

Efficacy as a predictor of bystander anti-racism in support of Indigenous Australians

Megan McKee

School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Western Australia

Anne Pedersen

Centre for Human Rights Education, Curtin University, Western Australia

Racial discrimination detrimentally affects the mental and physical health and wellbeing of Indigenous Australians. Bystander anti-racism is positive action undertaken by a witness of a racist event in support of the victim of such discrimination. The present study investigated the predictive utility of dispositional efficacy compared with situational efficacy in anticipating the likelihood of bystander anti-racist action. Participants were 156 non-Indigenous Australians (50% female) aged from 18-89 recruited to complete an anonymous survey using Qualtrics. The dependent measure was a hypothetical bystander anti-racism scenario. There were three independent variables: a dispositional efficacy scale and two situational efficacy scales - bystander intervention opportunity (measuring perceived ability to act in a situation of racism) and bystander proactive opportunity (measuring proactive engagement with Indigenous Australians or issues). Results indicated that dispositional efficacy did not correlate with bystander action nor did it predict bystander anti-racism in a multiple regression. Bystander proactive opportunity correlated with bystander anti-racism but did not predict it. Bystander intervention opportunity was the strongest predictor in the correlation analysis and the regression analysis. This novel research highlights the need to include efficacy in bystander education and training programs within the community to reduce the prevalence of racism in Australian society.

Since colonisation, Indigenous Australians have been subject to considerable cultural dislocation, unjust government policies, and displacement resulting in historical trauma (Paradies, 2016a). One consequence of colonisation is racism towards Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous Australians (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 with respect to

health, education, and employment. However, there are still significant discrepancies with Indigenous Australians more likely to suffer from high psychological stress (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2010a) and experience long-term health issues (ABS, 2013) as well as greater educational disadvantage (ABS, 2016) compared with their non-Indigenous counterparts.

Racism can be defined in a variety of different ways. However, for the purposes of this article, we define racist attitudes as being beliefs and prejudices that act to maintain social stratification and an unequal division of social power (Russell, Pennay, Webster, & Paradies, 2013). We define racial discrimination as being unjust behavioural actions, both overt and subtle, towards

individuals who identify as part of a minority racial group (Butrus & Witenburg, 2013). Research suggests that systemic issues exist due to the racially-based treatment of Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous Australians. This embedded racism (both attitudinal and behavioural) is a major factor that continues to contribute to the inequality and related inequity of Indigenous Australians (Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, 2016; Tilbury, 2009).

Since 1975, when unjust treatment of an individual based on race became unlawful after the introduction of the Racial Discrimination Act (Commonwealth, 1975), racial discrimination has been more commonly expressed in a covert manner (Lentin, 2017). Casual racism is one form of covert racism. Casual racism refers to utterances such as jokes and comments based on negative stereotypes or beliefs about a particular race (Essed, 1991; also see Soutphommasane, 2015). Identifying and addressing casual racism can be difficult due to the desire to abide by social norms and ignore or dismiss the act as humorous or not worthy of intervention (Soutphommasane, 2015). An example of casual racism in Australia that became nationwide news was when a sporting fan called Adam Goodes, an Indigenous football player, an “ape” (Sheehan, 2015); many Australians did not recognise that this was racism. Modern racism relates to the belief that Indigenous Australians no longer experience racism as well as feelings of resentment towards Indigenous Australians who are perceived to receive special treatment (Pedersen, Dudgeon, Watt, & Griffiths, 2006).

Racism is prevalent in Australia with 25-27% of Indigenous Australians regularly experiencing instances of racial discrimination (ABS, 2010a; also see, Australian Institute of Health & 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. The effects of this

discrimination can be seen in a variety of domains. Experiences of racism can result in poorer mental and physical health outcomes (Ferdinand, Paradies, & Kelaher, 2015; Paradies 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, Harris, & Anderson, 2008; Paradies et al., 2015). The Elder’s Report (Gooda et al., 2014) highlights first-hand accounts of difficulties with self-harm and suicide in communities with female and male Indigenous youth suicide rates four and five times higher than non-Indigenous Australians. Strikingly, across all ages, the 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 and physical health requires attention. Indeed, research indicates that racism can make the victim, the perpetrator, and the community sick (Paradies, 2016b).

