Relationship between Bystander Efficacy and Decisional Balance in Case of Domestic Violence among Jabodetabek Teenagers
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Abstract

Previous studies have shown the rate of domestic violence towards women in Indonesia was threatening. Researches have found that one of the most effective way to prevent the violence was the bystander. By understanding the characteristic of bystander in the sample of teenager in Indonesia, this study seeks to predict the tendency to help from their efficacy and decisional balance. The result shows that there are significant correlations between bystander efficacy and tendency to intervene, yet no empirical support for decisional balance.
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1. Introduction

Gender-based violence has always been a pattern of violence supported by education, employment and economic discrimination (Rose, 2013), being the most prominent form is the domestic violence. Every year, there has been an increase in the number of domestic violence cases, creating many new victims of domestic violence in terms of
physical, psychological, sexual and even economical damage (Hartono, 2014) making it one of the greatest problem faced in Indonesia. The violence may be experienced by a relative, a friend, a co-worker or even a student (Ramakrishnan, 2014). The number has been rising especially in heavily populated urban areas such as Greater Jakarta or Jabodetabek, among teenager in a family and romantic relationships. However, the number of cases uncovered are just another proof that violence has prevailed once again and intervention program targeting abuser and victim do only a little help. This problem has made researchers realize that the most effective approach in preventing domestic violence, is not through understanding and intervening the victim nor the abuser, but through focusing people around them who are likely to just stand by and doing nothing to prevent the occurrence of domestic violence. Focusing on this bystander phenomenon, or known as ‘bystander effect’ (Latane and Darley, 1968) in an effort to prevent domestic violence has been proven to be effective in many countries with their bystander intervention program, for example Domestic Violence Act (DVA) in Malaysia (Zain, 2012) and The Bringing in The Bystander Program (Banyard, Eckstein and Moynihan, 2009) and yet in Indonesia there has been a little focus on the subject. By understanding how bystanders think and behave in the occurrence of domestic violence, it is possible to engage them to intervene and prevent the incident they will encounter in the future.

1.1. Variables

There are many predictors for bystander effect based on previous studies including the number of people present during the incident (Latane and Darley, 1968), knowledge and attitude about violence, childhood experience, gender and situational factors (Banyard, 2008), conformity to masculinity norm (Koon, 2013), efficacy to intervene and decisional balance of the bystander (Banyard, 2008; Banyard, Eckstein and Moynihan, 2009). In this studies, we are not focusing on predictors with lower modifiability, such as gender factor and the number of people present during the incident which could be understood better with experimental design. Rather, in this study we seek to replicate the result of previous bystander intervention studies which have proven that efficacy and decisional balance of bystander are two of the best predictor of bystander intervention behavior.

1.2. Research objective

Mentioned above were only some of many predictors for bystander effect, yet beside only a little number of research on the topic, the cultural and demographic difference in Indonesia may contribute to the effectiveness of these predictors. Thus, it is unwise to generalize and quickly apply them in Indonesian samples. This study then serves to investigate whether the predictors apply in Indonesian sample of teenagers in Greater Jakarta. The result hopefully, can be beneficial for potential bystander intervention training program in Indonesia.

2. Literature review

2.1. Domestic violence

Domestic violence is an issue of topical interest in the context of contemporary society (Golu, 2014). The term domestic violence, which covers all type of domestic relationship is the most commonly employed to describe incidents of familial or intimate abuse (Zain, 2012). The form of abuse can be sexual, physical, verbal, psychological, economical and even can go as far as threaten one’s freedom. As one of the most recognized gender-based violence, we can assume that the main victims are women. The problem regarding domestic violence is that despite the modernization of an era which accompanies the growth of more potent law, protection, culture and mindset of people around the world, it still prevails and tragically, increase. Most research paper regarding domestic violence, started from the same notion of thinking, which described best by Safta, Stan, Iurea dan Suditu (2010) on the findings (from the book ‘Be European: Promote and support Gender Equality! – Civic Education Handbook for the Support and Promotion of Gender Equality for Men and Women, 2004) that started their study that: 1) Domestic violence is a problem that affect us all, regardless of geographical borders, age, class, race, ethnicity and cultural distinction, 2) It is the most frequent form of violence and often silenced due to the fear towards the aggressor and embarrassment and finally, 3) Domestic violence is not a private or family issue, but rather one of social interest
which affects not only the victims but also the person who witness or are aware of domestic violence instances. The first point was well renowned globally across any country, and Indonesia was no exception. What makes domestic violence study an urgent issue to focus on in Indonesia, however, is the second point. Cultural differences in Indonesia do play a role in how we treat women in a family and how will they respond to domestic violence. Some culture do demote women’s social status in a family and gives right to husband and male companion to punish them if they do not behave as ordered. In the same notion, some culture hold tight family dignity and honour, so the behaviors such as reporting or letting others know your family problem are discouraged and seen as shaming the family, hence many cases go unreported. The third point supports the argument of that bystanders do play roles in domestic violence, because if they are aware of an incident happening, they are the hope and chance to escape for the victims can’t report the violence case due to various reasons. Bystander can provide a secondary prevention or perhaps in the future, a primary prevention towards domestic violence act (Barna and Barna, 2014) because they can provide immediate help when the incident occurs or intervene before the incident happens faster than others who are not aware or realize it yet. These are the reason why studying the role of bystanders in cases of domestic violence needs to be conducted, especially in Indonesia.

