. As highlighted below, taking into account shared variance, the most influential predictor of bystander anti-racist action intention in the final regression model was Bystander Intervention Opportunity.

Table 5

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Bystander Anti-Racist Action from Dispositional and Situational Factors of Empathy and Efficacy

Predictor	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.14**	
Generalised Efficacy		.10
Empathetic Concern and Perspective Taking		.30**
Fantasy and Personal Distress		.09
Step 2	.16**	
Generalised Efficacy		.10
Empathetic Concern and Perspective Taking		.13
Fantasy and Personal Distress		.08
Indigenous Empathy		.04
Bystander Intervention Opportunity		.42**
Bystander Proactive Opportunity		.00
Total R ²	.30**	
<i>n</i>	120	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

It should be noted Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking was the only significant predictor at Step 1; however, this was not a significant predictor at Step 2. It is assumed the variables entered at Step 2 are responsible for accounting for the significant variance explained by Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking at Step 1.

Discussion

Utilising Identity Theory as a framework, the central aim of this research was to investigate the most significant predictors of bystander anti-racist intention to act. Based both on Identity Theory and past research, it was hypothesised that situational bystander efficacy (Bystander Intervention Opportunity and Bystander Proactive Opportunity) and Indigenous empathy would be more predictive of bystander action intention than dispositional empathy (Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking and Fantasy-Personal Distress) and dispositional efficacy. This hypothesis was found to be partly supported with the measure Bystander Intervention Opportunity as the most predictive of bystander action intention after accounting for shared variance. The second hypothesis pertained to the specific demographic factors of female gender, older, highly educated and left political preferences predicting bystander intention to act. This hypothesis was not supported with no demographic variables positively associated with bystander action.

Additionally, a minor aim of this research was to investigate the use of the dispositional empathy measure, the IRI (Davis, 1980) in an Australian adult sample. Factor analysis revealed a two factor structure comprising of the Fantasy and Personal Distress subscales and the Perspective-Taking and Empathetic Concern subscales. This does not replicate the expected four-factor structure of dispositional empathy, and is not consistent with the cognitive empathy (Fantasy and Perspective Taking) and affective empathy (Perspective Taking and Empathetic Concern) model proposed by Davis (1980). However, considering the new factor structure and the associated high internal reliability obtained, this new structure provides greater reliability compared to previous four-subscale measures (Davis, 1980).

Hypothesis 1: Indigenous Empathy and Situational Bystander Efficacy are more Predictive of Bystander Action compared to Dispositional Empathy and Self-Efficacy.

Dispositional Empathy and Indigenous Empathy.

As per Identity Theory, it was expected that the Situational Self indicator of Indigenous Empathy would be more predictive of bystander action when compared to the Ideal Self determinant of dispositional empathy. Both dispositional empathy (Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking subscale) and Indigenous Empathy were moderately positively correlated with bystander anti-racist action. Consistent with Identity Theory, individuals with high dispositional empathy were more likely to identify with the identity role of the active bystander, and hence were primed to act (Burke & Stets, 2009). In line with this finding, high dispositional empathy has previously been found to correlate positively with high tolerance (Butrus & Witenberg, 2012) and reduced negative attitudes towards minority groups (Pedersen et al, 2004). It is interesting to note the other dispositional empathy measure (Fantasy-Personal Distress) was not related to bystander anti-racist action. As the situation in the present study was representative of a safe, low-risk scenario, it is possible this scenario was too irrelevant to the Fantasy-Personal Distress construct to be of significance.

In line with the Situational Self of Identity Theory, behaviour will only occur if the situation is conducive to promoting action. Specific empathy towards Indigenous Australians is a situational specific construct that has been previously found to be important not only in reducing negative attitudes (Pedersen et al., 2004), but also in promoting bystander action intention (Neto & Pedersen, 2013).

Consistent with these past findings, Indigenous Empathy was moderately positively related to the likelihood of bystander anti-racist intention to act.

When comparing the predictive utility of dispositional empathy and situational specific Indigenous Empathy in bystander anti-racist action, it is interesting to note the relationship was not found to be as expected. As Identity Theory proposes situational factors are essential for an individual to identify and enact their role identity, it was predicted that situational specific Indigenous Empathy would be more predictive than Dispositional Empathy. Contrary to this proposed relationship, the Empathetic Concern-Perspective Taking measure was significantly predictive at Step 1 of the regression equation, but not on Step 2 when the additional situational variables were added. This is inconsistent with the literature, as Pedersen and colleagues (2004) and Pedersen & Neto (2013) report specific empathy as an important predictor in bystander action. As individuals completed this measure before addressing the scenario, it may be possible survey order effects confounded the result. Individuals may not feel empathy towards Indigenous Australians when asked out of context of the bystander situation. However, when presented with a situation of discrimination, they may feel compelled to act on the victim's behalf. Further research into this finding is required to investigate the reported relationship between Indigenous Empathy and bystander intention to act.

Dispositional Efficacy and Bystander Efficacy.