Whilst there is a movement towards constitutional reform to address race-based discrimination (Cape York Institute for Policy and Leadership, 2017), and there are private campaigns working towards highlighting the effects 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 the prejudicial beliefs of the perpetrator (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.

Bystander Anti-Racism

One potential way to help alleviate the problems experienced by Indigenous

Australians is by taking action as a bystander when witnessing racial discrimination. With respect to bystander anti-racism, a bystander is defined as an individual present when a case of racial discrimination against another member of the public occurs (Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies, 2011). 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., 2010). Czopp and Monteith (2003) found that acts of confrontation were successful in eliciting negative feelings of guilt and self-criticism in the racist perpetrator. Additionally, Monteith (1993) found 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).

However, not everybody will take bystander action when they witness racism. As found by Stewart, Pedersen, and Paradies (2014), one reason people may not intervene is because they feel that any action on their part would be ineffective. This could well be linked to feelings of efficacy (Nelson et al., 2011); something that has not been investigated quantitatively in the bystander anti-racism literature to date.

Efficacy as a Predictor of Bystander Anti-Racism

Both dispositional efficacy and bystander efficacy have been highlighted in the prevention of sexual violence literature to predict bystander intervention and to measure the success of bystander training programs. However, these programs are yet to be directly compared. Dispositional efficacy is a personality trait-like dimension that is measured by one's self-belief in the ability to perform and succeed at a range of tasks (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). High dispositional efficacy relates to an individual's increased ability to attempt new and difficult tasks (Burke & Stets, 2009). Although not studied in relation to anti-racism, high levels of dispositional efficacy

have been previously linked with prosocial bystander helping behaviours related to high school bullying (Tsang, Hui, & Law, 2011) and sexual violence (Banyard, 2008). The investigation of dispositional efficacy relating to bystander anti-racist intention to act in Australia is yet to be explored.

Situational bystander efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his or her ability to intervene as a bystander and induce positive change from the perspective of the target (Banyard, Moynihan, Cares, & Warner, 2014). As stated by Bandura (2006), generalised self-efficacy must be conceptualised as distinct to the functioning of an individual in a specific situation. Bystander efficacy has been studied in relation to the effectiveness of college anti-sexual assault bystander training programs (McMahon, Postmus, & Koenick, 2011). Individuals who attended such programs reported higher levels of bystander efficacy and consequently increased bystander action (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). To date, this construct has not been studied in an Australian racial context; thus, it may provide insight to inform the development of future bystander anti-racist intervention programs.

There are two aspects of situational bystander efficacy as found by McMahon et al. (2014). The first is bystander intervention opportunity; this refers to one's perceived ability to act in a situation of racism (e.g., confronting a friend who is being derogatory towards Indigenous Australians). The second is bystander proactive opportunity which refers to one's engagement in gaining knowledge and understanding about the target groups. For example, to learn more about Indigenous Australians and their culture, people may attend a protest in support of Indigenous rights or visit their local Aboriginal cultural centre. Together, both constructs aim to provide insight into an individual's ability to engage in an act of bystander anti-racism whilst also acknowledging the person's level of engagement with Indigenous Australian culture and awareness of the unique issues Indigenous Australians face.

The Present Study

Bystander anti-racism is a small but growing area of study. To our knowledge, no research compares dispositional efficacy to specific forms of efficacy as a predictor of bystander anti-racism behaviours. Modelled on previous bystander research conducted by Pedersen, Paradies, Hartley, and Dunn (2011), the present study will contribute to the literature by investigating whether efficacy is a predictor 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 present study adopts this approach to measure the relationship between the independent variables - dispositional efficacy and the two types of situational bystander efficacy (proactive opportunity and intervention opportunity) - and the dependent variable - the likelihood of bystander action using a "modern" example of everyday racism.

With the aim of promoting social change and situating the research in context, the present study was cross-sectional in design and based on the research conventions of community psychology (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005). As the research was primarily interested in assessing participant attitudes, self-report measures using Likert-type scale item responses were used. From a theoretical perspective, the present research has the potential to advance the 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). The potential practical implications of the present study are in line with community psychology; this highlights the need for social action rather than simply talk (Prilleltensky & Gonick, 1996).