2.2. Bystander effect

The term was first coined by Darley and Latane (1968) on their study inspired by the case of Kitty Genovese. They argued that there were other factors other than inhumanity and apathy of the residence who did nothing despite Kitty was being murdered under their awareness. They argued that there were some circumstances that lead onlookers of the incident to resolve the conflict in the direction of nonintervention, such as the presence of others and the thought of a possibility that somebody, unperceived, had already initiated helping action (Latane and Darley, 1968). The presence of others was causing the pressure to intervene to decrease, creating a sense of diffused responsibility among the bystanders and usually resulting in nobody intervening. They also argued that there are some possibility that potential blame (of the incident later) may be diffused, so under circumstances of group responsibility for punishable act, the punishment and blame towards any individual is often slight (Darley dan Latane, 1968).

Recent studies, however, has taken bystander studies into a higher level with findings of many predictors of whether somebody in an incident of violence will help or not. Focusing on researching what it takes for people to help, many programs and studies have also been developed not just to understand, but also to combat bystander effect in an effort to prevent violence phenomenon such as domestic violence. Findings such as ‘bystanders intervened in situations where others also intervened’ by Christy and Voight (1994, p.841 as cited in Banyard, 2008) and also ‘in a situation in which a person is being attacked or at risk for assault, people who have the appropriate capacity and belief will have an intention to intervene’ provide a great deal of help in developing bystander intervention program because they give us information on what behavior to intervene if we want bystanders to take action. Looking at these premises, we can argue that there is a need to study bystander behavior and constructs in an effort to prevent domestic violence.

2.2.1. Bystander efficacy

Self-efficacy is composed of a person’s belief that he or she can reach an intended goal (Banyard, Eckstein and Moynihan, 2009). Developed from the concept of self-efficacy, fundamentally bystander efficacy can be explained as the confidence to perform an intervening action before or during the incident of domestic violence. It is a degree of how much a bystander belief himself can interfere in cases of domestic violence. The reason this concept was chosen was because its high modifiability in many bystander intervention programs, along with knowledge on violence and how to intervene which results in behavioral and attitude change in bystander. Understanding this in Indonesian samples could potentially open up doors toward changing the attitude and behavior of bystander. Previous research has also shown that increased in efficacy and confidence significantly increase bystander’s willingness to intervene and also related to being an active bystander (Banyard, Moynihan and Plante, 2007) which means bystander that helps.
2.2.2. Bystander decisional balance
Besides efficacy, another factor that is often discussed in bystander literature is the decisions that individuals must make, weighing pros and cons before deciding to intervene (Banyard, Eckstein and Moynihan, 2009) that is, the decisional balance. The concept of decisional balance refers to a procedure derived from Janis and Mann’s (1977) decision-making model, assumes that some decision making involves careful scanning of all relevant considerations that enter into a “decisional balance” sheet of comparative potential gains and losses (as cited in LaBrie, Pedersen, Thompson and Earleywine, 2008). As an often important component of many motivational interventions, the decisional balance penetrates a participant’s state of ambivalence, clarifies competing motivational factors, and encourage the person to consider change (LaBrie, Pedersen, Thompson and Earleywine, 2008). In this study, we seek to understand whether listing and weighing pros and cons before intervening results in active helping behavior.

2.2.3. Bystander intervention
When refer all Bystander Intervention mentioned in this study, as all action taken by a bystander to prevent or intervene an incident from happening or worsen. It could be anything from shielding the victim, confront the abuser or even call for help. The details would be presented in the methods section.

3. Hypotheses

Based on the literature review explanations, authors formed two hypotheses for this study, first regarding Bystander Efficacy:

H₁: There is a significant correlation between bystander efficacy and bystander intervention

The first hypothesis indicates that bystander efficacy predicts bystander tendency to intervene, that is we can assume a person’s tendency to help or not by evaluating his efficacy score.

