The Effect of Individualism And Collectivism In Relation To Bystander Efficacy And Communal Orientation Towards Sexual Violence

1st Pradipto, Y.D.[1], 2nd Murti, K.[2], 3rd Kartika, H.[3], 4th Arfiati H.[4], 5th Prastika, A[5], 6th Taufiq.R6

ypradipto@binus.edu[1], rohmat.taufiq@umt.ac.id[6], rohmat.taufiq@binus.ac.id[6]

Psychology Department, Faculty of Humanities, BINUS University[1,2,3,4,5], Indonesia
Muhammadiyah Unviersity, Tangerang, Indonesia[6], Doctor Computer Science, BINUS University, Indonesia[6]

Abstract. Sexual violence crimes is one of the highest crime rates in the world and programs have been created in order to deter the occurrence of sexual violence crimes with one program called Bringing the Bystander Program that focusing on the usage of bystanders in order to help deter them. The program has been implemented in college campus in the U.S, however, there have been no similar intervention programs in Indonesian college campus. If the program was to be adapted in Indonesia, it is deemed important to understand the underlying cultural influence that Indonesian would have to make the adaptation more relatable. The cultural influence chosen for this study is the kind of cultural orientation that Indonesian youths would possess as a majority and seeing whether an individual's cultural orientation has an effect on the bystander efficacy and communal orientation. A MANOVA result from this study shows that cultural orientation has an insignificant effect on both bystander efficacy and communal orientation, $\Lambda = .96$, F $(6=91, p > .05)$ with univariate results showing similar results with bystander efficacy, F $(3, 27) = .81$, $p > .05$, and communal orientation, F $(3, 62.8) = 1.04$, $p > .05$.

Keywords: collectivism, bystander efficacy, communal orientation, sexual violence

1. Introduction

In today's day and age, efforts to reduce sexual violence has been rampant, however, sexual violence is still one of the most common crimes against women (and sometimes even men) that still goes on. On a worldwide scale, sexual violence affects about 30% of the total women population having reported that they were victims of physical or sexual abuse that was conducted by their romantic partner (WHO, 2016). Programs to reduce acts of sexual violence were made with the most researched one being the Bringing the Bystander Program that was implemented by [2]. The idea behind the program was to utilize bystanders that were nearby to act rather than succumb to the notorious bystander effect. However, the question of culture orientation comes to mind. How far an individual's cultural orientation is affects the way that they would intervene in stopping criminal acts, especially one as damaging as sexual violence? An interesting cross-cultural study conducted by [13] in Italy and Singapore, seeks to measure students' attitude against bullying and perceived peer pressure, as well as measuring the effect of culture in how much individual attitude and

perceived peer pressure is affected by their respective cultural orientation as well as their reaction as bystander in bullying cases. Results from their study indeed shows a much bigger individual attitude amongst Italian students and a much more perceived peer expectations amongst Singaporean students, showing that indeed culture play a massive part in our action to help someone.

In relation to bystander efficacy, comes the question of communal orientation. Communal orientation refers to the degree that people "care for the welfare of others based on others' needs and desire similar care for themselves" [12]. If cultural orientation could have an effect on the bystander efficacy, it certainly call for an interesting case to see whether an individual's communal orientation would be affected as well and how far does communal orientation is being affected by it and whether it becomes a factor to be considered in increasing bystander efficacy that would eventually lead to bystander intervention in sexual violence.

Most bystander studies, focuses on how intervention could be induced as well as seeking for an explanation of why bystander effect occurs in the first place, which affects an individual's bystander efficacy as well. Other research seek to find the solution for bystander effects and relating programs has been created in the process [7]; [11]; [4]; [2]. Regarding communal orientation, there have been many researches that seek to explain empathy among bystanders, however, not many explains how bystander efficacy could play a part in the level of communal orientation felt towards those who are in need.

