Understanding Civil Behavior from Jakarta Urban Citizens: Study on High and Low Education Level Group

Nudzran Yusya and Amarina Ashar Ariyanto

Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract: This study aimed to describe the perception of civil behavior – especially responsibility, politeness and manners, respect, and empathy - among high and low education level group. One hundred and thirty eight people with high (diploma, undergraduate, and graduate level) and low education (elementary and junior high school) background in Jakarta participated in the study. The main study questionnaire was based on the result of preliminary research to 80 students to explore the meaning of civil behavior. In the main study, participants ranked behaviours which mostly describe citizen's responsibility, politeness and manners, respect, and empathy. Chi- square analysis revealed no difference between the two groups regarding the behavior that best described the social responsibility of citizens. However, there was a significant difference between high and low education level group regarding behavior that best described politeness and manners, respect, and empathy. These findings confirmed the diverse meaning of civility and behavior associated to civility, especially as politeness, respect and empathy among different education background groups. This study can serve as benchmark for civil behavior in Jakarta, as well as a reference for future policies regarding civility in urban areas. Items used in future studies are expected to be more easily understood by participants.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this study, the city of Jakarta became the highlight because of rapid changes and development that impact the lives of its citizens. The complexity of Jakarta might affect the perception of civil behavior among citizens of the city, how they process, organize and interpret information. Boyd (2006) explains that in everyday life in urban cities, civil behavior is recognized easily but not as easy to define. Based on researchers observation, there are many various answers from Jakarta citizens when asked, "what is civil behavior?". Some citizens perceive "greeting friends in public" as respect to others, whereas some other citizens perceive it as politeness and manners. Therefore we question what is civility from the perspective of Jakarta citizens?

To find out how Jakarta citizen perceive and give meaning to civil behavior and to understand more accurate whether civil behaviors are perceived as citizen's responsibility, politeness and manners, respect, or empathy, we conduct a descriptive study to Jakarta citizens. The first behaviour refers to substantive civility; while the rest refer to formal civility.

Civil related experience vary among individuals across the globe which result in various different interpretation about civil behavior. The process when people observe, experience and interpret their esperience is labelled as perception, or social perception. Any stimuli from the real world are received and interpreted as perceptual experience. The world that we know is the result of perception which are "not real" as they are all perceived world. Citizens of Jakarta are inevitable of being influenced by various variables that are present since Jakarta became the capital city of Indonesia and transformed into an urban city. According to Mourad (2001, in Wilkins et al., 2010), formal education is the main component of civil behavior. City relates to education and social maturity, as formal education aims to develop the community, to prepare the students to be able to serve and improve the social condition. Therefore we hypothesised that the proportion of the civil behavior that are considered most important will be different between the high and the low education level group.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Civility, defined as polite behaviors that maintain social harmony or demonstrate respect for the humanity of an individual, is important in maintaining a society (Wilkins et al., 2010). Definition of civility covers a fairly wide area; such as a behavior based on the presence of respect (Wilkins et al., 2010), responsibility and rights (Boyd, 2006), empathy (Davis, 1983), or politeness (Ferris, 2002). Boyd (2006) categorized civility into formal civility and substantive civility. Formal civility refers to manners, politeness, courtesies or other direct face to face interactions. While substantive civility is a sense of membership in a community that comes with various rights and obligations.

Civil behavior is important to be present amongst urban community because civil behavior develops a convenient and pleasant city atmosphere to live in (Labigne, 2012) and stimulate a city to grow optimally, through making the citizens participate actively to embody the direction of progress and activities of the city. However, there are indications that civil behavior are declining in major cities, which is caused by several factors, such as individualism, the influence of media, technology development, weakening of family role, mobility, and the increasing level of violence. (Labigne, 2012; Mumford, 1938; Wilkins et al., 2010).

Perception is the process of organizing and interpreting sensory information to reach a meaning (King, 2011). Each individual has different ways to interpret and process various sensory information experienced everyday, also in the process of interpreting and processing events considered as a civil or incivil behavior. Personal experience and environmental stimuli can influence the type of civil or incivil behavior perceived by urban citizens. There is yet no study that specifically examine the perception towards civil behavior of Jakarta urban citizens.