Concurrent with Identity Theory, it is assumed an individual will take on an identity in which they feel most efficacious (Burke & Stets, 2009). If an individual's Ideal Self already possesses high-perceived Dispositional Efficacy, they are more likely to attempt unfamiliar and difficult tasks (Burke & Stets, 2009). However,

certain situational factors are still required for the behaviour to occur. To the author's knowledge, bystander efficacy as related to bystander anti-racism is currently non-existent in the Australian anti-racist bystander action literature. Surprisingly, dispositional efficacy was not significantly related to bystander anti-racist intention to act. Previous research regarding the construct of Dispositional Efficacy suggests those with perceived high Dispositional Efficacy believe they are capable of meeting the demands of any environment of which they are a part (Chen et al., 2001). Unpublished research conducted by Howley and Pedersen (2006) indicates dispositional efficacy is a predictor of helping behaviours and thus this facilitates bystander action. This relationship is replicated in the anti-bullying literature, with the central finding that children with high-perceived dispositional efficacy are more likely to intervene in support of the bullied victim (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). Whilst these findings do exist, Bandura's (2006) research holds an alternative view, reporting that dispositional efficacy should always be considered specifically to the domain in question. It is possible that the Dispositional Efficacy scale used in the current research was too broad and did not correctly measure the construct in question.

As Identity Theory purports that the activation of an identity role is reliant on the Situational Self and external situational factors, situational Bystander Efficacy was anticipated to be more predictive of bystander action than Dispositional Efficacy. Based on Banyard and colleagues' (2007) finding that increased bystander efficacy predicts bystander action in cases of sexual assault the current research investigated this relationship in an Australian Indigenous anti-racist context. It was found that increased bystander efficacy was positively correlated with bystander anti-racist action intention in support of Indigenous Australians; with Bystander

Intervention Opportunity largely correlated and Bystander Proactive Opportunity moderately correlated with the likelihood of bystander action. Although this finding is novel, it replicates the initial relationship found by Banyard and colleagues (2007).

No evidenced research currently compares the predictive utility of dispositional efficacy and situational Bystander Efficacy. The regression analysis implicated Bystander Intervention Opportunity as the most influential predictor of bystander anti-racism in the hypothetical low-risk scenario. Whilst this research is novel, the measure has been previously utilised as an indicator of self-perceived ability to positively intervene as a bystander in an instance of sexual assault (McMahon et al., 2014). The present measure indicates a participant's perceived ability as a bystander to intervene in an immediate situation of racism. The current finding is consistent with the sexual assault literature, which reports that higher levels of perceived bystander efficacy is predictive of bystander action (Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard, et al., 2014; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfield, Hill, & Shelley-Tremblay, 2011).

The situational Bystander Proactive Opportunity construct did not predict the likelihood of bystander anti-racist action. In accordance with Identity Theory, this is also an unusual finding. This subscale indicates opportunities taken by the individual to engage in proactive learning activities about Indigenous Australians. An item such as "I have taken a class to learn more about Indigenous Australians" indicates previous exposure to Indigenous Australian culture. The finding that this was not predictive of bystander likelihood of action was not expected. It is assumed learning about Indigenous Australians may affect one's Ideal Self in terms of advancing one's knowledge about Indigenous Australians and potentially prompting advocacy for equal rights, and hence bystander action. Furthermore, participation in learning

activities may have an impact on individual's Situational Self by providing them with the necessary information and confidence to enact the anti-racist bystander identity role. On face value this finding may indicate that knowledge possessed about Indigenous Australians is not important in predicting bystander action. Rather, this may indeed be a reflection of the type and manner in which non-Indigenous Australians learn about Indigenous Australia throughout their formal education in both school and tertiary institutions. Although the sample is comparatively representative on most socio-demographic determinants, it is possible that this finding is related to the lack of exposure of the current undereducated sample to such learning opportunities.

Hypothesis 2: Specific socio-determinants will predict bystander action.

It was hypothesised that participants who were female, older, highly educated and with left political affiliation would be inclined to engage in bystander action. Interestingly, there were no socio-demographic variables that predicted bystander anti-racist action in this low-risk scenario. Whilst some research does report significant involvement of socio-demographics and bystander action, the effect size is generally small (Pedersen et al., 2004). Previous research conducted by Neto and Pedersen (2013), Redmond and colleagues (in press), and Russell and colleagues (2013) found significant correlations with female gender and bystander action. The present research findings of the null result are consistent with the research conducted by Stewart and colleagues (2014) reporting that gender is not influential in predicting bystander anti-racist action intention. Research concerning gender-role identification and bystander action reports highly gender-identified individuals are more likely to engage in bystander action (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012). In the case of the present study, it may be possible that sample participants did not strongly

identify with their gender-role prescriptions, and therefore did not feel compelled to engage in bystander anti-racist action.