Similar to the Pedersen et al. (2011) research, participants in the present study

responded to a hypothetical low-risk scenario of racism (everyday racism) involving a group of colleagues and a group of Indigenous Australians from an Indigenous rights organisation. Using this scenario as a catalyst to measure potential bystander action, the study was an exploratory investigation into the relative predictive power of dispositional and situational efficacy in predicting the likelihood of bystander anti-racism.

We used a post-positivist approach. We acknowledge, as argued by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), that "what we notice and observe is affected by our background knowledge, theories, and experiences; in short, observation is not a perfect and direct window into 'reality'" (p. 16). These authors further point out that researchers' values affect what they investigate, how they perceive the situation, and how they interpret their results. Thus, we state our political position up front. That is, we oppose prejudice and discrimination in any form and argue that steps need to be taken to eliminate them.

We had two research aims. First, a minor aim was to investigate the differences between participants who supported the perpetrator of the racist abuse compared with those who supported the victim. To our knowledge, no published research exists that investigates bystander action by the perpetrator. Our second major aim involved the predicting of bystander action. Because the present study is novel, specific hypotheses about the efficacy items were not made. Instead, we investigated which of the three types of efficacy (dispositional, bystander intervention opportunity, or bystander proactive opportunity) correlated with bystander anti-racism. We also investigated which of the three independent variables was the strongest predictor of bystander anti-racism utilising multiple regression. Having said that, given the research findings suggesting that bystander training in the sexual assault literature predicts intervention (Banyard et al., 2007), and Bandura (2006) arguing that efficacy is situation specific, it was hypothesised that

the two forms of bystander efficacy would be more likely to relate to greater bystander anti-racist action compared with dispositional efficacy.

Method

Participants

Ethical approval for the conduct of the research was sought and approved by Murdoch University in Perth, Western Australia. The sample was comprised of 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 might have been distressing for Indigenous Australians, individuals identifying as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander were asked not to participate in the present research. Furthermore, we focused on bystanders who were not Indigenous because Indigenous people already shoulder the burden of racism and should not be the ones solely responsible to tackle the perpetrators of racism. We acknowledge that within the non-Indigenous participant group, there will be people who are discriminated against because of their cultural group (e.g., race; religion; gender; disability; sexuality) and research also needs to be carried – and in some cases has been carried out – with these groups.

The sample contained 50% females and ranged in age between 18 and 89 years with an average of 46 years ($SD = 15.67$). This is slightly younger than the average age of 51 years represented in the census (ABS, 2011). Of the sample, 37% indicated a centred political preference, followed by 18% indicating they were somewhat left, 17% indicating they were somewhat right, 6% indicating that they were strongly left, and the remaining 6% indicating that they were strongly right. A total of 17% participants indicated no political preference by selecting the Don't Care option. Of the sample, 7% did not complete secondary school, 28% completed secondary school,

22% had completed or were completing vocational training, 15% had completed or were completing an undergraduate diploma, 17% had completed or were completing a bachelors degree, and 10% indicated that they were completing or had completed a higher postgraduate degree. The present sample was less educated than the wider Australian population. The majority of participants (88%) indicated that they were of Caucasian/European background, with the next largest group (8%) indicating that 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 Māori. In terms of ethnic participant background, the sample is relatively representative of the wider Australian population (ABS, 2011). A total of 48% of the study sample identified as Christian, followed by 42% indicating no religious affiliation. Of the remaining participants, five reported being Muslim, three reported being Hindu, two reported being Buddhist, and three reported being Jewish, Sikh and Asatru respectively. In comparison to the wider Australian population, this sample represents lower Christian religious beliefs and higher levels of no religious affiliation.

