

Title: Neighborhood Bystander Intervention in Intimate Partner Abuse: The Role of Social Cohesion

Authors: Lucero, J. L., Roark, J., & Patton, A.

Abstract:

Aims: This study examines the relationships among individual beliefs about intimate partner abuse (IPA), attitudes about IPA reporting, social cohesion, and the intention of intervening in neighborhood IPA.

Methods: Data for this study come from a larger cross-sectional, community-based study where participants (N=1,626) were surveyed face-to-face using stratified random sampling in targeted communities in a Mountain West state (i.e., drop-off, pick-up method) and online using social media outreach in targeted communities.

Results: Linear regression results indicated that participants were less likely to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood if they held beliefs about the private nature of IPA or feared retaliation. Additionally, social cohesion was positively associated with participants' intention for intervening in IPA situations in their neighborhood.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest potential avenues for community intervention that attempt to build community-wide beliefs that IPA is a community-level concern and one that demands attention from the entire community.

Key Words: Intimate Partner Abuse, Bystander Intervention, Social cohesion, Neighborhood

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner abuse (IPA) is a serious public health issue in the U.S., affecting approximately one in every four women and one in every ten men in their lifetime (Smith, Zhang, Basile, Merrick, Wang, Kresnow, et al., 2018). The consequences of IPA are felt among individuals, families, *and* communities – and avenues for intervention exist in each of these spheres as well. In recent years, community scholars have underscored the need for macro-oriented prevention and intervention strategies to reduce IPA (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Edwards et. al, 2014); however, there is relatively little empirical work that examines how features of one’s community (or neighborhood) are related to factors that could reduce IPA. IPA prevention and intervention strategies most often target victims and/or perpetrators, but a rapidly growing literature highlights the critical role that witnesses to violence, or bystanders, can play in reducing IPA (Bannon & Foulbert, 2017; Banyard, 2011; Laner, Benin & Ventrone, 2001; De La Rue, Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2017). While the majority of research on bystander intervention focuses on individual factors that predict one’s likelihood to support victims of IPA, there is a small, but growing body of research that considers community or neighborhood factors that do the same (Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014). According to Sulkowski (2011), almost one third of individuals who commit multiple victim attacks display threatening behaviors that are noticed by another person prior to an attack. Thus, bystander intervention programs work, in part, to address the factors that promote a person’s likelihood to *do something* about the acts leading up to violence as well the violence itself. Evidence suggests that bystander intentions predict bystander behavior over time, and intentions and efficacy to intervene work in a reciprocal manner (McMahon, Peterson, Winter, Palmer, Postmus, & Koenick, 2015). Bystander intervention programs that can increase intention to intervene and promote bystander self-

efficacy stand to influence bystander behavior. Since the bystander intervention literature has proliferated, there is growing consensus regarding the need to understand the social context that may influence intervention intentions and behavior (see Fischer et. al, 2011 for a full review). Uncovering neighborhood-level factors that predict bystander intervention may lead to more effective, multisystem anti-violence strategies. Using an ecological system framework and drawing on collective efficacy theory, this study uses a large, community-based sample to investigate how neighborhood factors influence the intention of intervening in IPA situations in one's neighborhood.

BACKGROUND

Theoretical Framework

According to ecological systems theory, individuals are shaped through complex, and mutually reinforcing proximal (e.g., family) and distal (e.g., neighborhood) forces (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In the case of bystander intervention, individual factors like cognitions and attitudes (Laner, Benin, & Ventrone, 2001; Gracia & Herrero, 2006) or neighborhood factors like sense of community and cohesion (Banyard, 2008; Sapouna, 2010; Sulkowski, 2011) can impact bystander behaviors. Collective efficacy theory (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997) suggests that cohesive neighborhoods are more equipped to regulate crime. According to Sampson and colleagues (1997), there are two defining characteristics of collective efficacy: social cohesion and informal social control. As a neighborhood's capacity to realize common values and form strong social ties increases, its ability to maintain effective social control increases. Social cohesion can be thought of as the extent to which neighborhood residents share trust and norms as well as the reciprocity present in the interconnections in the neighborhood (Lochner, Kawachi, & Kennedy, 1999). Informal social control can be thought of as the extent to