Perception of civil behavior is defined as a process where people receive, categorise and give meaning to experiences, interactions, stimulus associated with civility. The focus of this study are four elements of civility: politeness and manners, civic responsibility, empathy, and respect. Politeness and manners; empathy; and respect are classified into formal civility. While civic responsibility is classified into substantive civility.

There are various factors that can affect the perception torwards civil behavior of Jakarta urban citizens. One of the factors that determine how the interpretation and organization of information is the level of education. Functionalist argue that formal education can give rise to civil behavior, social integration, and obedience in a community (Parsons, 1959; in Peck, 2002). Educational background levels can affect how an individual understands everything. The information possessed by an individual will influence and to a certain extent determine his actions and thoughts. According to Meyer (1977), education can reorganize a population, create leaders, and redefine the rights and obligations of a society.

O'Carroll et al. (2006) conducted a research to see the relationship between voter's participation during election and education. The conclusion of their study shows level of education increases the number of informed voters. The higher level of education increases the likelihood of voters to participate during elections by 21% to 30% (O'Carroll et al., 2006). This suggests that education affects participation in democracy. In addition, Keyes (2005) showed that the level of civic responsibility, social involvement, and social concern is influenced by the level of education (Keyes, 2002).

Both of the above studies conducted in the United States, trying to find the correlation between education and civil behavior in point of view of substantive civility. Journal literatures about formal civility is limited as substantive civility remains the major focus of most studies. Discussions about civil behavior in Indonesia from a formal civility point of view is limited. This prompted the researchers to study the perception towards civil behavior of Jakarta citizens with high and low education levels.

3 RESEARCH METHOD

Participants of this study were adult citizens of Jakarta aged 18-60 years old, with high (diploma, bachelor, and master degree) and low education level (primary school and junior high school) who has been living in Jakarta for at least four years. Both groups must have completed elementary education to avoid literacy constrains. There were 138 participants (77 participants from high education and 61 participants from low education level group).

Individual varieties in perceiving civil behavior is confirmed from the preliminary study conducted by the researchers to 80 undergaduate students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia. Students were requested to list

several words related to civil behavior using free association. Results of the preliminary study showed at least 530 words and sentences that describe "what it is civil behavior". All words were categorized and ranked based on the frequency of occurence by four independent raters.

The questionnaire used in the study is the continuation of the preliminary study, where participants listed five most important behaviours that can best describe the elements of civility. Then they rank the behaviour from the most important (1) to least important (5) for citizens's responsibility. The same is done for element number two (politeness and manners), element number three (respect), and element number four (empathy).

This research is a descriptive research because it provides a depiction of perception towards civility of Jakarta urban citizens at high and low education level groups. The categorization between high and low education level is based on the length of time that has passed by an individual in formal education.The low education group are individuals who have formal education for 6-9 years (equivalent to elementary or junior high school level). The high education level are individuals who have formal education for more than 13 years (equivalent to the level of all diploma, bachelor, master, or doctoral degree).

The data were mainly about citizen in Jakarta. Data collection took approximately four weeks, from May 8th, 2016 until June 4th, 2016. To obtain low education level group participants, the researchers came to the traditional market at Kebayoran Lama and some areas in South Jakarta. To find high education level group respondents, the researchers distributed questionnaires to students at the University of Indonesia that live in Jakarta. All participants received rewards after completion of questionnaire.

Processing data using descriptive statistics to prove whether there is a relationship between two variables. Independent t-test was used to evaluate the relationship between the two variables in the population based on the frequency of the data from the sample. Then the sample distribution frequency was used to test the hypothesis.

4 RESULT

Statistical analysis with chi-square technique aim to determine the differences of perception among the high and low education level group in every element of civil behavior. We compared the highest score of each behavior in every element of civil behavior among the high and low education level group.