Based on various studies conducted by [3]; [2]), it is viewed as important that bystander do not succumb to the effects of bystander effect and instead take the initiative to intervene should there be cases of sexual violence in their community, through the increment of bystander efficacy. However, there are not many studies that take into account how much culture could impact bystander efficacy as well their communal orientation. By understanding how the differing cultures affect bystander efficacy and communal orientation, we would be closer in possibly creating an intervention program that could be tailored according to the culture of the community that we would like to intervene.

The cultural orientation refers to how much an individual is influenced by the culture that they live in [15]. It affects the way that we would operate on a day to day basis as well as affecting our mental processes, especially our perception of the world around us. Culture itself refers to the beliefs that is deeply embedded into our lives, as deep as affecting the way that we would behave in a society. Edward Tylor defined culture as "a complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, arts, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". (as cited in Kottak, 2011). At the beginning, the concept of cultural orientation began as a part of Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (2001) which is a framework for cross-cultural communication. In his theory, Hofstede produced six cultural dimensions with individualism versus collectivism being one of the dimensions in it [8].

The concept of cultural orientation was further adapted by Triandis and Gelfand in their 1998 study titled Converging Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. According to [14], the kind of individualism or collectivism that a country would have would differ from one country to the other and added two more distinctive factors, namely, horizontal and vertical patterns, which would distinguished the type cultural orientation that the culture has. The study explained that horizontal patterns "assume that one self is more or less like every other self" while vertical patterns "consist of hierarchies".

The cultural orientation scale used in this study measured four different dimensions of cultural orientations that was extended from the dichotomous measurement done by [8]. Hofstede proposes the classification of cultural orientation that is basely on the categorization of culture as individualism and collectivist. The dimensions are, then, expanded by Triandis et al (1998) with the expansion of those cultural orientation as being either horizontal or vertical in nature. The horizontal and vertical dimension proposed

by Triandis is categorized as such in order to differentiate the presumption of equal or different status between individuals, ss stated by [9].

The converges of the two concepts produces a four-way typology that better explained how countries or cultures with similar cultural orientation would have difference in their ways. The typologies identified by [14] are: (1) horizontal individualism, (2) vertical individualism, (3) horizontal collectivism, and (4) vertical collectivism. According to the typology, individuals living in a vertical collectivist culture, see themselves as a part of a collective and being willing to accept hierarchy and inequality within that collective as well as sacrificing their personal goals. Vertical individualism, on the other hand, measures how far people are interested in having a high status. Moving on, horizontal collectivism measures how far "people sees themselves as being similar to others". Lastly, horizontal individualism measures how far people "want to be unique and distinct from groups".

Bystander efficacy

Bystander efficacy developed from the concept of bystander effect that was constructed by [7]. In their article titled Bystander Intervention in Emergencies, relayed information about the infamous murder of Kitty Genovese and how there were many witnesses that did not step in to help prevent the murder. According to [7] there is a diffusion of responsibility that halts aid as there are no pressure to help and the blame does not befall on only one person. The idea of bystander effect as a result of diffusion of responsibility is further proven with an experiment on the inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on bystander intervention [11]. As informational social influence plays a big role in bystander effect, results from the study showed consistency with how informational social influence affects bystander effect, making it more prevalent when we are together with our friends than when we are together with a stranger. The explanation for this could be based on the informational social influence that would be looked for when we are faced in situations that are ambiguous [1]. Seeing someone in need would put the person in an ambiguous situation which would lead to them looking at others behavior to confirm on what to do.

The phenomena of bystander effect leads to the question of bystander efficacy. In [10] they identified five step process that people would undergo through when they are faced with the decision to come to the aid of those in need. The steps are: (1) notice the event, (2) interpret the event as an emergency, (3) assume responsibility, (4) know appropriate form of assistance, and (5) implement decision. Bystander efficacy is related to the fourth step of knowing the appropriate form of assistance. Efficacy itself is defined as the confidence in our abilities (Bandura, 1977), which would bring the definition of bystander efficacy as the belief in one's own ability in helping others [2].