which a collective perceives that residents in the neighborhood will do something when a problem arises. Hipp (2016) extends conceptualizations of collective efficacy and notes the need to consider the two defining characteristics separately. Social cohesion may enable the task-oriented nature of collective efficacy. In the case of our study, the problem demanding a collective response is IPA and the task of reducing IPA in one's neighborhood can be achieved by neighborhood bystander intervention (a manifestation of informal social control). Under this framework, neighborhood bystander intervention is more likely to occur when social cohesion is present.

Historically, IPA has been characterized as a personal issue—perhaps even an issue that should strictly be sorted out among intimate partners. However, due to the work of bystander interventionists, IPA is increasingly being considered a community issue that demands action from micro-, mezzo-, and macro actors (Beyer, et al, 2015; Modi, et al. 2014). Collective efficacy theory has been primarily used in studies of violent neighborhood crime (Almgren, 2005), but there is an emerging literature that makes theoretical connections between collective efficacy and IPA (Beck, Ohmer, & Warner, 2012). For example, Browning (2002) found that collective efficacy has the potential to protect a neighborhood from increased IPA. Theoretically, a neighborhood that has shared values and a strong sense of social cohesion will be more likely to enact social control strategies that will, in turn, reduce IPA.

Literature Review

Although there has been a proliferation of bystander intervention programs for preventing sexual assault on college campuses, (Jouriles, Krauss, Vu, Banyard, & McDonald, 2018) fewer of these programs have targeted the wider community. Many formal IPA intervention strategies target training professionals like nurses and police officers without addressing informal helpers

(Chabot et. al, 2009). Further, the majority of the research in this area focuses on individual and peer factors as opposed to contextual factors that influence the likelihood of bystander intervention (Banyard, 2008; Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Potter, Stapleton, & Moynihan, 2008). Critics of this approach often cite the need for an ecological or systems approach to understanding factors that inhibit or promote bystander intervention (Edwards et.al, 2000; McMahan & Farmer, 2009). Edwards and colleagues (2000) suggest that individual factors that influence bystander intervention cannot be understood outside of a social context. Thus, below we discuss the individual and neighborhood factors that are associated with bystander intervention.

Factors that predict neighborhood bystander intervention.

Individual-level.

Intervening in IPA situations depends on numerous individual demographic factors such as gender, income, and age (Chabot et. al, 2009). Research has shown that women, individuals with lower annual incomes, and older individuals are more likely to intervene in IPA incidents (Edwards, Mattingly, Dixon, & Banyard, 2014). Frye (2007) reported a positive relationship between age and self-efficacy in intervening in situations of violence. In addition, intrapersonal characteristics such as attitudes and beliefs have been shown to predict bystander intervention behaviors. For example, individuals with a positive attitude towards reporting (Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Frye, 2007); less tolerance of IPA (Chabot et. al., 2009); and greater self-efficacy (Frye, 2007; Sulkowski, 2011) tend to be more likely to intervene in IPA incidents. Chabot et. al (2009) found that characteristics of the perpetrator, such as sex, severity of the incident, and attribution also influence a person's willingness to intervene. Situational factors, like how many persons were there during the time of the incident, have also been shown to influence the likelihood of

intervening (Borges & Penta, 1977). Further, studies suggest that persons are less likely to intervene during an incident involving a female victim when the perpetrator is perceived to be her husband or partner (Laner et al., 2001; Shotland & Straw, 1976). In summary, there are many complex factors that operate at the individual-level and serve to either increase or decrease one's likelihood of intervening in instances of IPA. None of these factors can be understood in isolation, and thus it is imperative to examine the contextual factors that coalesce and interact with individual factors to influence IPA neighborhood intervention.

Neighborhood-level.