The data showed significant difference for element of civic responsibility among the high (x^2 (n = 77) = 56.42, p <.05) and low education level group (x^2 (n = 61) = 27.31, p <.05). This indicates that there is a difference between researchers assumption with the reality in the field about behavior of civic responsibility among high and low education group. The distribution proportion of civil behavior for civic responsibility is not spread evenly among the high and low education level group. The high and low education level group are likely to assume there is one or more behavior that best describe civic responsibility.

On the element of politeness and manners, high education level group is significant (x^2 (n = 77) = 50.72, p <.05), which means that the distribution proportion of civil behavior that is considered to best describe politeness and manners is not spread evenly among the high education level group. While the low education level group was not significant (x^2 (n = 61) = 27.31, p <.05). It shows the distribution proportion of civil behavior that best describes politeness and manners was spread evenly for the low education level group.

For the element of respect, high education level group is significantly higher (x^2 (n = 77) = 27.74, p <.05), which means that the distribution proportion of civil behavior of respect was not spread evenly. While among the low education level group (x^2 (n = 61) = 15.65, p <.05), in element of respect is not significant. So the distribution proportion of behavior that are considered best to describes civil behavior for element of respect from low education level groups are spread evenly. The interpretation is the high education level group are likely to assume one or more behaviors that best describe respect. While the low education level group are likely to assume that there is no specific behavior that best describes respect.

The last element which is the element of empathy, high education level group was significant (x^2 (n = 77) = 51.55, p <.05), meaning the distribution proportion of civil behavior for element of empathy in high education level group was not spread evenly. While the low education level group was not significant (x^2 (n = 61) = 18:42, p <.05), which means that the distribution proportion of civil

behavior for element of respect in low education level group was spread evenly. Interpretations that can be drawn is high education level group are likely to assume there are several behaviors that best describes empathy. As for the group of low education level, the interpretation that can be drawn is low education level group are likely to assume that there is no specific behavior that best describes empathy. Therefore, the group of low education level tend to exercise all five five civil behaviors related to the elemnt of empathy in urban life.

Table 1: Table of Significance of **citizen's responsibility** element from civil behavior based on independent t-test calculation

Behavior	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Menyebrang di jembatan penyebrangan	1.559	136	.121
Mematuhi segala aturan lalu lintas	1.514	136	.132
Membuang sampah pada tempatnya	-1.272	136	.206
Menjaga fasilitas umum	-2.247	136	.026
Mengikuti tata tertib kapanpun dan dimanapun berada	.587	134.041	.558
Tingkah laku kewajiban yg paling sering muncul	1.373	135.157	.172
Tingkah laku kewajiban yg paling jarang muncul	-1.093	135.640	.276

Table 2: Table of Significance of **politeness and manners** element from civil behavior based on independent t-test calculation

Behavior	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mengucapkan salam saat bertemu dan berpisah dengan orang lain	3.391	136	.001
Mengucapkan terima kasih saat seseorang membantu kita	-2.283	105.381	.024
Senyum ketika berpapasan dengan orang lain	2.255	133.857	.026
Menyapa orang yang dikenal saat bertemu	.078	136	.938
Berbicara sopan dengan orang lain	-3.185	136	.002
sopan santun yg paling sering muncul	3.987	135.753	.000
sopan santun yang paling jarang muncul/ditemui	-.846	136	.399

Table 3: Table of Significance of **respect** element from civil behavior based on independent t- test calculation

Behavior	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Menghargai privasi orang lain	-1.927	103.131	.057
Menghargai perilaku/kepercayaan agama lain	-2.580	136	.011
Orang yang lebih muda menghormati yang lebih tua	1.896	136	.060
Mendengarkan dan memperhatikan orang lain yang sedang berbicara dengan kita	-2.711	136	.008
Menghormati tetangga dengan tidak berisik	5.120	107.019	.000
Tingkah laku respect yg paling sering muncul	-.055	136	.956
Tingkah laku respect yg paling jarang muncul	1.313	136	.191

Table 4: Table of Significance of **empathy** element from civil behavior based on independent t-test calculation