Communal orientation

Communal orientation is a social orientation that identifies how much we perceive other's need as being important as well as how far we should care for other's needs, however with the expectation that their needs would be met as well [6]. In an experimental study conducted by [5] , subjects were exposed to a communal relationship and exchange relationship conditions, result showed that participants that were exposed to communal relationship condition would tend to "agree with statements indicating a desire to follow communal norms" [6], which leads to the assumption that increasing communal orientation would lead to an increment of helping behavior as it is considered a behavior of communal norm. As communal orientation is closely related to helping behavior, upon relating communal orientation to bystander efficacy, it could be assumed that individuals that receives high score on the communal orientation would be those that is more willing to help and would possess higher levels of bystander efficacy as well.

Studies of communal orientation focuses mostly on the implication of masculine and feminine values on that very communal orientation itself. According to [16], countries with higher feminine values would often possess higher levels of communal orientation as "social values (such as sociability and having many friends) may be valued more" in countries with higher levels of femininity. However, there are no enough literatures attributing cultural orientation to the levels of communal orientation, making this an interesting aspect to be studied.

2. Method

The usage of demography in this study focuses on the age, gender, country of origin and fluency in English as the questionnaire was spread in English as well as to ensure that the participants are those of Indonesian origin. In order to measure the type of cultural orientation that our respondents have, we used the cultural orientation scale that was developed by [14]. The measure is a 16-item scale using a Likert-scale ranging from a scale of 1 to 9 with 1 being "never or definitely no" and 9 being "always or definitely yes". The scale measures four dimensions of collectivism and individualism. According to [14], the four dimensions are: (1) vertical collectivism, (2) vertical individualism, (3) horizontal collectivism and (4) horizontal individualism. Upon testing for the reliability of the scale using the alpha Cronbach's scale, the results obtained was .79 (M= 105.27, SD=12.93).

The bystander efficacy scale used in this study is the one that was constructed by [3] that is also used in their Bringing in the Bystander program. The measurement scale is a 14-item Likert-scale that uses percentages from 0 to 100, with 0 being "can't do" and 100 being "very certain", instead of a numerical scale. For this study, the scale is adapted into a 4 range scale ranging from 0 to 3 with 0 being 'can't do' and 3 being The scale is a measures of the level of confidence that people have when it comes to the aid of those in need. The scale is specified for sexual violence cases. Upon testing for the reliability of the scale using the alpha Cronbach's scale, the results obtained was .82 (M = 24.86, SD = 7.05).

Communal orientation scale is a scale that was developed by [6] and it measures how much an individual "will behave in a communal fashion as well as whether the subject expects others to behave in a communal fashion toward him or her". The scale itself is a 14-item Likert-scale ranging from a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "extremely uncharacteristic of me" and 7 being "extremely characteristic of me. Upon testing for the reliability of the scale using the alpha Cronbach's scale, the results obtained was .72 (M = 64.6, SD = 10.57).

There are 110 participants for this study between the ages of 17 to 30 years old all across Indonesia. Reasoning behind choosing strictly Indonesian participants is to get a description of the possible different cultural orientation that Indonesians due to the large varieties of different ethnic backgrounds that could affect the formation of individual cultural orientation and how it affects their bystander efficacy and communal orientation. In the case of the chosen age range, this study is conducted in the hopes that it could adapt the Bringing the Bystander program in Indonesian college campus, due to that it felt appropriate if the chosen age range is one that represent the Indonesian student population sample. As Indonesia has been reported to be a highly collectivist culture, it becomes interesting to measure cultural orientation on an individual basis.

3. Results

Based on the demographic scale, we have found that the majority of our respondents are females, accounting for 63.6% of the total sample (70 respondent) whiles male respondents account for 36.4% of the total respondents (40 respondents). Majority of the respondents are 20 years old (see figure 1), with one missing value, which only allows us to analysis 109 out of 110 respondents. In terms of fluency in English, we categories our participants into three categories, which are (1) expert, (2) intermediate and (3) beginner. 10.9% of our respondents are categorized into the expert category (12 respondents), 65.5% are categorized into the intermediate category (72 respondents) and 23.6% are categorized into the beginner category (26 respondents).