There are numerous studies that examine the relationship between collective efficacy and community violence (Sampson & Morenoff, 2004; Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley, 2002) and significantly fewer that associate collective efficacy with IPA prevalence (e.g., Browning, 2002). Studies that consider the relation between bystander intervention and a component of collective efficacy—social cohesion—show mixed results. For example, one study found that social cohesion was positively related to IPA bystander intervention for men and women in a rural community (Edwards, Mattingly, Dixon, and Banyard, 2014) while a study by Frye (2007) found that perceptions of social cohesion did not predict informal social control (i.e., intervening in violent situations). Frye's (2007) study is most germane to the present study. In her study, data from 119 New York City residents were used to assess perceptions of neighborhood social cohesion and related neighborhood factors, personal attitudes toward IPA, and self-efficacy to intervene in situations of IPA. Frye's findings showed personal, healthy attitudes towards IPA and self-efficacy to respond to IPA were positively associated with informal social control of IPA against women. Perceptions of neighborhood social cohesion and other neighborhood factors were not positively associated with the informal social control of IPA

against women (p.1012). However, Frye's sample was relatively small and there is a need for further examination of how individual and neighborhood factors connect to bystander intervention. Thus, our study aims to expand the literature by examining the relationships between individual beliefs about IPA and attitudes about IPA reporting, perceptions of social cohesion, and intervening in neighborhood IPA situations in a large, community-based sample in Utah. Specifically, we hypothesize that individuals with more accurate beliefs about what constitutes IPA, fewer perceived barriers to reporting IPA, and higher levels of social cohesion will be more likely to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood.

METHODS

Data

Data for this study come from a cross-sectional community-based research project that was part of an annual statewide survey conducted in 2016. The survey was developed in collaboration with numerous anti-violence agencies in Utah in an effort to learn more about what community-members know and how they feel about IPA issues in their communities with the intention of using these data for community-outreach purposes.

Sample

The study sample is a subset (n=1,626) of a larger sample of an adult-aged general public sample in Utah (N=2,393). The analysis sample includes only individuals for which there were complete data for all study variables. Data were collected using three methods. The ultimate goal of the three-pronged sampling plan was to obtain a sample of individuals who were diverse in race, socioeconomic status, and religion. In the first sampling method, we used a stratified sampling technique wherein we identified neighborhoods (operationalized as block groups according to Census data) based on proportion of individuals living at or below the federal

poverty guideline. Three strata in each city/town were identified by calculating geographic area tercile points for the Census indicator in question. Census block groups were randomly selected from each strata in each of the 6 cities/towns. Researchers were then randomly assigned a neighborhood block group and every third house was surveyed until 14 surveys from each neighborhood block group was collected. This generated nearly twenty percent of the larger sample (n=315, 19.4%). Next, the survey was distributed online to respondents via social media (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) (n=947, 58.2%) and to community and religious organizations within the community to be redistributed to their clientele or parishioners (n=364, 22.4%). The final sample (N= 1,626) constitutes completed responses on the items included in the analysis. Table 1 portrays the demographic characteristics for the analysis sample. The majority of study participants were in their mid to late 30s, female, white and identified as Latter-Day Saint (see Table 1). With the exception of the over sampling of female respondents, the sample reflects the general population of Utah. There were few respondents who were born outside the United States. Although almost five percent reported being born outside the United States, there was slight under sampling of foreign born residents, as the census reports that percentage to be 7.2% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Finally, 54.4% of the sample lived in rural areas of the county.

Insert table 1 about here

Measures

Intentions of intervening in an IPA situation. The outcome variable, developed by the authors, was a 3-item scale that measured the intentions of intervening in an IPA situation ($\alpha = .719$). Using a 5-point Likert scale from *very unlikely* to *very likely*, respondents were asked how likely would they intervene in the following scenarios: “You heard a domestic dispute coming

from your neighbor's home;" "You were suspicious that your neighbor was physically abusing his or her partner;" and "There was a fight in front of your house between intimate partners and someone was being beaten or threatened." The total scale score ranged from 3 to 15 with higher values indicating higher intentions of intervening.

