Eastern Kentucky University

Encompass

January 2018

The Effects of College Diversity Education on Ethnocultural Empathy

Addison Dean Monroe
Eastern Kentucky University

Recommended Citation

THE EFFECTS OF COLLEGE DIVERSITY EDUCATION ON ETHNOCULTURAL
EMPATHY

BY

ADDISON DEAN MONROE

THESIS APPROVED:

_____
Chair, Advisory Committee

_____
Member, Advisory Committee

_____
Member, Advisory Committee

_____
Dean, Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's of Science in General Psychology degree at Eastern Kentucky University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from these documents are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgements of the source is made. Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this document may be granted my major professor in [his/her] absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this document for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature:

Date: 11/8/2018

THE EFFECTS OF COLLEGE DIVERSITY EDUCATION ON ETHNOCULTURAL

EMPATHY

BY

ADDISON DEAN MONROE

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
Eastern Kentucky University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

2018

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this manuscript to my family and friends. The time I spent completing this project was coincidentally a time when I faced the most challenges and setbacks in my life. The antidote for the losses I dealt with was the unconditional support from those who have meant the most to me. Without the support of my family and friends I would not have made it this far in my education and I would not be the person who I am today. A special thank you to my Father who gave me someone to look up to, my Mother who showed me unconditional love, and my Brother who taught me how to chase dreams. Thank you all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Gains in ethnocultural empathy are one way to establish positive changes in social attitudes. The goal of the present study was to assess changes in ethnocultural empathy among students in a wide range of diversity courses. Preliminary data was collected from two groups of undergraduate students at a large, public university located in the Southeast (n = 47). Pre and post-test measures of ethnocultural empathy (EMC/RSEE) were completed by both the control group (i.e., undergraduate psychology students) and the experimental group (i.e., students enrolled in a diversity course). Post-test, qualitative data related to student perceptions and empathy was also collected and from the diversity course participants. I hypothesized that participants in the diversity course condition would see larger gains in ethnocultural empathy as noted by the quantitative and qualitative measures. A mixed groups factorial ANOVA was conducted for subscale scores (see Table 1). No significant differences between groups were found when comparing pre and post-test scores. However, demographic variables, such as discrimination acknowledgement and multiracial interaction, were positively related to ethnocultural empathy levels. Qualitative data supported several hypotheses. Specifically, most students, (84%) in the diversity condition, were better able to understand what life is like for people who are of a different background as it applies to social identity. Furthermore, most of these students (68%) were better able to understand the traditions and values of other cultures. Most students (68%) reported they were more likely to intervene if they witness someone making discriminating statements towards an individual because of their social identity. Limitations and future directions are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction and Review of the Selected Literature

Diversity education is an increasingly important part of college academics as the U.S. grows more diverse (Colby & Ortman, 2015; Goodman, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Jones and Cox, 2017; Mallinckrodt et al., 2014). Diversity education often addresses social justice topics such as race, religion, gender, sexuality, and social class (Dovidio et al., 2004; Mallinckrodt et al., 2014). The recent spike in diversity education course offerings comes from the need for students to live and work amongst a diverse population (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Goodman et al., 2004; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Efforts to enhance the competency of the U.S. work force are far from perfect which has led to a large increase in diversity education research (Kulik & Roberson, 2008; Remer, 2008). The growing importance of this issue is necessary as the projections of the U.S. composition suggests a large change in composition based on race and ethnicity, sexuality, and religion (Colby & Ortman, 2015; Jones and Cox, 2017; Pew Research Center, 2013; Toossi, 2012).

Race and ethnicity demographics are fluctuating more than ever (Colby & Ortman, 2015). Specifically, the composition of oppressed racial and ethnic minorities continues to grow each year (Colby & Ortman, 2015). Foreign-born individuals are projected to increase in population by 85% from 2014 to 2060 whereas native-born individuals are only expected to increase by 22% (Colby & Ortman, 2015). The majority White population in the U.S. is expected to make up less than half of the population by 2044, which will make our country a "majority-minority" country (Colby & Ortman, 2015). People who are of two or more races are expected to experience the

greatest growth in the upcoming years followed closely by Asian and Hispanic populations (Colby & Ortman, 2015). Toossi (2012) noted that the U.S. work force will be changing quickly as people of color are projected to comprise as much as 40% of the work force by 2020.

Religion and sexual orientation are also under rapid changes in the U.S. (Jones & Cox, 2017). White Christians who make up the majority are now just 43% of the population compared to 65% in 1996 (Jones & Cox, 2017). The religiously unaffiliated (e.g., atheist, agnostic) who made up just 9% of the population in 1993 now make up 24% of the population (Jones & Cox, 2017). Sexuality is also undergoing a large shift in demographics. Although the LGBT community is a clear minority group, 4.1% of Americans now identify as LGBT, which is a steady increase since 2012 (3.5%; Pew Research Center, 2013). The ever-changing populations in the U.S. creates an environment in which discrimination and bias are present each day (Bonilla-Silva, 2017).

Shifting demographics has led to great tension between privileged and oppressed groups (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Worell & Remer, 2003). Worell and Remer (2003) defined privileged groups as groups who have dominant power in society. Oppressed groups are those seen as inferior and different by privileged groups (Worell & Remer, 2003). Privileged groups often have access to valued resources in society whereas oppressed groups are not allowed the same benefit due to systematic action by privileged group members (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Worell & Remer, 2003).

Race is one example of a demographic category that divides people into privileged (e.g., Caucasian) and oppressed (e.g., Black, Hispanic) groups. Education

and housing are two valued resources in the U.S. that are much easier to obtain for Whites than for racial and ethnic minorities (Roscigno, Karafin, & Tester, 2009; Ryan & Bauman, 2016; Taylor, Kochlar, Fry, Velasco, & Motel, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Only 22% of blacks have a college education compared to 36% of whites (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). The lack of educational opportunity for racial minorities may be due to the nature of the schools that racial minorities attend. Black majority schools lack proper buildings, educational resources, experienced teachers, and advanced courses compared to White majority schools (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Housing is another resource that is more challenging to obtain for racial minorities. Less than half of the Black population own homes compared to 75% of the White population (Taylor et al., 2011). Bonilla-Silva (2017) suggested that housing discrimination serves to limit opportunities for Blacks. Between 80 and 90 percent of the housing discrimination cases in the U.S. are perpetrated against Blacks (Roscigno et al., 2009). The overall value of a house within the Black community is worth 18 times less than a house within the White community (Taylor et al., 2011). The struggle for oppressed groups to gain resources is undermined by the privileged groups' desire to maintain valued resources (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Worell & Remer, 2003).