Measures

Demographics. Participants entered their age in numerals, and indicated their sex ($1 = \text{male}$, $2 = \text{female}$), ethnic background ($1 = \text{Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander}$, $2 = \text{African}$, $3 = \text{Asian}$, $4 = \text{Caucasian/European}$, $5 = \text{Indian}$, $6 = \text{Middle Eastern}$, $7 = \text{Pacific Islander}$), religious affiliation ($1 = \text{Buddhist}$, $2 = \text{Christian}$, $3 = \text{Hindu}$, $4 = \text{Jewish}$, $5 = \text{Muslim}$, $6 = \text{No religion}$), level of education ($1 = \text{did not complete secondary school}$, $6 = \text{part or completed higher degree – Masters or PhD}$) and political preference ($1 = \text{strongly left}$, $5 = \text{strongly right}$, $6 = \text{don't care}$). Participants were also provided with the option of selecting *Other* to enter text in the ethnic background and religious affiliation questions.

Dispositional 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 5-point Likert scale, participants indicated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* their views 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 with respect to sexual assault (McMahon et al., 2014). The scale used in the present 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". Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

The Bystander Intervention Opportunity subscale measures individuals' belief in their ability to intervene in an immediate situation of racism. An example of this sub-scale is "I would feel comfortable confronting a friend who is being derogatory towards Indigenous Australians". The Bystander Proactive Opportunity subscale measures proactive behaviours of individuals promoting bystander action. An example of this sub-scale is "I have taken a class to learn more about Indigenous Australians". As our scale was amended for 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 $\alpha = .82$ (McMahon et al., 2014). 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 et al. (2011). The scenario takes place in a restaurant and involves a hypothetical colleague reacting to a group of Indigenous Australians entering the restaurant. The colleague makes loud comments audible to the Indigenous Australians pertaining to acts of modern racism; in particular, that racism does not exist anymore and that Indigenous Australians 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 7-point Likert scale with the points 1 = *extremely unlikely* and 7 = *extremely likely*, with the midpoint coded as 4 = *unsure*. A higher score indicated a greater likelihood of action. Only data gathered from individuals who indicated that they supported the victim were utilised in predicting bystander intention to action.

Procedure

Pilot testing revealed errors in question sequence, as well as the need to alter some items to reflect Australian English conventions and gender neutrality. The final survey was emailed to participants by the Qualtrics software platform in June 2014. The email included the title of the study and a secure link to the survey website. The questionnaire was closed after a sample of 156 wholly completed surveys was achieved. This took approximately 2 weeks to occur.

Results

The descriptive statistics are presented to contextualise the data, and independent samples *t*-tests were utilised to compare perpetrator support to victim support (Aim

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics including Means (*M*), Standard Deviations (*SD*), Range of Scores, Number of Items and Cronbach's Alpha (α)

	M(<i>SD</i>)		Range	Items	α
	Victim Support	Perpetrator Support			
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	

1). Only participants who supported the victim were included in the main analyses. Relatedness between variables was measured using Pearson's *r* correlation. A hierarchical regression was utilised to establish the most influential variable/s responsible for predicting bystander anti-racist action intention. All tests of significance were evaluated according to a *p*-value of $p < 0.05$. Bootstrapping was used throughout the analysis in an attempt to minimise bias and normalise the distribution (Field, 2007).

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1. As shown, the reliability was satisfactory for all scales as $\alpha > .80$ (Field, 2007). All of the scales remained as initially formulated, 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 in Table 1, 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.

Assumptions

Prior to conducting the *t*-tests, a comparison between 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.

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 participants 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 that 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 that participants who supported the victim were more likely to speak up compared to those who supported the perpetrator.

Correlations

Table 2: Pearson *r* intercorrelations of all predictor variables with 95% confidence intervals noted

	1	2	3	4
1. Likelihood of Action	-	.10 [-.35, .48]	.44** [-.10, .67]	.59** [.29, .78]
2. Dispositional Self- Efficacy	.17 [-.03, .38]	-	.22 [-.16, .64]	.37* [.04, .63]
3. Bystander Intervention Opportunity	.50** [.38, .63]	.14 [-.08, .38]	-	.47** [.20, .69]
4. Bystander Proactive Opportunity	.29** [.12, .46]	.12 [-.05, .30]	.47** [.31, .59]	-

Note: Intercorrelations for Perpetrator Support data are presented above the diagonal, and intercorrelations for the Indigenous Support data are presented below the diagonal.

Confidence intervals are presented in square brackets.

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

Prior to the correlation analysis, the appropriate assumptions were checked. Results indicated no violations of such assumptions.