Reporting beliefs. How a person feels about an IPA situation will affect their intentions to report or intervene (Chabot et. al., 2009). To account for personal beliefs about IPA situations, three separate items, developed by the authors, were included: "I consider IPA more of a personal issue of the couple, rather than a community issue;" "I would be more likely to report IPA to the police if it were a couple that I knew rather than a couple that I did not know;" and "I would feel uncomfortable reporting IPA to police because I would be concerned that if the abuser found out, they would either hurt me or hurt the victim more." Respondents were asked on a 5-point Likert scale how much they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements.

Beliefs about violence. Beliefs about IPA were measured using a 15-item scale ($\alpha = .958$) that asked respondents using a 5-point Likert scale how much they agreed or disagreed with statements about what constitutes abuse. The items were adapted from Flescher's (2003) work community survey in Longmont, CO. The higher the score, the more the respondent held beliefs that aligned with the definition of IPA. The items included: "A person verbally threatens to harm their partner/ex-partner or their children;" "A person secretly follows them to keep track of their partner/ex-partner's actions;" "A person shoves or pushes their partner/ex-partner;" "A person repeatedly contacts (calls, texts, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter) their partner/ex-partner to annoy or scare them;" "A person hits their partner/ex-partner resulting in pain or bruising;" "A person hurts the family pet in order to scare or annoy their partner/ex-partner;" "A person damages some personal items belonging to their partner/ex-partner;" "A person slaps the

partner/ex-partner in front of their children;” “A person forces their partner/ex-partner to engage in sexual activities against their will;” “A person coerces their partner/ex-partner to engage in sexual activities;” “A person withholds money from their partner/ex-partner as a way to control them;” “A person uses their religious theology as a way to control their partner/ex-partner;” “A person has a heated verbal fight (yelling and screaming) with their partner/ex-partner in front of their children;” “A person consistently insults their partner;” and “A person consistently points out their partner’s flaws or mistakes.” The range for this scale was 15-75.

Social cohesion. To understand the effects of a neighborhood’s social cohesion on an individual’s intentions to intervene, a 5-item social cohesion scale ($\alpha = .860$) was used (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). On a 5-point Likert scale, respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with the following items: “People around here are willing to help their neighbors;” “This is a close-knit neighborhood;” “People in this neighborhood can be trusted;” “People in this neighborhood generally don’t get along with each other;” and “People in this neighborhood do not share the same values.” The last item was reverse coded. The scale ranged from 5 to 25.

Control variables. Respondents’ age, income, gender, race, nativity, religion, and if they resided in a rural county were included in the analysis to control for the effects of demographics on the intention to intervene in an IPA situation. Age was a continuous variable measured by years. Income was a continuous variable measured by the respondent’s self-report of their annual income. Gender was a dichotomous variable with Female =1 and Male = 0. Female respondents were used as the reference category.¹ For race, respondents were asked to identify as either Asian American, Black, Latino, Native American or Pacific Islander, White, and Other. Race was recoded into three categories: White, Latino, and Other. Because of the low number of

respondents identifying as Asian American, Black, Native American or Pacific Islander, and Other, those were recoded into the “Other” category. White respondents were used as the reference category. Next, nativity, or whether a respondent was born in the United States, was a dichotomous variable with being born in the United States as the reference category. For religion, respondents self-reported their religious affiliation as either Atheist, Catholic, Jewish, LDS, Non-denominational Christian, Muslim, Protestant, or a write-in Other. These categories were collapsed into Atheist/Agnostic, Catholic, Latter-Day Saint, Other, and non-denominational Christian. Atheist/Agnostic was the reference category for religion. Finally, whether a person lived in a rural county in the state was included as a dichotomous variable. Person’s residing in predominantly rural counties were coded as 1 and non-rural counties were coded as 0.