Based on the results gained from the cultural orientation scale, it could be seen that the majority of Indonesians fall into the horizontal collectivism orientation, accounting for 30.6% of the total results (49 respondents) (see table 1). Results taken from obtained scores, however, shows close results for the four cultural orientation with a slight majority that falls into the horizontal collectivism category for Indonesian respondents. In order to come up with a more concise results for our respondents, transformation of the scores into z-scores was done. This is to ensure that our participants falls into one of the four determined categories and to avoid any overlapping scores amongst the participants.

Results for the bystander efficacy scale and communal orientation scale could be seen from table 2.

Table 1. Proportions of cultural orientation amongst the participants

Cultural Orientation	N	Percentage
Horizontal individualism	27	20.6
Vertical individualism	31	23.7
Horizontal collectivism	31	23.7
Vertical collectivism	42	32.6
Total	131	100

Table 2. Results of bystander efficacy and communal orientation scale

Scales	M	SD	Variances
Bystander efficacy	25.35	5.77	33.3
Communal orientation	62.19	7.76	60.3

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used in this study with the cultural orientation being the independent variable and dependent variable being bystander efficacy and communal orientation. Result findings from the analysis revealed a statistically insignificant effect of cultural orientation towards bystander efficacy and communal orientation, $A= .96$, $F (6, 252) = .91$, $p > .05$, with univariate results showing similar results with bystander efficacy, $F (3, 27) = .81$, $p > .05$, and communal orientation, $F (3, 62.8) = 1.04$, $p > .05$.

A discriminant analysis was followed in order to look at the relationship between bystander efficacy and communal orientation. Results from the discriminant analysis would show two discriminant functions.

The first function explained 59.5%, canonical R2 = .026, of the variance and the second function explained 40.5%, canonical R2 = 0.18, of the variance in the study. In combination, the discriminant functions did not differentiate the treatment groups with the first function showing, Λ = .96, χ2 (6) = 5.43, p > .05 and the second function showing, Λ = .98, χ 2 (2) = 2.21, p > .05. Correlations between outcomes showed that there is an almost equal influence between the two functions, with bystander efficacy reported with r = .37 for the first function and r = .93 for the second, making bystander efficacy to be more loaded on the second function. Communal orientation, on the other hand, is reported with r = .90 for the first function and r = -.44 for the second, showing communal orientation to be more loaded in the first function.

4.   Discussion

The effects of bystander efficacy, especially in terms of sexual violence, becomes an important issue to be looked at due to high rates of sexual violence here in Indonesia. As was pointed out by [2], bystander could play a role in reducing the occurrence of sexual violence. In that regard, the confidence about what to do should sexual violence were to occur, or as defined here, bystander efficacy, becomes a fundamental aspect that needs to be looked at, leading to intervention measures that focuses on these very aspects. The intervention proposed and conducted by [3] is focused in the United States, which would not be applicable should it be applied to another country with differing cultural orientation. The hypothesis for this study focuses on the difference that cultural orientation would give on bystander efficacy as well as the communal orientation of the people in Indonesia with the hope that the bystander intervention measure could be adapted based on the evidence found from these results. Looking at the results shown by the study conducted, however, it could be seen that cultural orientation possesses little influence in how people perceive their bystander efficacy as well as their communal orientation. The insignificant results from the study is believed by the author to be caused by the methodological aspects of the study. Beginning with the cultural orientation scale as proposed by [14], the scale was constructed to measure cultural orientation on a universal level and was never used to measure cultural orientation on an individual level which could lead to the results being insignificant as the one shown after the analysis due to inappropriate use of the scale. This raises the questions of whether cultural orientation is purely a universal phenomenon or whether it could be applied on a continuum basis on an individual level.