Racial minorities are but one of the oppressed divisions in America. Women, although not a minority, lack social power and experience discriminatory treatment every day (Horowitz, Parker, & Stepler, 2017; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017) weekly earnings for women are 18% lower than weekly earnings for men. Also, 43% of women say they have

experienced discrimination or have been mistreated because of their gender (Horowitz et al., 2017). Most women who have experienced discrimination felt so because of their experience in the work place (e.g., in hiring, salary, promotion; Horowitz et al., 2017). Similar to women, the majority of the LGBT community (66%) say that they have experienced some form of discrimination in their lives because of their sexual orientation (Pew Research Center, 2013). Religious minorities, such as Muslims, also routinely experience discrimination (Pew Research Center, 2017). According to the Pew Research Center (2017), almost half of Muslims living in the U.S. report having experienced discrimination in the past year. In 2016, there were 307 hate-crime incidents reported against Muslims which represented a 19% increase from 2015 (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017). In addition, Jewish people reported 684 hate crimes that same year (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017). Whether it is fighting for education opportunity, equal pay, or acceptance, oppressed groups in the U.S. continue to lack access to the resources privileged groups have acquired.

Diversity Training Goals and Frameworks

College is an exceptional time for diversity training to impact people due to the structure of the time-period that students are in college and the opportunity for development (Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Kulik and Roberson (2008) suggest that diversity training that takes place in an academic course setting can have longer-lasting effects because of the length of the training (e.g., one full semester). The longevity of the college diversity experience makes it far more beneficial than a workshop (e.g., half-day) conducted within an organization (Kulik & Roberson, 2008). The grading

system in college academics also provides an incentive for students to learn and practice the material. Other diversity training formats may not have this luxury, as attendance is normally the only standard (Kulik & Roberson, 2008).

The goals of college diversity courses help to ensure that students are prepared with the knowledge, awareness, and skills that will be required to join the diverse workforce of the U.S (Cross, Brazen, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989). Cultural competency is one of the most basic frameworks for diversity education. Cross et al. (1989) defined cultural competence as:

> A set of congruent behaviours [sic], attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enable that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross cultural situations. The word "culture" is used because it implies the integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs, values, and institutions of a racial, ethnic, religious, or social group. The word competence is used because it implies having the capacity to function effectively. (p. 13)

In essence, cultural competency is the cultural knowledge, awareness, and skills that are needed to function in a diverse society. If students are unable to develop cultural competency skills, they may struggle when experiencing cross-cultural interactions when they enter society (Cross et al., 1989; Kulik & Roberson, 2008).

Although cultural competence is a framework used by most educators, practitioners, and institutions, there are several critics who argue that cultural competency is too simplistic (Fisher-Borne, Cain, & Martin, 2015). Fisher-Borne et al. (2015), suggested there are four major criticisms of cultural competence: (a) the focus on being comfortable with diverse groups rather than being self-aware of power differentials, (b) an overemphasis of racial/ethnic identity as opposed to incorporating other group differences (e.g., religion, social class, gender), (c) a focus on minority

group history rather than striving to eliminate oppression, and (d) a failure to challenge systematic inequality which stabilizes existing social norms.

While cultural competency has a strong focus on acquiring basic knowledge about minorities (Fisher-Borne et al., 2015), cultural humility is a more modern framework with a stronger focus on holding individuals accountable to engage in self-reflection and self-critique (Foronda, Baptiste, Reinholdt, & Ousman, 2016; Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) summarized cultural humility as "a lifelong commitment to self-evaluation and critique, to redressing the power imbalances in the physician-patient dynamic, and to developing mutually beneficial and non-paternalistic partnerships with communities on behalf of individuals and defined populations" (p. 123). A central focus of cultural humility is for all group members (e.g., majority members and minority members) to understand both the opposing culture as well as their own culture. After reflection, the cultural humility model emphasizes not only an acknowledgement of power imbalances, but action that continues to challenge those differences throughout life (Fisher-Borne et al., 2015). The cultural humility model is applicable at both the individual (e.g., college students, workers) and institutional levels (e.g., educational institutions, organizations; Fisher-Borne et al., 2015; Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Furthermore, Foronda et al. (2016) suggested that cultural humility can be used in a variety of contexts like race/ethnicity, sexuality, social class, interprofessional roles, and provider-patient relationships.

Although cultural humility is a relatively modern framework, the literature shows many positive outcomes from using the approach. Rosen, McCall, and

Goodkind (2017) investigated how graduate social work students evaluated assignments as part of a diversity course. The assignments approached diversity using the cultural humility framework (Rosen et al., 2017). Students reported that these assignments helped them to reflect critically on their personal lives as well as the lives of their classmates (Rosen et al., 2017). After the assignment, students felt more prepared to work with diverse populations as they learned to value the tenants of cultural humility (Rosen et al., 2017). Cultural humility has also been applied to the medical field (Chang, Simon, & Dong, 2012; Juarez et al., 2006). Chang and his colleagues (2012) found significant improvements in practitioner-client relationships and health outcomes after cultural humility training. Similarly, Juarez et al. (2012) found that implementing cultural humility into a medical curriculum increased practitioners' attention to patient contexts. Ross (2010) discussed the importance of cultural humility at the community level. While looking at students in a community development and planning graduate program, she found that the incorporation of cultural humility led students to develop insights about community dynamics based on the discovery of their own biases (Ross, 2010). These insights led to a better outlook on relationships with community members (Ross, 2010).

Goodman et al. (2004) provides a more specific framework for diversity training goals and noted the following six goals: ongoing self-examination, sharing power, giving voice, facilitating consciousness raising, building strengths, and leaving clients with tools needed to work toward social change. If the following goals are established, students should be able to learn about other cultures, challenge their own beliefs, and act in a way that is consistent with new beliefs (Goodman et al., 2004; Kulik &

Roberson, 2008). Goodman et al.'s. (2004) framework has a strong focus on bridging the gap between privileged and oppressed groups. "Sharing power" and "giving voice" refer specifically to a reallocation of resources from privileged groups to oppressed groups (Goodman et al., 2004; Worell & Remer, 2003).

Transformative Learning

Two integral components of diversity training include critical self-reflection and challenging existing knowledge (Goodman et al., 2004). These components require mass amounts of effort by both the diversity educator and the learner. Before entering a classroom, each student has what are called frames of reference, or predispositions (Mezirow, 1997). These frames of reference include the values, associations, and concepts that define an individual's life (Kitchenham, 2008; Mezirow, 1997). Doucet, Grayman-Simpson, and Shapses Wertheim (2013) suggested that frames of reference, as they relate to diversity education, are predispositions, prejudices, and assumptions that gain strength over time. Frames of reference have a profound impact on how we think and feel (Mezirow, 1997) and the habitual nature of our frames of reference make them almost permanent (Doucet et al., 2013; Mezirow, 1997). This is why the job of a diversity educator requires the use of strong emotional experiences (e.g., intergroup dialogue, self-examination, challenging life-long beliefs) which lead to more permanent effects (Goodman et al., 2004; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). These exercises are contrary to the typical sharing of knowledge that takes place in diversity education courses (e.g., reading a textbook; Goodman et al., 2004; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Kitchenham (2008) noted that several frames of reference could interact to produce a point of view. For example, a person may have a negative race frame of reference (e.g., dislikes

oppressed racial group members) and a negative religion frame of reference (e.g., dislikes oppressed religious groups) that will combine to produce a negative point of view towards diversity (e.g., dislikes all societal groups which are oppressed; Kitchenham, 2008).