Analysis

Simple descriptive statistics were used to understand the sample and responses. To determine how social cohesion may influence the intentions of intervening, a hierarchical linear regression was employed. Regressed onto the intention to intervene scale variable were the control variables, reporting beliefs, beliefs about violence, and social cohesion. Missing data were addressed through stepwise deletion.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

The results regarding the intention to intervene scale indicated that respondents scored high on the intention to intervene (see Table 2) ($M = 11.50$, $SD = 2.19$). In other words, more than half (57.5%) of the sample reported they were likely or highly likely to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood. However, on average, respondents reported neutral responses to the beliefs about reporting IPA. Specifically, the mean score for “IPA is a personal issue” was

2.45 ($SD = 1.08$), “respondent knows the couple” was 2.68 ($SD = 1.16$), and “respondent has high concern for retaliation” was 2.87 ($SD = 1.19$). In other words, 60.2% of participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that IPA is a personal issue, 52.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they would be more likely to intervene if they knew the couple, and 45.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they would not feel comfortable reporting IPA out of fear of retaliation. On a scale of 15-60 with higher scores indicating greater alignment between participants’ beliefs and definitions of IPA, participants had an average score of 52.52 ($SD = 8.32$). Put simply, participants had high levels of agreement that various abusive acts constitute IPA. The average social cohesion score for participants was 17.76 ($SD = 3.89$) on a scale of 5-25. Overall the sample had high intentions to intervene, beliefs about IPA that aligned with definitions of abuse, high levels of social cohesion, and mixed reporting beliefs.

Insert table 2 about here

Multivariate Results

Table 3 presents the results from the hierarchical linear regression. Overall, the hierarchical linear regression analysis indicated the demographic controls, beliefs about violence and reporting, and social cohesion accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in the intention of intervening in IPA situations in one’s neighborhood, $R^2 = .105$, $F(16, 1,648) = 11.961$, $p < .001$.

As shown in Table 3, the only significant demographic variable associated with the dependent variable was age. Age was positively related to intention of intervening in IPA situations in one’s neighborhood, such that the older an individual was, the more likely they were to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood. Reporting beliefs were negatively related to the dependent variable: An individual was less likely to intervene in IPA situations in their

neighborhood if they agreed that (1) IPA is more of a personal issue than a community issue; (2) they would be more likely to report IPA if it were a couple they knew rather than one they did not; and (3) they would feel uncomfortable reporting due to concern that the abuser would hurt them or the victim more. Finally, social cohesion was positively associated with the dependent variable such that participants with higher levels of reported social cohesion were more likely to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood. It is important to note that the overall size of these coefficients were relatively small. For additional details regarding model statistics, refer to Table 3.

Insert table 3 about here

DISCUSSION

Using a large, community-based sample, our study expands the literature by examining the relationships between individual beliefs about IPA and attitudes about IPA reporting, perceptions of social cohesion, and intervening in neighborhood IPA situations. We found that, when controlling for numerous demographic characteristics, beliefs and attitudes about IPA and IPA reporting as well as social cohesion were each significantly associated with increased intention of intervening in an IPA situation in one's neighborhood. **While reporting beliefs, beliefs about IPA, and social cohesion were all statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable, the size of the coefficients were largest for individuals' reporting beliefs.** Although the coefficient for social cohesion was smaller, it presents an unexplored avenue for IPA prevention and has practical implications for designing neighborhood-level prevention and intervention strategies for reducing IPA in our communities. IPA is a community issue that requires a comprehensive approach. Our finding that social cohesion is connected to IPA intervention adds credence to recent work with similar findings (Edwards, et al., 2014) despite

being inconsistent with previous work (Frye, 2007). Specifically, we found that as individuals perceived their neighborhood as having greater capacity to realize common values and form strong social ties, they had higher intentions of intervening in IPA situations in their neighborhood. This finding suggests that community development efforts that seek to build social cohesion may have implications for increasing neighborhood bystander intervention, which could, in the long-term, lead to greater social control regarding IPA. Practically speaking, social cohesion can be built through community development programs like NeighborCircles (Lawrence Community Works, 2007) that bring residents together in structured opportunities like dinners to help them build relationships and realize their shared values for their neighborhood. Although these types of community development programs do not typically originate in the domestic violence sector, they have the potential to build social cohesion and have positive spillover effects for increasing IPA bystander intervention and ultimately reducing IPA.