Age did not significantly impact on bystander anti-racist action. Some studies have reported older participants are more likely to engage in bystander action (Neto & Pedersen, 2013; Russell et al., 2013). However, this is not often widely reported. Other research reports older age increases negative attitudes towards Indigenous Australians (Pedersen et al., 2004), and that age is not a significant factor in promoting bystander action (Redmond et al., in press).

It was unusual that the level of formal education was not significantly correlated with bystander anti-racist action. Increased education is related to more positive attitudes towards Indigenous Australians (Pedersen et al., 2004) and greater levels of tolerance (Paradies et al., 2009), which in turn can predict bystander anti-racist action (Russell et al., 2013). As the present sample had obtained lower levels of formal education compared to the wider Australian population (ABS, 2011), this may explain why formal education was not influential in predicting bystander anti-racist action in this study.

In the current study political affiliation was also not predictive of bystander anti-racist action. Previous research suggests right-wing political affiliation is related to elevated prejudicial beliefs (Pedersen & Hartley, 2012). This in turn decreases the likelihood of bystander action (Neto & Pedersen, 2013; Stewart, 2012). However, as political preference is not a robust predictor of action, the current finding of the null result is consistent with Redmond and colleagues (in press).

Research Aim: Appropriateness of Dispositional Empathy Measure in Australia.

The IRI did not display the same four-factor structure consistent with Davis (1980) predictions. To the researcher's knowledge, this measure has only been used twice in an Australian context, once with children (Garton & Gringart, 2005) and once with violent offenders (Beven et al., 2004). Davis (1980) constructed this dispositional measure to indicate cognitive empathy, measured by the Fantasy and Perspective-Taking subscales, and affective empathy, measured by the Empathetic Concern and Personal Distress subscales. Potential reasons for this alternative factor structure may include an inability of participants to fully understand items due to a lack of verbal comprehension skills (Bevan, O'Brien-Malone, & Hall, 2004). For example, Perspective Taking items such as "Before criticising somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place" and Empathetic Concern items like "When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them" may have been viewed as similar by some participants. Literacy skills were assumed, however, due to the demographics of the sample, lower than average rates of participant education may have produced confounded results (ABS, 2011). Similar to the previous research of the IRI in Australia (Bevan, O'Brien-Malone, & Hall, 2004; Garton & Gringart, 2005), this Index did not replicate the four-factor structure as initially predicted by Davis (1980). As Davis (1980) does not specify the education level of the sample used in the development of the IRI, inferences about the influence of education on factor structure cannot be made. Future research is required to further investigate the generalisability of the new two-factor structured IRI as used in an Australian context.

Practical Implications

The current research has significant theoretical implications for the bystander anti-racist action literature and also practical implications for Indigenous Australians who regularly experience racism. The present research is novel in Australia and therefore is important in advancing this literature. The finding that bystander efficacy is a significant predictor of bystander anti-racist action is a primary indicator establishing an urgent need for bystander action training programs in Australia. There are a number of programs that currently focus on creating positive intergroup contact situations. In particular they teach education, awareness raising, media literacy and peace and conflict resolution skills (Paradies et al., 2009). However, none of these programs teach bystander action skills specific to instances of racism. Many bystander action training programs are successfully teaching bystander intervention strategies to prevent sexual assault in American universities (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2011). These programs could be adapted for use in an Australian anti-racism context and implemented in educational institutions to increase general levels of bystander efficacy in society.

Increases in general levels of bystander efficacy within the population have been supported in this study to positively increase instances of bystander anti-racist action. Previous research suggests confronting the individual committing a racist act in a safe environment positively affects the bystander, victim and perpetrator (Levine & Crowther, 2008). Specifically, spontaneous helping has been shown to increase psychological well-being in both the bystander and victim (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Furthermore, bystander confrontation has also been shown to elicit guilt in the perpetrator, which has the powerful implication of reducing future discriminatory behaviours (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

There are a number of potential methodological limitations of the present study. The implications of these limitations are individually addressed with consequential future research directions. Firstly, identified as the intention-behaviour gap (Sniehotta, Scholz & Schwarzer, 2005), there is a known discrepancy between bystander action as indicated in research scenarios and bystander action in real life instances of racism (Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, 2012). As found by Mansouri and colleagues (2009), immediate effects associated with racism can include emotional responses such as feelings of anxiety, anger and sadness. Whilst research into this area is needed, there are extensive ethical and moral implications of exposing participants to such negative emotional effects in the name of research. Although this limitation may be difficult to address, future research designs may consider utilising a virtual diary study in which an individual's intention to act is determined by an initial questionnaire, which is in turn compared to reported bystander action behaviours.

As this research is primarily interested in measuring a large community sample of participant attitudes towards a construct, self-report measures utilising Likert-scale responses are an appropriate method of assessment due to their administration ease (Wakita et al., 2012). However, this method is known to have associated biases. The acquiescence response bias refers to the inclination of participants to respond more positively to positively-worded items (Smith, 2004). This can be addressed by negatively wording the items. Whilst the present study did include some such items, future research utilising self-report measures should include equal numbers of positively and negatively worded items to help accommodate for this bias.