Mezirow (1997) proposed an educational process that effects a change in frame of reference called the transformational learning theory. Transformational learning theory is a learning process that includes the following steps: (a) critical reflection of assumptions, (b) validating contested beliefs through discourse, (c) taking action on the reflective insights gained, and (d) critically assessing the reflective insight (Mezirow, 1997). The product of the transformative learning process is a new frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997). Each step of the transformation is necessary to establish a transformative experience (Doucet et al., 2013).

We can understand the transformative process using the example of a race frame of reference. If one has a negative race frame of reference (e.g., assumes his or her race is superior) they may be resistant to changing their beliefs about others because of the permanent nature of these types of beliefs. The role of a diversity educator in this situation is to first allow the individual to critically reflect on their assumptions. An individual may contemplate their assumptions in many ways: (a) "Does the assumption that a race is superior to another have supporting evidence?", (b) "Is it possible that this assumption was learned over time?", (c) "Why do I believe that my race is superior to other races?", and/or (d) "What is life like for minorities?"

Once an individual is able to fully self-reflect, he or she must validate beliefs through discourse (Mezirow, 1997). Mezirow (1997) defined discourse as "dialogue

devoted to assessing reasons presented in support of competing interpretations, by critically examining evidence, arguments, and alternative points of view." A diversity educator may elicit discourse by offering many alternate points of view with supporting evidences so that the learner can decrease bias. Using our example, we can assume that the individual may have more positive insights on minority races after discourse occurs. Specifically, an instructor may provide several research findings that highlight the struggles that oppressed groups face. This would allow an individual to experience alternate points of view. Discourse is essential because it allows one to understand a construct from many interpretations. If discourse is used properly, there will be a constructive social interaction between the diversity educator and the student (Kitchenham, 2008; Mezirow, 1997).

The product of successful discourse is the formation of a new, comprehensive, insight (Mezirow, 1997). In order to complete the transformative learning process, the individual must take an action on the new insight. Using our example, the individual who now has a healthier insight on racial minorities must take action on his or her new assumption. This individual would need to experience social interactions with people who represent members of other racial groups. Acting in a way that shows cultural sensitivity and advocacy would strengthen an individual's new insight at a behavioral level. Perhaps a diversity educator would suggest that an individual interacts with different cultures to ensure that the new insight replaces the original frame of reference (Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Lastly, to complete the transformative process, an individual must reflect on their new insight. He or she may realize that minorities endure struggle and that equality is worth promoting. If one takes action on the insight

10

and reflects on their action, a new frame of reference will be established (Doucet et al., 2013; Mezirow, 1997).

<div align="center">**Diversity Education Outcomes**</div>

The literature reveals many positive outcomes resulting from diversity education. Positive outcomes are often categorized as either affective-, cognitive-, or skill-based (Kalinoski et al., 2013). Changes in awareness of privilege and oppression and changes in ethnocultural empathy are two major components of affective-based outcomes (Carrell, 1997; Mallinckrodt et al., 2014; Remer, 2008; Worell & Remer, 2003). Developed moral reasoning and critical thinking are two of the most studied cognitive benefits of diversity training (Bowman, 2009; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado & Gurin, 2002; Kalinoski et al., 2013; Tsui, 1999). Lastly, the skills needed to become an advocate for diversity are highly referenced in the literature including diversity initiative involvement, diversity promotion, and cross-cultural communication (Case, 2007; Dovidio et al., 2004; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005; Nagda & Zuniga, 2003).

Awareness of privilege and oppression is commonly increased after diversity trainings and/or interventions which is a critical step taken towards reducing cultural bias (Case, Hensley, & Anderson, 2014; Cole, Case, Rios, & Curtin, 2011). Case et al. (2014) displayed the effect that gender-focused college courses can have on the awareness of heterosexual privilege and male privileges. Case and her colleagues (2014) exposed undergraduate students to a video intervention that displayed individual testimonials about privilege in everyday life. As a result, students' awareness of heterosexual privilege and male privilege was significantly increased (Case et al.,

2014). Due to the acknowledgement of privilege and oppression, students' prejudices were reduced (Case et al., 2014). Case (2007) used a pre-test/post-test design to evaluate level of male privilege awareness before and after women's studies courses. Students significantly improved their level of male privilege awareness from the start of the course to the end of the course (Case, 2007). In regards to race, Cole et al. (2011) noted that students who took part in a diversity class acknowledged White privilege more compared to students participating in an introductory psychology course. Similarly, in her investigation of 23 courses, Remer (2008) found that students in diversity courses demonstrated significantly higher increases in their awareness of privilege and oppression compared to students in non-diversity courses. Marginalized groups (e.g., Black, Muslim, LGBTQ), however, do not always see the same gains in privilege and oppression awareness due to a focus of diversity education from the majority standpoint (e.g., White, Christian, heterosexual; Cole et al., 2011).

Given the purpose of social justice courses, it comes as no surprise that cognition can be influenced as a result of taking such a course. Within the literature, moral reasoning has been a specific focus as an outcome from diversity education (Adams, 2002; Hurtado et al., 2012). Hurtado et al. (2012) found that gains in moral reasoning are made throughout diversity training experiences. Current enrollment in diversity courses as well as the total number of diversity courses one has taken strengthen this relationship (Hurtado et al., 2012). Adams (2002) similarly noted that students who choose to enroll in diversity courses are more morally advanced and have a greater potential to improve moral judgment compared to the general population. Critical thinking is another cognitive construct positively impacted by diversity training

(Hurtado, 2005; Tsui, 1999). Hurtado (2005) and Tsui (1999) found that students have an increase in critical thinking skills after having been enrolled in women's studies courses. The extent to which a diversity course influences cognitive development is primarily impacted by how many diversity courses an individual has taken and what group the individual belongs to (e.g., privileged or oppressed; Bowman, 2009; Gurin et al. 2002). Gurin et al. (2002) suggested that cognitive development might be more visible during early diversity training experiences compared to later diversity training experiences. For example, Bowman (2009) found that participating in more than one diversity course was unrelated to gains in moral reasoning and critical thinking. This finding is inconsistent and may depend on the specific type of training experience (e.g., a course that integrates intergroup dialogues, a course that has assigned readings; Adams, 2002). Furthermore, cognitive gains as a product of diversity education are more noticeable in individuals who are White and belongs to a middle or lower class family (Bowman, 2009).