Our findings regarding the relationship between beliefs/attitudes and IPA intervention are consistent with the literature (Chabot et. al., 2009; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Frye, 2007). Specifically, we found participants reported lower intention of intervening in IPA situations in their neighborhood when they believed that IPA is more of a personal issue than a community issues, they are more concerned about retaliation from the perpetrator if they were to intervene, and they believe they would be more likely to intervene if they knew a couple personally. These findings suggest potential avenues for community change efforts that attempt to build community-wide beliefs that IPA is a community-level concern and one that demands attention from the individuals that comprise the community. Furthermore, participants' concerns about retaliation from the perpetrator point to important work that needs to be done to increase trust

between the legal system (including law enforcement) and IPA bystanders. Without trust that the perpetrator will be held accountable, neighborhood bystanders may continue to be fearful of retaliation and less likely to intervene. Not surprisingly, we found that folks who have more accurate beliefs about what constitutes IPA were more likely to intervene in IPA situations in their neighborhood. In other words, if an individual strongly believes that hitting, slapping, or kicking their partner constitutes IPA, this individual is more likely to intervene in IPA in their neighborhood. This finding illuminates the need for increasing public consciousness on accurate definitions of IPA. It is possible that when individuals have inaccurate beliefs about the definition of IPA, they may not (1) even recognize that IPA is happening in their neighborhood despite indicators of such, or (2) think it is serious enough to intervene.

Limitations

Despite this study's merits, it faces a number of limitations which necessitate a cautious interpretation of results. First, this study is only generalizable to a Utah context. Given that almost two-thirds of the sample were LDS (Mormon), the finding that social cohesion is associated with intention to intervene may not be true among other regions/demographics, which is consistent with Frye's (2007) findings. Although stratified random sampling was used in the neighborhood sub-sample, these surveys only accounted for one-fifth of the study sample and the remaining nonrandom online survey sample should be acknowledged as such. Additionally, the sample was predominantly female, and thus does not fully capture the male perspective – something that is needed to further this vein of inquiry. Further, the sensitive nature of the study topic combined with the use of face-to-face study invitations in the neighborhood sub-sample may have introduced social desirability bias. Further, many factors may influence someone's decision to intervene in IPA incidents and the cross-sectional nature of the study precludes any

causal inferences. The current study examined macro-level influencers, but did not include micro level variables (e.g., prior victimization or perpetration histories, vicarious victimization, type of education, and so forth) that might be directly correlated with a person's intention to intervene. Finally, it should be noted that the dependent variable measured intentions for intervening and not bystander intervention behaviors themselves. Although this is common in the bystander intervention literature, it is possible that intentions do not accurately depict what behaviors will take their place. In addition, the intention to intervene variable only captured scenarios where physical and verbal abuse were observed. Future studies on neighborhood bystander intervention should expand to consider other forms of abuse.

Conclusions

In summary, using a large, community-based sample, our study found that beliefs about reporting, attitudes/beliefs about IPA, and social cohesion were each significantly associated with the intention of intervening in an IPA situation in one's neighborhood. Our study findings expand the current bystander literature, more importantly it adds to the growing evidence for the necessity of considering neighborhood factors in the study and the design of community based bystander interventions programs. Not only should future programming focus on micro level attitudinal changes, but should also incorporate neighborhoods into the local domestic violence community response.