Taking into consideration these limitations and future research directions, there is potential to extend this study to include an aspect of qualitative data collection. From the perspective of a community psychologist, qualitative data is advantageous as it allows the research to be situated in the social context. In this area, qualitative data may provide insight into the experience of racism as a bystander. In combination with quantitative findings, this would allow the researcher to triangulate the quantitative data and gain greater insight into participant perceptions of enacting the active bystander identity role.

Conclusion

Using Identity Theory as a theoretical framework, the present study has investigated the factors pertaining to the Ideal Self: dispositional empathy and Self-Efficacy; and factors related to the Situational Self: Dispositional Self-Efficacy and Situational Bystander Efficacy, in order to determine the most significant predictors of bystander anti-racist action. Bystander Intervention Opportunity was the most influential predictor of bystander anti-racist action in the current study's low-risk scenario. The inclusion of the bystander efficacy variable is novel in the bystander anti-racist action on behalf of Indigenous Australians literature. This study provides considerable insight into the importance of individuals identifying with the self-perceived ability as a bystander to positively impact on a situation in an instance of racism. Considering the predictive utility of the Bystander Intervention Opportunity measure, this research highlights the overarching need to increase individual bystander efficacy in society.

The negative impact associated with racial discrimination toward Indigenous Australians is considerable. Increased rates of mental illness, suicide and substance abuse have all been found to be related to race-based discrimination (ABS, 2010;

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2011; Paradies et al., 2008).

Acknowledging that bystander action can reduce future instances of prejudice (Czopp & Monteith, 2003), the current research implicating bystander efficacy as a predictor of action is important. The present study has great potential to inform bystander anti-racist action training programs in an overall effort to reduce the prevalence of racism towards Indigenous Australians in society.

References

- Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K., & Rapley, M. (1999). Genocide or failure to gel? Racism, history and nationalism in Australian talk. *Discourse and Society*, 10(3), 351-378. doi:10.1177/0957926599010003004
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2006). *Population Characteristics, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians* (Catalogue No. 4713.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/7B81E2576DEE6160CA2578DB00283CC0?opendocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2010a). *The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples* (Catalogue No. 4704.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/lookup/4704.0Chapter715Oct+2010>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2010b). *Suicides Australia – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Suicide Deaths* (Catalogue No. 3309.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/3309.0~2010~Chapter~Aboriginal+and+Torres+Strait+Islander+suicide+deaths?OpenDocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2011). *2011 Census Community Profiles – Basic Community Profiles*. Retrieved from http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2011/communityprofile/0?opendocument&navpos=220
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2013). *Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey: First Results, Australia, 2012-13* (Catalogue No. 4727.0.55.001). Retrieved from

<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/BA9A277C6C6E4C0DCA257C2F001459DF?opendocument>

Australian Government, Department of Social Services. (2013). *Closing the Gap: Prime Minister's Report*. Retrieved from http://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/02_2013/00313-ctg-report_accessible11.pdf

Australian Government. (1967). Referendum, 1967: Constitution alteration. Series Number A406, E1967/30. Retrieved from <http://recordsearch.naa.gov.au/scripts/Imagine.asp?B=7001316>

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2011). *The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, an Overview 2011*. Cat. No. IHW 42. Canberra: AIHW. Retrieved from <http://www.aihw.gov.au/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=10737418955>

Australian Psychological Society. (2007). *Code of Ethics*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/APS-Code-of-Ethics.pdf>

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Banyard, V. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, 23(1), 83-97. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83 83

Banyard, V., Moynihan, M., & Plante, E. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(4), 463-481. doi:10.1002/jcop.20159

- Banyard, V., Moynihan, M., Cares, A., & Warner, R. (2014). Do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(1), 101-115. doi:10.1037/a0033470
- Banyard, V., Plante, E., & Moynihan, M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 61-79. doi:10.1002/jcop.10078
- Baumert, A., Halmburger, A., Schmitt, M. (2013). Interventions against norm violations: Dispositional determinants of self-reported and real moral courage. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(8), 1053 –1068. doi:10.1177/0146167213490032
- Beven, J., O'Brien-Malone, & Hall, G. (2004). Using the Interpersonal Reactivity Index to assess empathy in violent offenders. *International Journal of Forensic Psychology, 1*(2), 33-41. Retrieved from <http://www.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@health/documents/doc/uow045072.pdf>
- Beyond Blue, Australia. (2014). *Stop Think Respect – The Invisible Discriminator Campaign resources* [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.beyondblue.org.au/resources/for-me/stop-think-respect-home/the-invisible-discriminator>
- Bowerman, B., & O'Connell, R. (1990). *Linear Statistical Models: An Applied Approach* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Duxbury.
- Burke, P., & Stets, J. (2009). *Identity Theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Butrus, N., & Witenberg, R. (2013). Some personality predictors of tolerance to human diversity: The roles of openness, agreeableness and empathy. *Australian Psychologist, 48*, 290-298. doi:10.1111/j.1742-9544.2012.00081.x
- Carter, M. (2013). Advancing Identity Theory: Examining the relationship between activated identities and behavior in different social contexts. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 76*(3), 203-223. doi:10.1177/0190272513493095
- Chen, G., Gully, S. T., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*(1), 62-83.
doi:10.1177/109442810141004
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (Cth). Retrieved from http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Senate/Powers_practice_n_procedures/~link.aspx?_id=AE5927DE2F0148F2B8B701857EBEB2F3&_z=z
- Czopp, A., & Monteith, M. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personal and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(4), 532-544. doi:10.1177/0146167202250923
- Czopp, A., Monteith, M., & Mark, A. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-903.
- Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*, 85-104.
- Dunn, K. & Forrest, J. (2004). Constructing racism in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 39*(4), 409-430.