The second hypothesis, regarding decisional balance:

H₂: There is a significant correlation between bystander decisional balance and bystander intervention

The second hypothesis indicates that the process of bystander decisional balance predicts bystander tendency to intervene, that is we can assume a person tendency to help or not by evaluating his decisional balance score.

4. Method

4.1. Instruments

4.1.1. Demographic scale
This study used a demographic scale to collect demographical data such as age, gender, domicile, employment status, job and educational experience all in Indonesian.

4.1.2. Bystander efficacy scale
The instrument used to measure bystander efficacy is the Bystander Efficacy Scale developed by Banyard and Moynihan (Banyard, 2008). The instrument consists of 18 items indicating behaviors that participants can express in certain situations. Participants then were asked to rate their degree of confidence for each item by recording a number from 0 (can’t do) to 100 (very certain). As explained in the introduction, we adapted the Bystander Efficacy Scale for samples in Indonesia, including translation and wording to Indonesian. After the pilot study, there were some items eliminated and resulting in nine final items to be used. The scale was also adapted into four item Likert scale ranging from ‘can’t do’ to ‘very certain’. The Cronbach’s alpha for the full sample at pilot was .79 (M = 25.47, SD = 4.06).
4.1.3. Decisional balance scale

The decisional balance scale was also developed by Banyard and Moynihan (Banyard, 2008). The instrument consists of 11 items representing a thought that might occur to a person who is deciding whether or not to help someone who is in trouble. Participants were asked to indicate how important each item would be to them if they were considering intervening in a situation where ‘they thought someone might be being hurt or was at risk of being hurt’ by circling a number from ‘not at all important’ to ‘extremely important’. The decisional balance scale was also adapted for samples in Indonesia, including translation and wording to Indonesian. After the pilot study, there were some items eliminated and resulting in five final items to be used. The scale was also adapted into a four-item Likert scale ranging from ‘not important’ to ‘very important’. The Cronbach’s alpha for the full sample at pilot was .79 (M = 13.10, SD = 3.16).

4.1.4. Bystander intervention measure

The Bystander Intervention Measure was created by Koon (2013) for a study on the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and bystander interventions. It was modeled after the Bowes-Sperry and O’Leary-Kelly (2006) observer intervention typology, providing 12 items providing bystander intervention options across the domain of immediacy of intervention and level of involvement (Koon, 2013). Participants were asked to rank each item on the five-item Likert scale ranging from ‘very likely’ to ‘very unlikely’ toward performing an intervention. It includes a sample scenario for participants to base their statement rating on, and was purposely designed to be vague in order to reduce situational and relational variables between other witnesses and the victim (Koon, 2013). However, this study used the scale to simply measure bystander intervention only, without classifying the immediacy and level of involvement of the intervention. The scale was adapted for samples in Indonesia, including translation and wording of the items and scenario to Indonesian. No items were eliminated after the pilot study, but the Likert scale were modified into a four-item Likert scale from ‘very likely’ to ‘very unlikely’. The Cronbach’s alpha for the full sample at pilot was .80 (M = 25.87, SD = 5.04).

4.2. Participants

Participants were late 93 adolescents aged 18 to 24 from the urban area of Greater Jakarta or Jabodetabek with 25 male and 68 female participants. As Siyez and Kaya (2010) suggest, adolescent are prone to violence exposure as they were still establishing their value and identity. Other bystander programs focused on adolescent also argued that we could establish the value of gender equality, opening their minds and convince them that each one of them could be the agent of violence prevention.

4.3. Sampling and procedure

This study, quantitative in nature, used simple random sampling to collect data. The instruments were compiled into one booklet, complete with an informed consent and instruction to fill the questionnaire, all in Indonesian. The participants were made sure to sign the informed consent as a symbol of an agreement to participate in the study.

4.4. Statistical analysis

This study used Pearson Product Correlation to process the data collected and IBM SPSS Statistics 22 program to compute the correlation score.

5. Results

5.1. Demographic results

The demographic data obtained from the study show that there were 52 people (55.91%) participants from Jakarta, 3 people (3.23%) from Bogor, 13 people (13.98%) from Tangerang, 11 people (11.83%) from Bekasi, 4 people (4.30%) from Depok and finally 9 (9.68%) unspecified but lives in one of the five region. Only 9 (9.68%) of
them were working and 84 (90.68%) others are either in college or not working currently. There were at least 86 participants who graduated from high school (79 people (84.95%), 1 person (1.08%) with Diploma and 6 other (6.45%) finished college study, while the other 7 people only graduated from middle school (7.53%). The results indicate that the participant met the requirement of the study objective and were adequate enough to represent the population.