Another methodical issue that should be paid attention to is the lack of participant that responded to the online questionnaire given by the author. The total number of participants is only 131 in total, not very representative of the large population of Indonesia and as the cultural orientation scale is quite deterministic in nature and as it separates the individuals into concrete groups, the results would surely be insignificant to produce any real effects.

An interesting aspect of this study would be the lack of relations between bystander and communal relations. As mentioned above, communal orientation is defined as how far we perceive other's need and view them as important. According to [6], individuals possessing high levels of communal orientation would be more responsive to other's need and are more willing to help should the need arise. Based on the definition given, the hypothesis becomes that individuals possessing higher levels of bystander efficacy should possess high levels of communal orientation as well. However, results proven otherwise with quite weak relationship between the two variables as shown in the discriminant analysis. A possible explanation for this result could lay in the very nature of bystander effect itself. One of the factors that determines the occurrence of bystander

effect is ambiguity. Bystander effect is closely related to informational social influence, especially in its interpretation of a situation as either being an emergency or not [1]. As more and more people look nonchalant about the situation, it would lead to pluralistic ignorance about the situation and lack of intervention. The ambiguity of the situation is answered by the reaction of those around us, which would prove the weak relations between bystander efficacy and communal orientation if proven.

Based on the discussion above, it is clear that the study still possesses some design flaws beginning with the use of appropriate scale and the lack of representative participant in the study. This study could be seen as a preliminary study amongst the variables mentioned above that enable us to get a sense of how these variables relate or not relate to each other. Further studies to delve deeper into the subject is definitely needed to gain a clearer picture of the factor that could encourage the occurrence of bystander intervention measures.

References

[1]   Aronson, E., Wilson, T., & Akert, R.: Social psychology. Boston: Pearson (2013)

[2]   Banyard, V. L., Eckstein, R. P., & Moynihan, M. M.: Sexual violence prevention: the role of stages of change. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25(1), 111-135 (2010)

[3]   Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., Moynihan, M. M.: Rape prevention through bystander education at as Northeastern state university. U.S Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. National Institute of Justice (2004)

[4]   Bickman, L.: The effect of another bystander's ability to help on bystander intervention in an emergency. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7, 367–379 (1971)

[5]   Clark, M. S.: Evidence for the effectiveness of manipulations of desire for communal and exchange relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12,414-425 (1986)

[6]   Clark, M., Ouellette, R., Powell, M., & Milberg, S.: Recipient's mood, relationship type, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 94–103 (1987)

[7]   Darley, J. M., & Latané, B.: Bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8(4), 377-383 (1968)

[8]   Hofstede, G.: Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1) (2011)

[9]   Kitayama, S., & Cohen, D.: Handbook of cultural psychology. New York: Guilford Press (2007)

[10]   Latané, B., & Darley, J. M.: The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall (1970)

[11]   Latané, B., & Rodin, J.: A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and stranger on bystander intervention. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology (5), 189-202 (1969)

[12]   Le, B., Impett, E., Kogan, A., Webster, G., & Cheng, C.: The personal and interpersonal rewards of communal orientation. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30(6), 694-710 (2012)

[13]   Pozzoli, T., Ang, R., & Gini, G.: Bystanders' reactions to bullying: A cross -cultural analysis of personal correlates among Italian and Singaporean students. Social Development, 21(4), 686-703 (2012)

[14]   Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J.: Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1), 118-128 (1998)

[15]   Tsai, J. L., & Chentsova-Dutton, Y.: Models of cultural orientation: Differences between American-born and overseas-born Asians. In K. S. Kurasaki, S. Okazaki, & S. Sue (Eds.), Asian American mental health (pp. 95-106). New York: Kluwer Academic (2002)

[16]   Vanyperen, N. W., & Buunk, B. P.: Equity theory and exchange and communal orientation from a cross -national perspective. The Journal of Social Psychology, 131(1), 5-20 (1990)

[17]   World Health Organization.: Violence against women. Retrieved 21 January (2016)