Diversity advocacy is perhaps the most useful of the benefits associated with diversity education. Diversity educators strive not only to create competent individuals, but they also hope that those individuals become advocates (Gurin et al., 2002). If this process occurs, advocates will take on the role of a diversity educator and the process effectively continues (Dovidio et al., 2004; Gurin et al., 2002; Nagda & Zuniga, 2003). Gurin and colleagues (2002) suggested that pedagogical practices, such as intergroup dialogue, can encourage culturally supportive behaviors (e.g., supporting equality initiatives, promoting diversity; Case, 2007; Dovidio et al., 2004; Hurtado, 2005). One basic step towards becoming an advocate is to support initiatives (e.g., rallies, events,

13

workshops; Case, 2007; Hurtado, 2005). Both Case (2007) and Hurtado (2005) found

that students report a higher likelihood of supporting race-based initiatives at the

conclusion of a diversity course. Reporting a higher likelihood of supporting initiatives,

however, does not guarantee actual participation in an initiative. Luckily, diversity

education increases students' acknowledgment of advocacy importance as well as

confidence in their ability to be an advocate (Nagda & Zuniga, 2003). The success in

providing students with the knowledge and skills they need to promote diversity relates

back to the cultural competency framework mentioned earlier (Cross et al., 1989). If

students receive the skills they need through diversity education, becoming a diversity

advocate is more likely to occur (Dovidio et al., 2004).

Ethnocultural Empathy

Ethnocultural empathy themes are incorporated into almost all diversity

education frameworks. Wang et al, (2003) conceptualized ethnocultural empathy using

three constructs: (a) intellectual empathy, (b) emotional empathy, and (c) capacity to

communicate empathetic understanding. Intellectual empathy refers to the cognitive

understanding of another person's cultural view whereas emotional empathy is one's

ability to feel another person's emotional experience (Wang et al., 2003). The capacity

to communicate empathy refers to one's ability to express their thoughts and feelings

about cultural differences within a social context (Wang et al., 2003).

Strengthening ethnocultural empathy is a primary goal of diversity education

(Goodman et al., 2004). Without being able to take the perspective of another

individual, one will not be able to change a frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997),

acknowledge power differentials (Worell & Remer, 2003), or develop the skills

necessary to work in our diverse society (Cross, 1989; Kulkin & Roberson, 2008).

Ethnocultural empathy plays many roles in diversity education research. Normally,

researchers hope to find that ethnocultural empathy is an outcome to diversity training.

This is not always the case as changing empathy levels can be very challenging during

the course of a normal college semester (Remer, 2008; Kulkin & Roberson, 2008).

Some researchers have found that one's level of ethnocultural empathy acts as a

moderator and mediator of diversity education rather than a product (Cole, et al., 2011).

Regardless of the role that ethnocultural empathy plays, an increase is a way to assess

whether or not there was positive change that occurred from diversity training (Cole, et

al., 2011; Mallinckrodt et al., 2014).

Researchers have found substantial increases in ethnocultural empathy after

diversity education participation. Carrell (1997) compared empathy changes between

students enrolled in an intercultural communications course and students enrolled in a

generic communications course. She found that the multicultural component of the

intercultural communications class largely affected empathy (Carrell, 1997). Remer

(2008) found various positive outcomes of diversity training (e.g., awareness of

privilege and oppression), but no change in ethnocultural empathy when comparing

diversity students to control students. The absence of ethnocultural empathy change

illustrates the idea that diversity education can produce specific positive outcomes (e.g.,

awareness of privilege and oppression) without effecting closely related outcomes (e.g.,

ethnocultural empathy; Remer, 2008).

Pedagogical exercises such as intergroup dialogue have been found to

significantly affect ethnocultural empathy (Gurin et al., 2002; Muller & Miles, 2017;

Nagda & Zuniga, 2003). Using 19 intergroup dialogues that focused on a range of

diversity issues (e.g., gender, race, religion, sexuality, social class), Muller and Miles

(2017) discovered significant increases in empathetic perspective-taking in less than

eight weeks. Nagda and Zuniga (2003) noted that intergroup dialogues allow for

exchanging perspectives, thoughts, and differences that lead to changes in perspective

taking. In their research, Nagda and Zuniga (2003) found that face-to-face encounters

with socially diverse individuals was enough to increase perspective taking. The

success that intergroup dialogues have is largely due to the non-confrontational nature

of the exercise (Gurin et al., 2002; Muller & Milers, 2017). Intergroup dialogues

provide an exchange of thoughts and feelings rather than promote argument (Muller &

Milers, 2017).

Ethnocultural empathy is not always characterized as a product of diversity

education. Instead, ethnocultural empathy is sometimes considered as an existing trait

rather than a trait acquired as a result of diversity education (Cundiff & Komarraju,

2008; Rasoal, Jungert, Hau, Stiwne, & Anderson, 2009). Cundiff and Komarraju

(2008) observed ethnocultural empathy differences independent of diversity training or

experience. These authors found that women, as well as people who support women, in

leadership have higher levels of ethnocultural empathy compared to control groups

(Cundiff & Komarraju, 2008). Educational discipline also has an impact on one's level

of ethnocultural empathy (Rasoal et al., 2009). For example, Rasoal et al. (2009) found

that psychology students had significantly higher levels of ethnocultural empathy

compared to nursing and social work students.

Ethnocultural empathy has often taken the role of a mediator and moderator rather than a byproduct of diversity training. While investigating workplace diversity attitudes, Brouwer and Boros (2010) discovered that ethnocultural empathy enhances the effect that intergroup contact has on positive diversity attitudes, however, ethnocultural empathy does not have the same effect when measuring negative diversity attitudes. In this case, empathy took the role of a mediator (Brouwer & Boros, 2010). In Cole et al.'s (2011) research on diversity course effectiveness, empathy moderated the effect of diversity courses on willingness to promote diversity. Regardless of whether ethnocultural empathy was changed as a result of diversity education or not, research suggests that higher levels of ethnocultural empathy predict that one will have better experiences within a diverse setting (Brouwer & Boros, 2010; Cole et al., 2011).

Several ethnocultural empathy measures gauge the effectiveness of multicultural programming. One classic measure of ethnocultural empathy is the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang et al., 2003). Wang et al.'s (2003) item pool was based on a literature search of the three primary domains of empathy: (a) intellectual empathy, (b) emotional empathy, and (c) communicative empathy. From the SEE, other researchers modeled or incorporated the measure into their own. For example, the Global Empathy Scale was a scale adapted from the SEE (Bachen, Hernandez-Ramos, & Raphael, 2012). The Global Empathy Scale has a strong focus on political and social understandings of people around the world (Bachen et al., 2012).