As shown above, Table 2 reflects the calculated bootstrapped bivariate Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient (r) indicating the size and direction between all continuous linear predictor variables. 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).

With respect to the Indigenous support group, significant positive correlations indicated that the likelihood of bystander action was weakly correlated with bystander proactive opportunity and strongly correlated with bystander intervention opportunity. There was no significant correlation between bystander anti-racism and dispositional efficacy. Although it was not our primary intention to investigate participants who supported the perpetrator, given the lack of research on this topic, we briefly note that the relevant correlations showed the same pattern as the participants who did not support the perpetrator.

Regression

A linear regression was utilised to determine the most significant predictors of bystander action intention in the hypothetical scenario. The likelihood of bystander action

was entered into the regression model at Step 1, followed by dispositional efficacy, bystander intervention opportunity, and bystander proactive opportunity at Step 2. Because of the small sample size of the group who supported the perpetrators, no regression analysis was performed with this group.

A number of assumptions were assessed before the results were interpreted. There were no major violations for almost all assumptions. However, visual inspection of the normal P-P plot of standardised regression indicated a slight pattern in the data and bootstrapping was used to address this violation.

As shown by Table 3, dispositional efficacy, bystander intervention opportunity, and bystander proactive opportunity accounted for a significant 27% of the variance in the likelihood of bystander action ($F(3, 116) = 14.10, p < .001, R^2 = .27$). By Cohen's (1988) conventions, a combined effect of this size can be considered large ($f^2 = .36$). 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 $f^2 = .36$. This analysis indicates the statistical power for the study was large, with the power exceeding .99. Considering convention indicates that power should exceed .80

Table 3: Linear regression analyses predicting bystander anti-racist action from dispositional and situational factors of empathy and efficacy (N = 120)

Predictor	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Dispositional Efficacy	.22	.17	.10
Bystander Intervention Opportunity	.94	.19	.46***
Bystander Proactive Opportunity	.11	.16	.06

Note: $R^2 = .27$ for Step 1 (** $p < .001$)

(Field, 2007), it is safe to assume that 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.

Discussion

The central aim of the present research was to investigate the relationship between types of efficacy as correlates of bystander anti-racist intention to act. It was hypothesised that situational bystander efficacy (bystander intervention opportunity and bystander proactive opportunity) would be more related to bystander action intention compared with dispositional efficacy. This hypothesis was supported.

Dispositional Efficacy and Bystander Efficacy.

To the authors' 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 that people with perceived high dispositional efficacy believe that they are capable of meeting the demands of any environment of which they are a part (Chen et al., 2001). This relationship is found in the anti-bullying literature, with the central finding being that children with high perceived dispositional efficacy are more

likely to intervene and support the victim (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). However, Bandura (2006) posits an alternative view, arguing that dispositional efficacy should always be considered specifically to the domain in question, which aligns with our findings.

Both forms of situational bystander efficacy were anticipated to be more related to bystander action than dispositional efficacy. Based on the findings of Banyard et al. (2007), that increased bystander efficacy predicted bystander action in cases of sexual assault, the present research investigated this relationship in an Australian Indigenous anti-racist context. It was found that bystander intervention opportunity was largely correlated and bystander proactive opportunity was moderately correlated with the likelihood of bystander action. Although this finding is novel in that it involves another target group, and is in another country, it replicates the initial relationship found by Banyard et al. (2007).

No research currently compares the predictive utility of dispositional efficacy and either form of situational bystander efficacy. The regression analysis suggested that bystander intervention opportunity was the most influential predictor of bystander anti-racism in a hypothetical low-risk scenario of everyday racism (Essed 1991). Whilst our 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). This situational efficacy measure (bystander intervention opportunity and bystander proactive opportunity) indicates participants' 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., 2004; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2014; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfield, Hill, & Shelley-Temblay, 2011).

While being significantly correlated to bystander action, the situational bystander proactive opportunity construct did not predict the likelihood of action in the regression. This subscale measures engagement of the individual 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. Engaging in such activities may advance one's knowledge about Indigenous Australians and potentially prompt advocacy for equal rights. However, as bystander intervention requires behavioural action, it is possible that gaining information is not enough; bystander action skills (as highlighted by bystander intervention opportunities) are required. It may also be the case that this is 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 our sample is comparatively representative of most socio-demographic determinants, it is possible that this finding is related to the lack of exposure of the current relatively undereducated sample to such learning opportunities.