Behavior	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Menolong mobil lain apabila mogok	-1.016	136	.311
Membantu orang yang sedang kesusahan	-4.226	106.529	.000
Secara sukarela membantu orang lain tanpa diminta	-.179	136	.858
Membantu orang lanjut usia menyebrang jalan	.051	136	.959
Memberikan uang kepada pengemis	4.703	87.504	.000
Tingkah laku empathy yg paling sering muncul	4.278	117.422	.000
Tingkah laku empathy yg paling jarang muncul	.072	136	.943

5 DISCUSSIONS

There are some differences between the high education level and low education level group regarding their understandings of which behavior best describes a certain element. Differences between the high education and low education group is found in the behavior of respecting the beliefs of others. High education level group had a greater likelihood of exposure to information related to religious harmony because it has become a daily discussion at the university (all participants of high education level group experienced living in the university environment). However, the group of low education level that only finished elementary or junior high school, are not necessarily familiar interacting with people from different religious backgrounds.

For the element of respect, the behavior "respect of others privacy" best describes the element of respect for both the high and low education level group. In this study it was also found that according to the high education level group, the behavior "respect the elders" is perceived as less describing the element of respect. The reason behind could be because the high education level group tend to acknowledge intellectual integrity more compared to age integrity when interacting with others. While the reason for the low education level group to consider the behavior "respect the elders" to adequately describe the element of respect is because there is a possibility they have an understanding that the integrity of a person is measured based on age not based on intellectual quality of an individual.

Furthermore, this study also found the act of altruistic helping is a luxury, it reinforces the statement of Milgram (2010) and Moser and Corroyer (2001), they argue that along with the increasement of population density in urban areas, the tendency of people to help each other diminishes and their social responsibilities also decline. This is reflected through the behavior "not littering" as most rarely encountered by the group of high education level compared to the four other behaviors in the element of civic obligation. As for the group of low education level, the behavior "maintain public facilities" is the most rarely encountered. This could be because they do not have awareness of the importance to maintain public facilities.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research and data analysis from this study, it can be seen that there is no particular pattern in the perceptions towards civil behavior, both group levels, higher education and lower education. These findings are the answer to the first the research problem. While between the high level of education groups and low level education groups there is no difference of perception about civil behavior. The results of statistical calculations on groups of lower education levels indicate that there is no behavior that are considered best describes the elements of courtesy, respect, and empathy. However, low education level group considers that there is a behavior that best describes the elements obligations as citizens of the city. As for the group of higher education, there are behaviors that are considered to best describes each element.

REFERENCES

Boyd, R. (2006). 'The value of civility?'. *Urban Studies*, *43*(5-6), 863-878.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *44*(1), 113.

Keyes, C. L. (2002). Social civility in the United States. *Sociological Inquiry*, *72*(3), 393-408

King, L. (2010). *The science of psychology: An appreciative view*. McGraw Hill Professional.

Labigne, A. (2012). *Civil*ity as a public opinion: Theorizing civility and discussing an attitude survey-based research agenda. *Journal of Civil Society*, *8*(2), 123-135.

Meyer, J. W. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American journal of Sociology*, 55-77

O'Carroll, C., Harmon, C., & Farrell, L. (2006). The economic and social impact of higher education. *Economic Review*, *82*(1), 363-367.

Milgram, S. (2010). The experience of living in cities. *Crowding and behavior*, *167*, 41.

Mourad, R. (2001). Education after Foucault: The question of civility. *The Teachers College Record*, *103*(5), 739-759.

Moser, G., & Corroyer, D. (2001). Politeness in the Urban Environment Is City Life Still Synonymous with Civility?. *Environment and Behavior*, *33*(5), 611-625.

Peck, D. L. (2002). *Civil*ity: A contemporary context for a meaningful historical concept. *Sociological Inquiry*, *72*(3), 358-375.

Wilkins, K., Caldarella, P., Crook-Lyon, R., & Young, K. R. (2010). Implications of civility for children and adolescents: A review of the literature. *Online Submission*, *33*, 37-4.