With the intent of developing a brief instrument with a strong focus on ethnocultural empathy, Mallinckrodt et al. (2014), constructed the Everyday Multicultural Competencies/Revised Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (EMC/RSEE).

17

Part of the measure was taken from Wang et al.'s (2003) Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE), which is intended to strictly measure ethnocultural empathy. Several items from this scale were combined with a pool of items developed from focus groups that pertain to multicultural competencies (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014). There were 115 initial items that were consolidated into a final item count of 48 (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014). Mallinckrodt et al. (2014) received strong reliability, discriminant validity, and stability during initial validation using undergraduate samples. The 48-item EMC/RSEE is grouped into six subscales: (a) Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, (b) Resentment and Cultural Dominance, (c) Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (d) Empathic Perspective-Taking (e) Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege and (f) Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014).

The Present Study

The present study had two primary goals. The first was to assess the effects of a broad range of college diversity courses on ethnocultural empathy. Given previous research findings, I hypothesized that taking diversity courses within any social justice discipline (e.g., gender studies, human sexuality, religious studies, etc.) would produce an increase in ethnocultural empathy from the beginning of the course to the end. Secondly, I hypothesized that this increase in ethnocultural empathy will be larger in comparison to students who are not enrolled in a diversity course.

The second goal I had was to gather qualitative data based on ethnocultural empathy constructs. Specifically, for students who saw increases in ethnocultural empathy, I wanted to better understand what specifically occurs within the diversity course that leads to such an increase. Similarly, I wanted to know why some students

do not see a gain in ethnocultural empathy. I hypothesized that students who experienced gains in ethnocultural empathy would report (a) increased understanding of what life is like for people from different cultural backgrounds (e.g., race, religion, sex, sexuality, or social class), (b) increased familiarity with the traditions and values of other cultures, (c) more willingness to intervene if they witness someone making discriminating statements towards someone because of their culture, (d) increased ability to identify specific course content that helped them understand what life is like for people who are from a different cultural background, and/or (e) increased ability to identify positive class-related experiences (e.g., intergroup dialogue, critical self-reflection) that helped them to better understand what life is like for people from different cultural backgrounds. I predicted that people who do not see increases in ethnocultural empathy would report oppositely to those who experienced increases in ethnocultural empathy. For example, people who did not have increases in ethnocultural empathy would not better understand what life is like for people from a different cultural background. In the overall qualitative portion of the study, I also expected that students would describe at least one of the various frameworks of diversity education I have discussed above (e.g., transformative learning, cultural competence, and cultural humility) within their answers.

Attempting to reach the two goals outlined above would be beneficial in multiple ways. There are a lack of studies that incorporate a broad range of diversity courses in their data collection. In the present study, various diversity courses at the host institution were considered for data collection. This will allow the research findings to generalize to several types of diversity disciplines. There is also a lack of

19

research support for increasing ethnocultural empathy through one college diversity course. This study will add to the literature by increasing our understanding of how ethnocultural empathy works throughout a full-semester diversity course. Lastly, there is a lack of qualitative data within the field of diversity education. Understanding how and why students experience shifts in ethnocultural empathy will allow us to better understand which teaching methods are effective and which teaching methods are ineffective. Results from this portion of the study will provide insight for diversity educators in various disciplines.

Chapter 2: Method

Participants

Participants were 294 undergraduate students at Eastern Kentucky University. After accounting for missing post-test data, 47 participants remained. Forty-two (90%) of the participants were female, 4 (9%) participants were male, and 1 (2%) participant identified as non-binary. Participants described themselves as 87% White ($n = 41$), 4% Black ($n = 2$), 2% Latino/a ($n = 1$), 2% Brazilian ($n = 1$), and 4% Multiracial ($n = 2$). The mean age of participants was 24. The sample was comprised of Freshmen (23%, $n = 11$), Sophomore (21%, $n = 10$), Junior (28%, $n = 13$), and Senior (28%, $n = 13$) students. Participants were diverse in their sexual orientation with 34 (72%) heterosexual, 10 (21%) bisexual, and 3 (6%) gay or lesbian participants. Participants described their religious affiliation as Christian (72%, $n = 34$), Buddhist (2%, $n = 1$), Agnostic (2%, $n = 1$), Universal (4%, $n = 2$), and Non-religious (19%, $n = 9$). The majority of participants were psychology majors (43%, $n = 20$) with the remainder of participants coming from various majors.

Procedures

Recruitment

Two groups of participants were recruited for the study in order to allow for a treatment- and control-group comparison. Undergraduate students participating in diversity courses as well as students enrolled in non-diversity-oriented, psychology courses during the Spring, Summer, and Fall 2018 semesters were recruited at the host institution. Diversity courses were defined as any course where the central theme of the

course dealt with some kind of cultural difference (e.g., religion, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, social class, gender). Non-diversity courses were considered to be any psychology course where the theme of the course was not cultural differences. Both diversity course and non-diversity course participants contributed pre- and post-test data. In order to recruit participants from diversity courses, all instructors who were teaching a course related to diversity issues were contacted by researchers through email. Instructors who expressed interest in allowing their students to participate were selected to take part in the study. Diversity course instructors were asked to provide a copy of their syllabi for data analysis purposes. Instructors who agreed to participate in the project were sent instructions on how to get their students to participate. The instructions included a link that would direct students to a web-based research program, SurveyMonkey, to complete the pre- and post-test surveys. Instructors provided their students with the link through email, during class, and/or through the institution's online learning program (Blackboard). If students chose to participate in the study, they clicked on a link that directed them to an internet-based informed consent document (see Appendix A). The participants in diversity courses were given the opportunity to participate in a raffle for a $15 Walmart gift card for incentive (one gift card for every 100 participants). Diversity course participants were informed that they would not be eligible for the raffle unless both parts of the study were completed.

In an effort to attain a higher completion rate, members of the investigational team collected data in-class during the Fall 2018 semester. Similar procedures were followed for in-class data collection. Professors instructing diversity courses during the Fall 2018 semester were contacted by the research team to establish interest in the

study. Professors who were interested in having a member of the research team collect data were asked to schedule a time in which their class could be used for the study during the first two weeks of class. These instructors were also asked to provide a time in which researchers could distribute the post-test at the end of the semester. Instructors who were not willing to use class time to have their students participate in the study were provided with information about how their students could participate online.

In order to recruit students that were not taking a diversity class, the SurveyMonkey link to the study was posted on a cloud-based participant management program called Sona. Sona is utilized at the host institution to allow students to fulfill required research credits within the psychology department. The students that took the survey via Sona were not given the option to participate in the raffle for a $15 Walmart gift card as they were rewarded by attaining research credit as part of a course assignment.