REFERENCES

- Almgren, G. (2005). The ecological context of interpersonal violence: From culture to collective efficacy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(2), 218-224.
doi:10.1177/0886260504267741
- Bannon, R. S., & Foubert, J. D. (2017). The bystander approach to sexual assault risk reduction: Effects on risk recognition, perceived self-efficacy, and protective behavior. *Violence & Victims*, 32(1), 46-59. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-15-00057
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and Correlates of Prosocial Bystander Behavior: The Case of Interpersonal Violence. *Violence & Victims*, 23(1), 83-97.
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of violence*, 1(3), 216.
- Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: an experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25(4), 463-481. doi:10.1002/jcop.20159
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. 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
- Beck, E., Ohmer, M., & Warner, B. (2012). Strategies for preventing neighborhood violence: Toward bringing collective efficacy into social work practice. *Journal of Community Practice*, 20(3), 225-240. doi:10.1080/10705422.2012.700278
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(3), 476-496. doi:10.1177/0886260513505210
- Beyer, K., Wallis, A. B., & Hamberger, L. K. (2015). Neighborhood environment and intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, 16(1), 16-47.
doi:10.1177/1524838013515758
- Borges, M. A., & Penta, J. M. (1977). Effects of third party intercession on bystander intervention. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 103(1), 27.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Browning, C. R. (2002). The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of Marriage And Family*, 64(4), 833-850.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00833.x

- Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, attribution, and severity influence intervention decisions of informal helpers in domestic violence. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(10), 1696-1713. doi:10.1177/0886260509331514
- De La Rue, L., Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2017). A meta-analysis of school-based interventions aimed to prevent or reduce violence in teen dating relationships. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(1), 7-34.
- Edwards, R. W., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. A., Oetting, E. R., & Swanson, L. (2000). Community readiness: Research to practice. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 291-307.
- Edwards, K., Mattingly, M., Dixon, K., & Banyard, V. (2014). Community matters: Intimate partner violence among rural young adults. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 53*(1/2), 198-207. doi:10.1007/s10464-014-9633-7
- Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., & ... Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(4), 517-537. doi:10.1037/a0023304
- Flescher, Elise. (2003). *A Study Regarding Violence in Longmont: A Survey of Victims, Police Officers, & the Public*. Longmont Police Department: Longmont, CO.
- Frye, V. (2007). The informal social control of intimate partner violence against women: Exploring personal attitudes and perceived neighborhood social cohesion. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(8), 1001-1018.
- Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006). Public attitudes toward reporting partner violence against women and reporting behavior. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 68*(3), 759-768. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00288.x
- Hipp, J. R. (2016). Collective efficacy: How is it conceptualized, how is it measured, and does it really matter for understanding perceived neighborhood crime and disorder? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 46*, 32-44. Doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.016
- Jouriles, E. N., Krauss, A., Vu, N. L., Banyard, V. L., & McDonald, R. (2018). Bystander programs addressing sexual violence on college campuses: A systematic review and meta-analysis of program outcomes and delivery methods. *Journal of American College Health, 66*, 457-466. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2018.1431906
- Laner, M. R., Benin, M. H., & Ventrone, N. A. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: who's worth helping?. *Deviant Behavior, 22*(1), 23-42. doi:10.1080/016396201750065793
- Lawrence Community Works (2007). *The NeighborCircles Approach—A Practice Guide for Hosts, Facilitators, and Organizers*. Retrieved from

https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/typp/pages/67/attachments/original/1445572280/0155_NeighborCircles.pdf?1445572280

- Lochner, K., Kawachi, I., & Kennedy, B. P. (1999). Social capital: A guide to its measurement. *Health & Place, 5*, 259-270.
- McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2009). The bystander approach: strengths-based sexual assault prevention with at-risk groups. *Journal of Human Behavior in The Social Environment, 19*(8), 1042-1065. doi:10.1080/10911350902990304
- McMahon, S., Peterson, N. A., Winter, S. C., Palmer, J. E., Postmus, J. L., & Koenik, R. A. (2003). *American Journal of Community Psychology, 56*, 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9740-0>
- Modi, M. N., Palmer, S., & Armstrong, A. (2014). The role of Violence Against Women Act in addressing intimate partner violence: A public health issue. *Journal of Women's Health, 23*(3), 253-259. doi:10.1089/jwh.2013.4387
- Potter, S. J., Stapleton, J. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2008). Designing, implementing and evaluating a media campaign illustrating the bystander role. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 36*, 39-56. doi: abs/10.1080/10852350802022308
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918-924. doi:10.1126/science.277.5328.918
- Sampson, R. J. & Morenoff, J. D. (2004). Spatial (dis)advantage and homicide in Chicago neighborhoods. *Spatially integration social science*. M.F. Goodchild & D. G. Janelle (Eds.), 145-170. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D. & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing “neighborhood effects”: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 443-478.
- Sapouna, M. (2010). Collective efficacy in the school context: Does it help explain victimization and bullying among Greek primary and secondary school students? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(10), 1912-1927. doi:10.1177/0886260509354509
- Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 34*(5), 990-999.
- Smith, S.G., Zhang, X., Basile, K.C., Merrick, M.T., Wang, J., Kresnow, M., Chen, J. (2018). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2015 Data Brief. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Sulkowski, M. L. (2011). An investigation of students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(1), 53-65. doi:10.1037/a0021592