As we have identified previously, Indigenous Australians were not included in the present study for ethical reasons. However, it is worth noting that Indigenous people would be likely to be very active bystanders if they saw other Indigenous people being targeted.

Practical Implications

The present research has significant theoretical implications for the bystander anti-racist action literature but also has practical implications for Indigenous Australians who regularly experience racism. It has been found that everyday racism has a significant negative emotional effect on victims; for example, increasing their feelings of threat (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003). The present research is novel in Australia and is therefore important in advancing this literature.

The finding that situational bystander efficacy was a significant predictor of bystander anti-racist action is a primary indicator establishing a need for bystander action training and education programs in Australia for non-Indigenous Australians. 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, there is little published research on programs that teach bystander action skills specific to instances of discrimination and inequality. Having said that, there are a handful of studies that are beginning to incorporate the teaching of bystander skills (e.g., Dunn, Nelson, & Pedersen, 2013; Pedersen et al., 2011). Our findings stress the importance of programs such as these. 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. Considering these programs act to increase bystander action, it is possible that the skills learned would be generalised across many domains.

As both bystander intervention opportunities and bystander proactive opportunities are predictors of anti-racist bystander behaviour, it is essential for both

to be incorporated into future bystander intervention programs (Banyard et al., 2007; McMahon et al., 2011). As indicated by the strength of the relationship between bystander action and both components of bystander situational efficacy, bystander action programs should primarily focus on the development of practical skills that provide opportunities for individuals to practise engaging in situations that require bystander intervention. An education component addressing individual attitudes and beliefs would be important as a method of providing knowledge and promoting understanding to support why an individual should engage in anti-racist action. These program components are consistent with the findings of the literature review of Storer, Casey and Herrenkohl (2016) regarding bystander intervention programs designed to reduce dating and sexual assault. Although not specific to bystander anti-racism, the review of Storer et al. highlights the importance of increasing individuals' confidence in their ability to intervene, as well as expanding their knowledge and adapting their attitudes to promote intervention. When adapting the education components to an anti-racism context, sessions that highlight the unjust treatment of Indigenous Australians since white occupation, the current inequalities that continue to exist, and a focus on eliciting empathy towards Indigenous Australians facing racism should be included. A program comprising these core components is key to providing a theoretical and practical platform to promote bystander anti-racist action.

Increases in general levels of bystander efficacy were found to positively increase instances of bystander anti-racist action in our study. Previous research suggests that 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 been shown to elicit guilt in the

perpetrator, which has been found to reduce future discriminatory behaviours (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006).

As an aside, we note the correlations between bystander action and efficacy with respect to the perpetrator group. At first glance, providing individuals with the efficacy skills to act as a racist bystander may appear counterproductive when the central aim is to reduce the occurrence of racist actions in society. However, if they are also provided with knowledge and understanding of colonisation from an Indigenous perspective, the impact of inhumane government acts such as the forcible removal of children from their families, and the negative impact of casual racism, their attitudes might change. Indeed, there is some research finding this to be the case. The implementation of cultural awareness training incorporated into an undergraduate medicine curriculum revealed increases in self-perceived awareness of Indigenous health issues, increased skills to work with Indigenous patients, and a shift in attitudes towards working with Indigenous people (Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006). Similarly, Pedersen et al.'s (2011) implementation of a cross-cultural education program revealed post-intervention increases in positivity towards the social 'out-groups' Indigenous Australians, Muslim Australians and asylum seekers. Additionally, increases in perceived intention to speak up were also found (Pedersen et al., 2011). These findings suggest that increasing the knowledge of all Australians (regardless of racist attitudes) will be beneficial in increasing the likelihood of anti-racist bystander action.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

There are a number of potential methodological limitations of the present study. The implications of these limitations are now individually addressed with consequential future research directions. Firstly, identified as the intention-behaviour gap (Snihotta, 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 et al. (2009), immediate effects associated with racism can include emotional responses such as feelings of anxiety, anger, and sadness. It could be argued, however, that if people are taught the skills to address racism, feelings of anxiety might be decreased. 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.