Pre-test

The SurveyMonkey pre-test was active for both groups of participants (e.g., diversity students and psychology students) from February 7, 2018 to February 25, 2018. This time period was utilized with the assumption that students in the diversity courses would not yet be influenced by course material early in the semester. The pre-test consisted of a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix B) and the EMC/RSEE (see Appendix C). All participants were asked to provide their email so that they could be contacted for the post-test survey.

During the Fall 2018 semester a paper version of the pre-test was created to distribute to students in class. Students in a diversity class during the Fall 2018

semester were surveyed between August 20, 2018 and August 31, 2018. Members of

the research team attended scheduled class meetings during the first two weeks of

classes to distribute the pre-test. Researchers reviewed informed consent (see Appendix

A) with participants and gave them the option to participate. Once participants signed

the consent form they were instructed to complete the demographics questionnaire (see

Appendix B) and the EMC/RSEE (see Appendix C).

Post-test

All participants who completed part one were by members of the research team

by email and provided with a link to the post-test study in SurveyMonkey. Participants

completed part two of the study from April 29, 2018 to May 5, 2018. This time-period

was one week prior to the institution's final exam week. The post-test data was

collected the week prior to final exam week because the participants should have been

exposed to the majority of course content by this time. I believed that participants

would also be more likely to complete the survey during that timeframe because they

would not have the stress associated with final exams during this time. The post-test for

the diversity condition consisted of a shortened demographics questionnaire (see

Appendix D), the EMC/RSEE (see Appendix C), and a qualitative measure developed

by researchers (see Appendix E). The post-test for the non-diversity condition did not

include the qualitative measure because the questions pertained to diversity course

content only. At the end of the post-test survey participants were thanked and

encouraged to contact researchers for a copy of the debriefing statement (see Appendix

F).

Participants who participated in the face-to-face version of the study during the Fall 2018 semester are to also be given a post-test in-class. These participants will given the post-test during a scheduled class period one week prior to finals week. The post-test for these participants will consist of a paper version of the shortened demographics questionnaire (see Appendix D), the EMC/RSEE (see Appendix C), and a qualitative measure (see Appendix E). Similarly to the online study, participants will be thanked and encouraged to contact researchers for a copy of the debriefing statement (see Appendix F).

Instruments

Demographics Questionnaire

A 40-item demographics questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used to assess a participant's age, race, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, political affiliation, and experiences with diversity. The quality and quantity of interactions with different cultures were explored in this questionnaire. Previous diversity education participation was also measured in this questionnaire.

EMC/RSEE

The Everyday Multicultural Competencies/Revised Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (EMC/RSEE) is a 48-item measure that is intended to assess multicultural programs (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014; see Appendix C). The scale is composed of six subscales: Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, Resentment and Cultural Dominance, Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, Empathic Perspective-taking, Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally. Participants rated their level of agreement to each response with the

following options: 1 (strongly agree), 2 (disagree), 3 (slightly disagree), 4(slightly

agree), 5 (agree), and 6 (strongly agree). Items 6, 10, 16, 28, 30, 38, 39, and 43 were

reverse-scored. Higher subscale scores indicated higher levels of the measured trait.

Qualitative Measure

A qualitative measure (see Appendix E) was constructed by the researchers in

order to assess the opinions and experiences participants gained from a diversity course.

The measure included five open-ended items. Three questions addressed the constructs

of ethnocultural empathy and the last two questions addressed students' experiences in

the diversity course (e.g., course content, class exercises).

Chapter 3: Results

Preliminary EMC/RSEE Data Analysis

Differences between subscale means for both pre and post-test measures were

evident but not significant (see Table 1). The condition did not have an effect for any

subscale of on the EMC/RSEE for either pre or post-test, $F(6, 40) = .845$, $p = .543$.

Time also showed no significant effects on any subscale measures of the EMC/RSEE,

$F(6, 40) = 1.04$, $p = .414$. Furthermore, the interaction between condition and time

yielded no significant effect, $F(6, 40) = .579$, $p = .745$. Overall, there was no

relationship between the diversity education implementation and ethnocultural empathy

improvements.

Table 1

EMC/RSEE Pre-Test/Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations

Measure	Diversity Condition		Control Condition	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Subscale 1	5.2(.97)	5.29(.79)	5(1.08)	5(.95)
Subscale 2	2.37(1.13)	2.27(.93)	2.71(1)	2.84(1.08)
Subscale 3	1.93(.77)	2.02(.66)	1.99(.7)	2.12(.78)
Subscale 4	3.87(.83)	3.67(.84)	3.81(.78)	3.52(1.03)
Subscale 5	4.72(1.03)	4.78(.95)	4.13(1.18)	4.2(1.07)
Subscale 6	4.98(.64)	5(.54)	4.66(.91)	4.68(.88)

Note. Subscale 1 = Cultural openness and desires to learn, Subscale 2 = Resentment and
Cultural dominance, Subscale 3 = Anxiety and lack of multicultural self-efficacy,
Subscale 4 = Empathic perspective-taking, Subscale 5 = Awareness of contemporary
racism and privilege, Subscale 6 = Empathic feeling and acting as an ally

When separating the sample into different groups based on demographic variables, significant differences were found. While investigating pre-test results, an ANOVA revealed significant differences were found between participants who acknowledged racial discrimination and people who did not. Specifically, people who acknowledged racial discrimination ($M = 5.32$, $SD = .92$) scored higher ($F(2,46) = 6.42$, $p = .004$) on the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale (Subscale 1) than participants who did not acknowledge racial discrimination ($M = 4.1$, $SD = .94$). Participants who acknowledged racial discrimination ($M = 2.32$, $SD = .97$) scored significantly lower ($F(2,46) = 5.27$, $p = .009$) on the Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale (Subscale 2) compared to participants who did not acknowledge racial discrimination ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .98$). Similarly, participants acknowledging racial discrimination ($M = 1.79$, $SD = .64$) also scored lower ($F(2,46) = 6.89$, $p = .002$) on the Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscale (Subscale 3) compared to participants who did not acknowledge racial discrimination ($M = 2.68$, $SD = .68$). Lastly, when looking at pre-test results, participants who acknowledged racial discrimination ($M = 4.69$, $SD = .98$) scored significantly higher ($F(2,46) = 9.66$, p = .001) on the Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale (Subscale 5) compared to participants who did not acknowledge racial discrimination ($M = 3.11$, $SD = .95$).