U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). *Foreign born persons, percent, 2012-2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/map/cachecountyutah/POP645216#viewtop>

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

	N [Mean, SD]	% [Range]
Age	[37.6, 14.1]	18-84
Annual Income	[\$62,646, \$62,721]	[\$2-\$1,500,000]
Gender (Female) [†]	1246	76.7
Race		
White	1463	89.3
Latino	68	4.2
Other	107	6.5
Religion [‡]		
Atheist/Agnostic	167	10.3
Non-denominational Christian	154	9.5
Latter-Day Saint	1039	63.9
Catholic	66	4.1
Other	200	12.3
Born outside the U.S. (Yes)	76	4.7
Lives in the rural part of the state (Yes)	884	54.4

[†] In the larger sample, there were 3 respondents who identified as transgender. They were omitted from the final analysis sample due the small n; [‡] does not equal 100 due to rounding error

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Key Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Range
Intention to Intervene [†]	11.50	2.19	3-15
Reporting Beliefs [‡]			
IPA is a personal issue	2.42	1.09	1-5
Respondent knows the couple	2.68	1.16	1-5
Respondent has high concern for retaliation	2.87	1.19	1-5
Respondents Belief about IPA [§]	52.52	8.33	15-60
Social cohesion [¶]	17.77	3.90	5-25

† 3-item scale with individual items ranging from 1=not at all likely to intervene to 5=highly likely to intervene, higher scale scores indicate higher intention of intervening; ‡ measured as individual items, ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree; § 15-item scale with individual items ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree, higher scale scores indicate more accurate beliefs about IPA; ¶ 5-item scale with individual items ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree, higher scale scores indicate higher levels of collective efficacy.

Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Intention of Intervening in IPA Situation in Neighborhood (N=1,626)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	11.476	0.525		21.869	0.000
Age	0.011	0.004	0.07	2.771	0.006
Income	1.98E-07	0.000	0.006	0.235	0.814
Gender (Male)	-0.079	0.128	-0.015	-0.619	0.536
Race [†]					
Latino	0.003	0.286	0	0.01	0.992
Other	-0.157	0.219	-0.018	-0.716	0.474
Nativity (Born in the U.S.)	-0.495	0.261	-0.048	-1.894	0.058
Religion [‡]					
Catholic	-0.235	0.32	-0.021	-0.735	0.463
Latter-Day Saint	0.061	0.18	0.013	0.338	0.735
Other	0.122	0.221	0.018	0.552	0.581
Non-Denominational Christian	0.274	0.233	0.037	1.174	0.241
Rural (Yes)	0.067	0.105	0.015	0.636	0.525
Reporting Beliefs					
IPA Personal Issue	-0.315	0.05	-0.156	-6.244	0.000
Knows Couple	-0.28	0.048	-0.148	-5.786	0.000
Concern for Retaliation	-0.146	0.048	-0.079	-3.068	0.002
Beliefs about IPA	0.017	0.006	0.066	2.725	0.007
Social cohesion	0.034	0.014	0.061	2.368	0.018
<i>R</i> ²	.105				
<i>F</i>	11.961***				

Note: **p* < .05. ***p* < .01.

[†]Reference category is White.

[‡]Reference category is Atheist.