Another line of future research could be to incorporate other measures of racism; more explicit ones to investigate the relationship between teaching efficacy skills to participants. Since Essed's (1991) conceptualisation of 'everyday racism', research into everyday anti-racism from a linguistic perspective has begun to emerge. Research conducted by Mitchell, Every and Ranzijn (2011) highlighted the difficulties associated with intervening in acts of everyday racism which included the desire to fit in in social situations, the uncertainty of potential conflict or aggression, and the relationship between the people in the situation. Their study also noted facilitators of everyday anti-racism included whether participants were armed with knowledge and information regarding facts about Indigenous Australians. It would be useful to establish whether the teaching of skills would relate to bystander action in a more explicit setting. It would also be useful to use different target groups and other bystander scenarios.

Taking into consideration these limitations and future research directions, there is the 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 (Sullivan,

2010). 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 when they might engage in the situation as an anti-racist bystander.

Conclusion

The present study investigated the relationship between situational and dispositional efficacy as predictors of bystander anti-racist action. Bystander intervention opportunity was the most influential predictor of bystander anti-racist action in the present study's low-risk scenario; however, the correlations showed the importance of bystander proactive opportunity as well. The inclusion of the bystander efficacy variable is novel in the bystander anti-racist action on behalf of Indigenous Australian literature. This study provides 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 relationship between the two situational measures and the intention to engage in bystander action, this research highlights the overarching need to increase individual bystander efficacy in society. We are not arguing that bystander training holds all the answers. Indeed, previous research finds that a strong correlate of taking bystander action is individuals' levels of prejudice or racism (Redmond, Pedersen, Paradies, 2014) and ethnocentrism (McWhae, Paradies, & Pedersen, 2015). There are also racist structural issues to be addressed. As Kagan and Burton (2015) note, community psychology should not restrict itself to the individual but also take into account relational and societal issues: these also need to be addressed.

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, 2010a; ABS, 2010b Australian Institute of Health &

Welfare, 2011; Paradies et al., 2008). Acknowledging that bystander action can reduce future instances of prejudice (Czopp & Monteith, 2003), the present research finding that situational bystander efficacy relates to action is important. The present study has the potential to inform bystander anti-racist action training programs in an effort to address 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. (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 Bureau of Statistics. (2016). *National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey, 2014-15* (Catalogue No. 4714.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4714.0~2014-15~Main%20Features~Education~5>
- 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 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
- 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., 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., 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
- 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>
- 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
- Cape York Centre for Policy and Leadership. (2017). *A First Nations voice in the constitution – Design issues: Report to the Referendum Council*. Retrieved from https://www.referendumcouncil.org.au/sites/default/files/2017-07/Report%20to%20the%20Referendum%20Council-%20First%20Nations%20Voice%20Design%20Report_0.pdf
- 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.
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- Dunn, K., Nelson, J., & Pedersen, A. (2013). *Educating young people for bystander anti-racism: Overcoming racism*. Paper presented at the 13th International Conference on Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations. Darwin, Australia.
- 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
- Ferdinand, A. S., Paradies, Y., & Kelaher, M. (2015). Mental health impacts of racial discrimination in Australian culturally and linguistically diverse communities: A cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health, 15*(1), 401. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1661-1
- Field, A. (2007). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM Statistics*. (4th ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Gooda, M., Dudgeon, P., Harrison, M. D., Hudson, L., Bergmann, W., Gooda, D., ... & Watson, A. (2014). The Elders' report into preventing Indigenous self-harm and youth suicide. *People Culture Environment*.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.
- Kagan, C., & Burton, M. (2015). Marginalization. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky, *Community Psychology: In Pursuit of Liberation and Well-Being* (pp 293-308). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- 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