5.2. Variables

Below are the Mean, Standard Deviation, and Variance for each instrument after the study was conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Std. deviation (SD)</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Efficacy</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>12.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Decisional Balance Scale</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>7.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Intervention</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>5.022</td>
<td>25.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. Pearson correlations

5.3.1. Bystander efficacy and intervention measure

Table below shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Bystander Efficacy and Intervention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.403**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The final Cronbach Alpha of bystander efficacy measure for this study was .643 and bystander intervention measure was .811. The value for Pearson Correlation obtained from IBM SPSS Statistics 22 program was $r = .403$ with the significance of .000 ($p < .01$) indicating that there is a significant correlation between bystander efficacy and intervention measure. This finding supports the first hypothesis and showed a positive relationship between both variables.

5.3.2. Bystander decisional balance and intervention measure

Table below shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Bystander Decisional Balance and Intervention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>-.114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final Cronbach Alpha of bystander decisional balance for this study was .703 and bystander intervention measure was .811. The value for Pearson Correlation obtained from IBM SPSS Statistics 22 program was $r = -.114$ with the significance of .227 ($p > .05$) indicating that there are no significant correlation between bystander decisional balance and intervention measure as the score fell away greatly from the confidence level author used. This finding shows that there are no support for the second hypothesis and was rejected.
6. Discussions

The important realization that domestic violence was an urgent issue that fundamentally may lead toward more unspoken and unknown violence towards women. Moving towards bystanders as intervention target was a great leap forward in combatting domestic violence. There is a need for Indonesia to also adopt this approach and apply them in effort to prevent domestic violence on many levels. Due to the little (almost none) study conducted in Indonesia, the concept was still too uncommon to be applied in Indonesian sample. It was simply a little too risky to intervene directly without understanding any characteristics of bystanders in Indonesia. So this study, as mentioned above seek to provide a bridge for understanding the characteristic of bystander in Indonesia, by looking at the correlative relationship between two of the most renowned construct of bystander, Bystander Efficacy and Decisional Balance towards the tendency to intervene in domestic violence cases for bystander in Indonesia, or at least in the sample of the teenagers of urban area of Greater Jakarta.

The final result of this study, however, only support one out of two hypotheses. Only bystander efficacy was shown to have a significant correlation with bystander intervention. In this sense, the study succeeded in replicating previous studies (e.g. Koon, 2013; Banyard, 2008; Banyard, Moynihan and Plante, 2007). The efficacy of bystander does really predict whether bystander will intervene or not during cases of domestic violence. The result indicated that the more participants believed that they could intervene, or the higher their confidence in their ability to prevent domestic violence, the higher the tendency for them to intervene during cases of domestic violence. Indeed, higher efficacy means more active bystander (Banyard, Plante and Moynihan, 2007). It shows that there is a glimpse of hope that we have the potential to benefit from bystander intervention. On the other hand, the result of decisional balance did not go as predicted. The difference was far from our expectation. The final value of Pearson Correlation were very little and shows no significant correlation. It means that even if bystander weights pros and cons before intervening, we still could not predict their tendency to help afterward. These findings suggest that decisional balance was still at risk and will not benefit any behavior to be targeted in intervention program in Indonesia or at least in the sample of teenagers in urban area Greater Jakarta.

7. Conclusions, implications, and further recommendations

We can conclude that only on of the predictor, that is the efficacy can significantly predict the tendency to intervene in cases of domestic violence. From the result shown, there is at least one route for Indonesia to develop intervention program targeting bystander based on this study that is by designing an intervention with an objective of increasing efficacy to increase the tendency for bystander to help, especially among teenager in urban area, as used for samples in this study. The unsuccessful attempt to replicate the result of decisional balance from previous studies might be caused by the difference in cultural and trend setting between the country that developed the scale and Indonesian samples. The scenarios may be unsuitable for Indonesian use and the items’ statement were novel to their ear, potentially resulting in unsure responds and causing errors. We recommend further study in Indonesia to adapt and modify better the decisional balance scale for Indonesian use. Another limitation of the study may be the Bystander Intervention measure, as explained by Koon (2013) was created only the first time purposely for his study, and it was the first time to be used in Indonesia. One other limitation for this study is the language. Authors sometimes find it hard to translate or find a suitable word in Indonesian from the original item. Even after the final translation, there are still quite some words that cannot be translated directly into Indonesian. Final limitation for this study is the sample. The sample representing Greater Jakarta and did not represent other urban or non-urban areas in Indonesia. More study should be conducted to provide more understanding in bystander behavior in Indonesia.
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