- Duron, R., Limbach, B., & Waugh, W. (2006). Critical thinking framework for any discipline. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(2), 160-166. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE55.pdf>
- Eagly, A., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behaviours: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 283-308. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.100.3.283
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146
- Fernández, A. M., Dufey, M., & U., Kramp. (2011). Testing the psychometric properties of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) in Chile: Empathy in a different cultural context. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 27(3), 179-185. doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000065
- Field, A. (2007). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM Statistics*. (4th ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Foote, N. (1951). Identification as the basis for a theory of motivation. *American Sociological Review* 26, 14–21.
- Garton, A., & Gringart, E. (2005). The development of a scale to measure empathy in 8- and 9-year olds. *Journal of Education and Developmental Psychology*, 5, 17-25. Retrieved from

http://www.newcastle.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/100394/v5-garton-gringart.pdf

Gilet, A-L., Mella, N., Studer, J., Grünh, D., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2013). Assessing dispositional empathy in Adults: A French validation of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI). *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 45(1), 42-48. doi:10.1037/a0030425

Good, J., Moss-Racusin, C., & Sanchez, D. (2012). When do we confront? Perceptions of costs and benefits predict confronting discrimination on behalf of the self and others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(2), 210-236. doi:10.1177/0361684312440958

Hardy, S. (2006). Identity, reasoning, and emotion: An empirical comparison of three sources of moral motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30(3), 205-213. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9034-9

Hodson, G., & Busseri, M. (2012). Bright minds and Dark attitudes: Lower cognitive ability predicts greater prejudice through right-wing ideology and low intergroup contact. *Psychological Science*, 23(2), 187 –195. doi:10.1177/0956797611421206

Howell, D. (2010). *Statistical Methods for Psychology* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Howley, M., & Pedersen, A. (2006). *To Help or Not to Help? The Effects of Efficacy Beliefs and Consequences of Helping on the Attributional Model of Motivational Behaviour* (Unpublished Honours Thesis). Murdoch University, Western Australia

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Foubert, J., Brasfield, H., Hill, B., & Shelley-Temblay, S. (2011). The Men's Program: Does it impact college men's self-reported

bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 743-759. doi:10.1177/1077801211409728

Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1429-1439. doi:10.1037/a0012634

Lodge, J., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). The role of peer bystanders in school bullying: Positive steps toward promoting peaceful schools. *Theory into Practice*, 44(4), 329-336. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4404_6

Lukes, S. (2003). Epilogue: The Grand Dichotomy of the Twentieth Century [Online]. In T. Ball and R. Bellamy (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Political Thought* (pp. 602-626). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/244/cup.pdf>

Mansouri, F., Jenkins, L., Morgan, L. & Taouk, M. (2009), *The Impact of Racism Upon the Health and Wellbeing of Young Australians*. Settlement Council of Australia, Surry Hills, N.S.W. Retrieved from <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30021686>

McCall, G., & Simmons, J. (1978). *Identities and Interactions*. New York, NY: Free Press.

McMahon, S., Allen, C., Postmus, J., McMahon, S., Peterson, A., & Lowe Hoffman, M. (2014). Measuring bystander attitudes and behaviour to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(1), 58-66. doi:10.1080/07448481.2013.849258

McMahon, S., Postmus, J., & Koenick, R. (2011) Conceptualising the engaging bystander approach to sexual violence prevention on college campuses.

Journal of College Student Development, 52(1), 115-130.

doi:10.1353/csd.2011.0002

- Monteith, M. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 469-485.
- National Centre of Indigenous Excellence. (2013). *Recognise This: Indigenous Youth Report on Constitutional Recognition* [online]. Retrieved from http://recognisethis.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/RECOGNISE_THISYouth-Report_Online.pdf
- 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*. Carlton, Victoria: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (2005). *Community Psychology: In Pursuit of Liberation and Well-Being*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- 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), 263-283. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01274.x
- Neto, Y., & Pedersen, A. (2013). No Time Like The Present: Determinants Of Intentions To Engage In Bystander Anti-Racism On Behalf Of Indigenous Australians. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 7(1), 36-49. doi:10.1017/prp.2013.4
- Ng, J., & Earl, J. (2008). Accuracy in self-assessment: The role of ability, feedback, self-efficacy and goal orientation. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 17(3), 39-50.