- Lentin, A. (2017). (Not) doing race : ‘casual racism’, ‘bystander antiracism’ and ‘ordinariness’ in Australian racism studies. In M. Boese & V. Marotta (Eds.), *Critical Reflections on Migration, ‘Race’ and Multiculturalism: Australia in a Global Context* (pp. 125-142). New York: Routledge.
- 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
- 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>
- 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
- McWhae, L., Paradies, Y., & Pedersen, A. (2015). Bystander antiprejudice on behalf of Muslim Australians: The role of ethnocentrism and conformity. *The Australian Community Psychologist, 27*, 6-20. Retrieved from <https://groups.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/ACP-27-1-2015-McWhae-et-al.pdf>
- Mitchell, M., Every, D., & Ranzijn, R. (2011). Everyday antiracism in interpersonal contexts: Constraining and facilitating factors for ‘speaking up’ against racism. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(4), 329-341. doi:10.1002/casp.1077
- Monteith, M. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 469-485. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.469
- 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
- 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.
- 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. doi:10.1177/103841620801700307
- Paradies, Y. (2016a). Colonisation, racism and indigenous health. *Journal of Population Research, 33*(1), 83-96. doi:10.1007/s12546-016-9159-y

- Paradies, Y. (2016b). Does racism make us sick? *The Conversation*, August 9, 2015. Retrieved: https://theconversation.com/does-racism-make-us-sick-63641?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20August%209%202016%20-%205401&utm_content=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20August%209%202016%20-%205401+CID_772d389362f0bc04166bb9b57863f8a6&utm_source=campaign_monitor&utm_term=Does%20racism%20make%20us%20sick
- Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., . . . Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*, *10*(9), e0138511. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138511
- 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/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>
- Paul, D., Carr, S., & Milroy, H. (2006). Making a difference: The early impact of an Aboriginal health undergraduate medical curriculum. *Medical Journal of Australia*, *184*(10), 522.
- Pedersen, A., Dudgeon, P., Watt, S., & Griffiths, B. (2006). Attitudes toward Indigenous Australians: The issue of "Special Treatment". *Australian Psychologist*, *41*(2), 85-94. doi:10.1080/00050060600585502
- 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. doi:10.1375/prp.5.1.19
- Prilleltensky, I., & Gonick, L. (1996). Politics change, oppression remains: On the psychology and politics of oppression. *Political Psychology*, *17*(1), 127. doi:10.2307/3791946
- Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Commonwealth) No. 52. Retrieved from <http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2014C00014>
- Redmond, J., Pedersen, A., & Paradies, Y. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of anti-racist bystander action towards Indigenous Australians. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *20*, 474-490. doi:10.1037/pac0000062.
- 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.
- Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision. (2016). *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2011*. Canberra: Productivity Commission.

- Sheehan, N. (2015). Racism defies logic – so don't go searching for any. *The Conversation*, August 7, 2015. Retrieved: <https://theconversation.com/racism-defies-logic-so-dont-go-searching-for-any-45617>.
- 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/snuehotta_210725.pdf?sequence=3
- Soutphommasane, T. (2015). *I'm not racist but ... 40 years of the racial discrimination act*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au>
- 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.
- Storer, H. L., Casey, E., & Herrenkohl, T. (2016). Efficacy of bystander programs to prevent dating abuse among youth and young adults: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 17(3), 256-269.
- Sullivan, C. (2010). Theory and method in qualitative research In M. A. Forrester (Ed.), *Doing qualitative research in psychology: A practical guide* (pp. 15-38). London, England: Sage Publications.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003). African American college students' experiences with everyday racism: Characteristics of and responses to these incidents. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 29(1), 38-67.
- Tilbury, C. (2009). The over-representation of indigenous children in the Australian child welfare system. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 18(1), 57-64. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2397.2008.00577.x
- 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
- 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

Acknowledgements

We note that the data were collected at the School of Psychology and Exercise Science, Murdoch University, Western Australia. Funding for this research was provided through an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant (LP110200495).

Address for correspondence

Anne.Pedersen@curtin.edu.au

Author biographies

Megan McKee. Megan obtained her Master of Psychology (Clinical) from Curtin University, Australia, in 2017 and is currently working as a Clinical Psychology Registrar at the WA Department of Health. Her current research interests include bystander anti-racism as well as healthy feeding behaviours in parents of toddlers.

Anne Pedersen. Anne is a community/social psychologist and adjunct associate professor at the Centre for Human Rights Education at Curtin University. Her current research interests include prejudice and

antiprejudice with an emphasis on asylum seekers to Australia, Indigenous Australians, and Muslim Australians.