Similar findings for the same variable were found when examining post-test results. Participants acknowledging racial discrimination ($M = 5.43$, $SD = .59$) scored significantly higher ($F(2,46) = 15.09$, $p = .001$) on the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale (Subscale 1) compared to participants who denied racial discrimination

($M = 4.04$, $SD = .81$). Similarly, participants acknowledging discrimination ($M = 4.9$, $SD = .66$) scored higher ($F(2,46) = 33.11$, $p = .001$) on the Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale (Subscale 5) compared to participants who denied racial discrimination ($M = 2.77$, $SD = .78$). The Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale (Subscale 6) showed significant differences ($F(2,46) = 7.31$, $p = .002$) between the participants acknowledging racial discrimination ($M = 5.03$, $SD = .69$) and participants denying racial discrimination ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .63$) on the post-test measure. Similar to the pre-test results, participants who acknowledged racial discrimination ($M = 2.27$, $SD = .88$) scored significantly lower ($F(2,46) = 10.42$, $p = .001$) on the Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale (Subscale 2) compared to participants who denied racial discrimination ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 1$).

The same patterns were noted when comparing participants who accepted and denied discrimination against women. An ANOVA revealed pre-test differences on three subscales: Resentment and Cultural Dominance (Subscale 2; $F(2,46) = 6.67$, $p = .003$), Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (Subscale 3; $F(2,46) = 5.84$, $p = .006$), and Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (Subscale 5; $F(2,46) = 10.99$, $p = .001$). People who acknowledged discrimination against women scored significantly lower on both the Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 1$) as well as the Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscale ($M = 1.77$, $SD = .61$) in comparison to people who did not acknowledge discrimination against women ($M = 3.64$, $SD = .68$; $M = 2.54$, $SD = .85$). Participants acknowledging discrimination against women ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1$) scored significantly higher on the

Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale compared to participants denying discrimination against women ($M = 2.97$, $SD = .55$).

Post-test results were similar when comparing groups of participants based on their beliefs about discrimination against women. Significant differences were noted on four subscales: Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (Subscale 1; $F(2,46) = 3.64$, $p = .035$), Resentment and Cultural Dominance (Subscale 2; $F(2,46) = 7.27$, $p = .002$), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (Subscale 5; $F(2,46) = 9.56$, $p = .001$), and Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (Subscale 6; $F(2,46) = 5.05$, $p = .011$). Scores were higher for participants who acknowledged discrimination against women on the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale ($M = 5.31$, $SD = .78$), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale ($M = 4.77$, $SD = .85$), and the Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale ($M = 4.97$, $SD = .7$) when compared to the participants who denied discrimination ($M = 4.39$, $SD = .91$; $M = 3.2$, $SD = .8$; $M = 4.05$, $SD = .75$). Scores were significantly lower for these participants ($M = 2.29$, $SD = .86$) on the Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale (Subscale 2) when compared to the same group ($M = 3.61$, $SD = .77$).

Group differences were also significant when looking at the demographic question regarding how much interaction one has with people who are of a different race. A one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences between people who had a high amount of interaction with people of a different race and people who had moderate to low interactions with people of a different race. Differences were noted on four subscales of the EMC/RSEE pretest: Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (Subscale 1; $F(5,46) = 8.58$, $p = .001$), Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (Subscale

3; $F(5,46) = 4.02$, $p = .005$); Empathetic Perspective-Taking (Subscale 4; $F(5,46) = 4.05$, $p = .004$), and Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (Subscale 6; $F(5,46) = 6.93$, $p = .001$). As expected, individuals with a lot of multiracial interaction scored significantly higher on the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale ($M = 5.5$, $SD = .65$), Empathetic Perspective-Taking subscale ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .81$), and the Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale ($M = 5.34$, $SD = .58$) when compared to individuals who had a moderate multiracial interaction ($M = 4.5$, $SD = 1.06$; $M = 3.11$, $SD = .28$; $M = 4.52$, $SD = .61$). These same individuals scored lower on the Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($M = 1.54$, $SD = .57$), compared to the same group ($M = 2.51$, $SD = .49$).

Another ANOVA was conducted to investigate the same group differences on the post-test. Three subscales were found to have produced significant differences between those with moderate multiracial interaction and those with a lot of multiracial interaction: Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (Subscale 3; $F(4,46) = 3.22$, $p = .022$), Empathetic Perspective-Taking (Subscale 4; $F(4,46) = 4.44$, $p = .004$), and Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (Subscale 6; $F(4,46) = 8.24$, $p = .001$). Individuals who reported having a lot of multiracial interaction scored significantly higher on both the Empathetic Perspective-Taking subscale ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .83$) and the Empathetic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale ($M = 5.24$, $SD = .57$) compared to individuals with moderate interactions ($M = 2.8$, $SD = .7$; $M = 4.14$, $SD = .61$). These same participants ($M = 1.71$, $SD = .7$) scored lower on the Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscale when compared to individuals with moderate interaction ($M = 2.55$, $SD = .43$).

Preliminary Qualitative Data Analysis

Common themes of qualitative data were extracted from the short answer questions from 19 students in the diversity class condition. Sixteen participants (84%) said that the diversity course they enrolled in helped them to better understand what life is like for people who are of a different background as it applies to race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class. Two participants (11%) said that their diversity course did not help them understand people from different backgrounds and one participant (5%) said that the class somewhat helped them to understand these differences. When asked about familiarity with the traditions and values of other cultures 13 participants (68%) said that they were more familiar, 4 participants (21%) said they were not more familiar, and 2 participants (11%) said they were somewhat more familiar. Thirteen participants (68%) agreed that they are now more likely to intervene if they witness someone making discriminating statements towards an individual because of their race, religion, sex, sexuality, or social class. Six participants (32%) were not more likely to intervene as a result of what they learned in their diversity class.

When asked about course content and activities that aided ethnocultural empathy, participant answers varied. When asked about specific course content students mentioned learning other ways of life in general (11%, $n = 2$), reading about non-Christian religions (11%, $n = 2$), class discussions (11%, $n = 2$), learning about similarities of humankind (11%, $n = 2$), learning about discrimination (5%, $n = 1$), learning about privilege (5%, $n = 1$), presentations (5%, $n = 1$), research papers (5%, $n = 1$), guest speakers and diverse classroom (5%, $n = 1$), nothing (5%, $n = 1$), and some participants had no relevant answers (16%, $n = 3$). When asked about class related

experiences that helped participants better understand other cultures students mentioned presentations (5%, $n = 1$), outside learning requirements and outside class activities (5%, $n = 1$), generally learning other ways of life (5%, $n = 1$), learning historical contexts (5%, $n = 1$), research papers (5%, $n = 1$), discussions with a professor from a different background (5%, $n = 1$), a guest speaker discussing privilege (5%, $n = 1$), books and videos (5%, $n = 1$), diverse classroom and guest speakers (5%, $n = 1$), nothing (11%, $n = 2$), and some irrelevant statements (11%, $n = 2$).