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York:

McGraw Hill.

Paradies, Y., Chandrakumar, L., Klocker, N., Frere, M., Webster, K., Burrell, M., &

McLean, P. (2009). *Building on our strengths: a framework to reduce race-based discrimination and support diversity in Victoria*. Full report, Victorian

Health Promotion Foundation, Melbourne. Retrieved from

[http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ProgramsandProjects/Publications/](http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ProgramsandProjects/Publications/Attachments/Building%20on%20our%20strengths%20-%20full%20report%20v2.ashx)

[Attachments/Building%20on%20our%20strengths%20-](http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ProgramsandProjects/Publications/Attachments/Building%20on%20our%20strengths%20-%20full%20report%20v2.ashx)

[%20full%20report%20v2.ashx](http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ProgramsandProjects/Publications/Attachments/Building%20on%20our%20strengths%20-%20full%20report%20v2.ashx)

Paradies, Y., Harris, R., & Anderson, I. (2008). *The impact of racism on Indigenous*

health in Australia and Aotearoa: Towards a research agenda. Discussion

Paper No. 4, Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal Health, Darwin.

Retrieved from

<http://www.aihw.gov.au/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6442458717>

Pearson, N. (2012). A letter to the Australian people [online]. In P. Dodson & M.

Leibler [Co-Chairs] *Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander*

Peoples in the Constitution: Report of the Expert Panel. Canberra:

Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved from

[http://www.recognise.org.au/uploads/assets/3446%20FaHCSIA%](http://www.recognise.org.au/uploads/assets/3446%20FaHCSIA%20ICR%20report_text_Bookmarked%20PDF%2012%20Jan%20v4.pdf)

[20ICR%20report_text_Bookmarked%20PDF%2012%20Jan%20v4.pdf](http://www.recognise.org.au/uploads/assets/3446%20FaHCSIA%20ICR%20report_text_Bookmarked%20PDF%2012%20Jan%20v4.pdf)

Pedersen, A., & Hartley, L. (2012). Prejudice Against Muslim Australians: The Role

of Values, Gender and Consensus. *Journal of Community & Applied Social*

Psychology, 22, 239–255. doi:10.1002/casp.1110

- Pedersen, A., Bevan, J., Walker, I., & Griffiths, B. (2004). Attitudes towards Indigenous Australians: The role of empathy and guilt. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 233-249. doi: 10.1002/casp.771
- Pedersen, A., Paradies, Y., Hartley, L., & Dunn, K. (2011). Bystander antiprejudice: Cross-cultural education, links with positivity towards cultural 'outgroups' and preparedness to speak out. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology, 1*, 19–30.
- Pennay D., & Powell A. (2012). *The role of bystander knowledge, attitudes and behaviours in preventing violence against women: A full technical report*. The Social Research Centre, Melbourne, Victoria: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ResourceCentre/PublicationsandResources/PVAW/Bystander/The-role-of-bystanders_PVAW_Technical%20report_FINAL_WEB.ashx
- Pulos, S., Elison, R., & Lennon, R. (2004). The hierarchical structure of the interpersonal reactivity index. *Social Behaviour and Personality, 32*(4), 355-360. doi:10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.355
- Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth) No. 52. Retrieved from <http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2014C00014>
- Redmond, J., Pedersen, A., & Paradies, Y. (in press). Psychosocial predictors of anti-racist bystander action towards Indigenous Australians. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*.
- Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. *Educational Psychology, 26*(3), 425-440. doi:10.1080/01443410500342047

- Russell Z., Pennay D., Webster K., & Paradies Y. (2013). *Choosing to act: Bystander action to prevent race-based discrimination and support cultural diversity in the Victorian community*. Melbourne: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Sanson, A., Augoustinos, M., Gridley, H., Kyrios, M., Reser, J., & Turner, C. (1997). *Racism and Prejudice – Psychological perspectives Position Paper*. Melbourne, Victoria: Australian Psychological Society Ltd. Retrieved from <https://www.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/RP-racism.pdf>
- Smith, P. (2004). Acquiescent Response Bias as an Aspect of Cultural Communication Style. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(1), 50-61. doi:10.1177/0022022103260380
- Sniehotta, F., Scholz, U. & Schwarzer, R. (2005). Bridging the intention–behavior gap: Planning, self-efficacy, and action control in the adoption and maintenance of physical exercise. *Psychology and Health* 20(2), 143–160. Retrieved from http://kops.ub.uni-konstanz.de/bitstream/handle/urn:nbn:de:bsz:352-210725/sniehotta_210725.pdf?sequence=3
- Stets, J. & Burke, P. (2000). Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Stets, J., & Carter, M. (2011). The moral self: Applying Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74(2), 192-215. doi:10.1177/0190272511407621
- Stevens, J. (2002). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stewart, K. (2012). Bystander anti-prejudice: Obstacles and enablers to intention to act. (Unpublished Honours Thesis). Murdoch University, Perth, Western

Australia. Retrieved from

<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/11145/2/02Whole.pdf>

- Stewart, K., Pedersen, A., & Paradies, Y. (2014). It's always good to help when possible BUT...: Obstacles to bystander anti-prejudice. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education*, *13*, 39-53.
- Swim, J., Aiken, K. Hall, W., & Hunter, B. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(2), 199-214. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomas, K., Phillips, L., & Brown, S. (1998). Redefining race in the workplace: Insights from Ethnic Identity Theory. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *24*(1), 76-92. doi:10.1177/00957984980241006
- Tsang, S., Hui, E., & Law, B. (2011). Bystander position taking in school bullying: The role of positive identity, self-efficacy and self-determination. *The Scientific World Journal*, *11*, 2278-2286. doi:10.1100/2011/531474
- Victorian Health Promotion Foundation. (2012). *More than ready: Bystander action to prevent violence against women in the Victorian community*. Carlton, Victoria: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~/_media/ResourceCentre/PublicationsandResources/PVAW/Bystander/More-than-ready_Research%20Report_FINAL_WEB.ashx
- Wakita, T., Ueshima, N., & Noguchi, H. (2012). Psychological distance between categories in the Likert Scale: Comparing different numbers of options.

Educational and Psychological Measurement, 72(4), 533–546.

doi:10.1177/0013164411431162

Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(2), 222-244.

doi:10.1037/a0016984

Zhang, J., & Li, Z. (2013). The association between depression and suicide when hopelessness is controlled for. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 54(7), 790-796.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2013.03.004>

Journal of Community Psychology – 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.

Authors are required to follow the APA Publication Guidelines. Authors must state explicitly that appropriate ethical guidelines on human and animal (where applicable) have been followed and that the work was reviewed and approved by an institutional Review Board (IRB) according to NIH regulations relating to research involving human subjects. Authors must also identify any actual or perceived conflicts of interest in their conduct of the research reported in their submission.

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

Participant Cover Letter

Participant Consent

I understand that this is a survey about how I feel about myself generally and my views on Indigenous Australians; it should take around 30 minutes to complete. I agree that by submitting this survey I give my consent for the results to be used in research. I understand that the findings of this study may be published and that no information which can specifically identify me will be published. I am aware that this survey is anonymous and no personal details are being collected or used. I understand that all information being collected will be treated as confidential and will not be released to a third party unless required to do so by law. I know that I may change my mind, withdraw my consent, and stop participating at any time simply by not completing the survey. I acknowledge that once my survey has been submitted, it will no longer be possible to withdraw my data as no individual is identifiable to the researchers.

If you have any questions regarding this study you can contact attitudesurveys@murdoch.edu.au. This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2014/092). 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

I wish to proceed with the survey Yes No

Appendix 2

Pre-Pilot Test Questionnaire

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
 - 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:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Indian
<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander
<input type="checkbox"/> Caucasian/European	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

6. What is your religion?

Buddhist

Christian

Hindu

Jewish

Muslim

No religion

Other _____

SECTION 2**How I feel about myself and towards others:**

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate number on the scale below. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the number on the answer sheet next to the item number.

- 7 = Strongly agree
- 6 = Moderately agree
- 5 = Slightly agree
- 4 = Neither agree or disagree
- 3 = Slightly disagree
- 2 = Moderately disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.
2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view.
4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.
5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.
6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.
7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it.
8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.
11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me.

13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.
14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.
16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.
17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.
18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.
20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.
23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.
24. I tend to lose control during emergencies.
25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while.
26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.
27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.
28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

SECTION 3**What kind of achiever am I?**

The following statements refer to your personal beliefs in your ability to succeed in tasks. Using the scale below, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree.

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.
2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain I will accomplish them.
3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.
4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.
7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.

SECTION 4**How I feel about Indigenous Australians**

The following statements state feelings you may or may not experience in regards to Indigenous Australian's. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your feelings of agreement or disagreement with each item.

- 7 = Strongly agree
- 6 = Moderately agree
- 5 = Slightly agree
- 4 = Neither agree or disagree
- 3 = Slightly disagree
- 2 = Moderately disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

1. I don't have much sympathy for Indigenous Australians.
2. I tend to get more emotionally involved when I think about Indigenous Australian issues.
3. I often feel empathy with Indigenous Australians.
4. I try to understand Indigenous Australian issues by imagining how things look to them.
5. I don't spend a lot of time imagining how I would feel if I were an Indigenous Australian.

SECTION 5 – Part 1
What would you do?

Using the scale below, indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- 5 = Strongly disagree
- 4 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 2 = Agree
- 1 = Strongly agree

1. I would feel comfortable confronting a friend who is being derogatory towards Indigenous Australians.
2. I would feel comfortable confronting a friend if I heard rumours that they were being discriminatory towards Indigenous Australians.
3. I would feel comfortable telling the authorities if I had information on an assault or discrimination case involving Indigenous Australians, even if my friends pressured me not to.
4. If an Indigenous Australian friend asked me to go with them, I would feel comfortable accompanying them to report to the authorities an assault or act of discrimination.
5. I have visited a website and/or social media information page to learn more about Indigenous Australians.
6. I have joined or volunteered with an organization that works to stop discrimination and assault towards Indigenous Australians.
7. I have participated in/ I would feel comfortable participating in a social event (ie. rally) that has been organized to promote Indigenous Australian rights and to stop discrimination.
8. I have taken a class to learn more about Indigenous Australians.

SECTION 5 – Part 2
What would you do?

Scenario:

You are sitting with a group of non-Indigenous friends waiting to be served at a restaurant. A group of Indigenous Australians walk in, wearing t-shirts supporting Indigenous equality and equal rights. As they sit down at the table next to you, an acquaintance you are sitting with whispers loudly so that both tables can hear "Don't they know they have enough rights as it is?! Racism doesn't exist anymore!! They get to eat where ever they want and do whatever they want, and they get government support while the rest of us struggle, isn't that enough?!"

Please mark the box most appropriate to you. Would you be more supportive of:

- Your acquaintances view, OR
- An alternative view?

Which value on the scale below best represents how *likely* you are to speak up in this scenario, either in support of your colleague's view or an alternative view? _____

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

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

Appendix 3

Post-Pilot Survey

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 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
 - 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:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Indian
<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander
<input type="checkbox"/> Caucasian/European	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

6. What is your religion?

Buddhist

Christian

Hindu

Jewish

Muslim

No religion

Other _____

SECTION 2**How I feel about myself and towards others:**

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations.

For each item, please indicate how well it describes you by selecting the appropriate option.

ANSWER SCALE:

- 7 = Strongly agree
- 6 = Moderately agree
- 5 = Slightly agree
- 4 = Neither agree or disagree
- 3 = Slightly disagree
- 2 = Moderately disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

1. I daydream and fantasise, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.
2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view.
4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.
5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.
6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.
7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it.
8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.

11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me.
13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.
14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.
16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.
17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.
18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.
20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.
23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.
24. I tend to lose control during emergencies.
25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.
26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.
27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.
28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

SECTION 3
What kind of achiever am I?

The following statements refer to your personal beliefs in your ability to succeed in tasks.

For each item, please indicate how well it describes you by selecting the appropriate option.

- 1 = Strongly agree
- 2 = Agree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 4 = Disagree
- 5 = Strongly disagree

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.
2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain I will accomplish them.
3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.
4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavour to which I set my mind.
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.
7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.

SECTION 4**How I feel about Indigenous Australians**

The following statements state feelings you may or may not experience in regards to Indigenous Australians.

Using the options below, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each item.

- 7 = Strongly agree
- 6 = Moderately agree
- 5 = Slightly agree
- 4 = Neither agree or disagree
- 3 = Slightly disagree
- 2 = Moderately disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

1. I don't have much sympathy for Indigenous Australians.
2. I tend to get more emotionally involved when I think about Indigenous Australian issues.
3. I often feel empathy with Indigenous Australians.
4. I try to understand Indigenous Australian issues by imagining how things look to them.
5. I don't spend a lot of time imagining how I would feel if I were an Indigenous Australian.

SECTION 5 – Part 1
What would you do?

The following statements enquire about your thoughts and actions in a variety of different situations.

Using the options below, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree

1. I would feel comfortable confronting a friend who is being derogatory towards Indigenous Australians.
2. I would feel comfortable confronting a friend if I heard rumours that they were being discriminatory towards Indigenous Australians.
3. I would feel comfortable telling the authorities if I had information on an assault or discrimination case involving Indigenous Australians, even if my friends pressured me not to.
4. If an Indigenous Australian friend asked me to go with them, I would feel comfortable accompanying them to report to the authorities an assault or act of discrimination.
5. I have visited a website and/or social media information page to learn more about Indigenous Australians.
6. I have joined or volunteered with an organisation that works to stop discrimination and assault towards Indigenous Australians.
7. I have participated in/ I would feel comfortable participating in a social event (ie. rally) that has been organised to promote Indigenous Australian rights and to stop discrimination.
8. I have taken a class to learn more about Indigenous Australians.

SECTION 5 – Part 2
What would you do?

Scenario:

You are sitting with a group of non-Indigenous friends waiting to be served at a restaurant. A group of Indigenous Australians walk in, wearing t-shirts supporting Indigenous equality and equal rights. As they sit down at the table next to you, an acquaintance you are sitting with whispers loudly so that both tables can hear "Don't they know they have enough rights as it is?! Racism doesn't exist anymore!! They get to eat where ever they want and do whatever they want, and they get government support while the rest of us struggle, isn't that enough?!"

Please indicate the option that is the most appropriate to you. Would you be more supportive of:

- Your acquaintances view, OR
- An alternative view?

Which value on the scale below best represents how *likely* you are to speak up in this scenario, either in support of your colleague's view or an alternative view?

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

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