Chapter 4: Discussion

The quantitative results suggest that the first hypothesis was not supported. Students enrolled in diversity classes did not show improvement in EMC/RSEE scores from the beginning of the semester to the end. Although the students in the diversity condition did start with higher EMC/RSEE scores compared to the control condition, the difference was not significant. The hypotheses regarding the qualitative data, however, was supported on several levels. First, I predicted that students in the diversity class condition would report that the course helped them to better understand people from different backgrounds in regards to race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class. The majority of the participants (84%) who completed the qualitative section of the study did report that the course allowed them to reach this goal. Second, I predicted that the majority of students in the diversity condition would report that the course allowed them to better understand the traditions and values of other cultures in relation to race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class. The majority of participants (68%) did report that they better understood the traditions and values of other cultures. Third, I predicted that students would be more likely to intervene if they witness someone making discriminating statements towards an individual because of their race, religion, sex, sexuality, or social class now that they have taken the course. This hypothesis was supported as the majority of participants were more likely to intervene (68%). Lastly, I hypothesized that students would report identifiable course content and class-activities that aided their improvements. Results from this portion of the qualitative data was variable. Different findings were found for most students and consistent themes were

mostly absent. Some students did discuss specific course content as it related to constructs such as cultural competence, cultural humility, and transformative learning. Some students also reported expected class activities that aided ethnocultural empathy (e.g., outside learning requirements). The results of the positive qualitative feedback did not reflect the scores on the EMC/RSEE.

The results of the study are inconsistent with the findings of Carrell (1997) and Remer (2008) who found significant gains in ethnocultural empathy in students who were enrolled in diversity courses. Perhaps one reason differences were not found was the content of the surveyed diversity courses. Ethnocultural empathy may not be the cornerstone of these courses. Ethnocultural empathy is also a diversity training outcome that is difficult to attain (Remer, 2008; Kulkin & Roberson, 2008). Improving or even establishing ethnocultural empathy may only be plausible for highly competent students in high-level diversity courses. Another possible explanation for the absence of statistical support is the limits of the measure. Scores on the desirable subscales (e.g., Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn) were relatively high overall and undesirable subscale scores (e.g., Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy) were relatively low overall. Ceiling and floor effects may very well be present as a result of the measure selection.

Although the main hypothesis was not supported, this study adds valuable insights to the literature. First, a link between the acknowledgement of discrimination and ethnocultural empathy was made. Specifically, the results suggested that individuals who acknowledge both racial discrimination and discrimination against women have higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. Another important finding in the

results included the relationship between interacting with people that belong to different races and ethnocultural empathy. The amount of interaction people had to those of different racial backgrounds was positively related to ethnocultural empathy. Furthermore, there is a shortage of qualitative data regarding ethnocultural empathy within the multicultural education field. The present study suggests relatively strong findings from the qualitative responses of the participants in the diversity condition. A stronger emphasis on qualitative data within multicultural education research will allow for more specific explanations of positive outcomes. Having a better explanation of what students are experiencing will allow researchers to properly assess ethnocultural empathy increases in terms of the course type, what type of content is being covered, and what kinds of experiences students are having. This study is also essential for our understanding of how ethnocultural empathy develops. The results suggest that ethnocultural empathy may be difficult to develop overtime. It may also be possible that ethnocultural empathy is developed for these participants already and gains are not made as a result of their previously established understanding. Whichever explanation is true, it is essential that we keep two goals in mind as we strive for competency in our education: (1) We must set a measurable goal for increasing or establishing ethnocultural empathy as a result of diversity courses and (2) we must attract students to diversity courses who actually have gains to be made.

Limitations

Several limitations inhibit this study from reaching full potential. First, construct validity problems arose as a result of the selected measure. Although the EMC/RSEE is designed to assess multicultural programming at large, the measure

36

places a special emphasis on competencies as they relate to race-based ethnocultural empathy (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014). The majority of the sample completing the post-test came from mostly diversity classes that were not linked with race (e.g., Identity and sexuality, world religions, civilizations of spain, etc.). Another way of addressing this issue could be to select more specified measures for the various types of courses. The present sample of diversity condition participants come from a varied selection of diversity courses ranging from Civilizations of Spain to Identity and Sexuality. Another issue with the sample could be the selected control group which consisted of mostly undergraduate psychology students. Rasoal and colleagues (2009) found that individuals within the psychology discipline have higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. Although the control group was unrelated to the diversity group, between-group differences could have been minimized as a result of a competent control group. The second major limitation of this study included a lack of power. An original sample of 294 students would have been sufficient had most of the participants completed the post-test portion of the study. A lack of incentive, questionnaire length, study format (i.e., online), and timing all could have led to a lack of post-test engagement. The data that has yet to be collected (Fall 2018 post-test) should yield a significant increase in post-test completion with the face-to-face data collection format. Lastly, the self-report structure of the study allows vulnerability to response bias. Specifically, several students in the diversity condition reported passionately in the qualitative section of the study. This may suggest that students taking diversity classes are attempting to appear culturally fluent.

Future Directions

Several steps can be made to establish improvements across the diversity education spectrum. One such direction for researchers should be to create a more comprehensive measure of ethnocultural empathy that applies to most dimensions of identity (i.e., race, religion, sex, sexuality, class etc.). An alternate route for future research would be for specific scales of ethnocultural empathy to be made for the various diversity courses offered at most institutions. The development of scales should be aided with more specific goals. Administrators and educators can aim to increase student ethnocultural empathy over the course of each diversity class taken. Furthermore, efforts should be made to attract students with low levels of ethnocultural empathy to enroll in diversity courses as opposed to students with sufficient levels of ethnocultural empathy. Future studies should also attempt to assess multicultural programming qualitatively as there is a large gap in the literature.

Conclusion

Although the results of the quantitative portion of the study yielded no significant effects, the findings still provide us with important insights. If limitations are addressed properly for future data collection as well as future research at large, ethnocultural empathy differences may be found. This study is one of a few that addresses multicultural programming from a qualitative perspective which adds value to the literature. A focus on scale development as well as empathy-directed goals should be a focal point for future research. Provided these improvements are made, a stronger diversity education system will be produced that allow students to function in a country that grows more diverse each year.

38

References

Adams, M. (2002). Charting and cognitive and moral development in diversity courses,
    Diversity Digest, Fall/Winter. Retrieved from www.diversityweb.org/digest/
    fw02/cognitive.html.

Bachen, C. M., Hernandez-Ramos, P. F., & Raphael, C. (2012). Simulating REAL
    LIVES: Promoting global empathy and interest in learning through simulation
    games. *Simulation & Gaming*, *43*(4), 437-460. doi:10.1177/1046878111432108

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the*
    persistence of racial inequality in America (5th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman and
    Littlefield.

Bowman, N. A. (2009). College diversity courses and cognitive development among
    students from privileged and marginalized groups. *Journal of Diversity in*
    Higher Education, *2*(3), 182-194. doi:10.1037/a0016639

Brouwer, M. A. R., & Boros, S., (2010). The influence of intergroup contact and
    ethnocultural empathy on employees' attitudes toward diversity. *Cognition,*
    Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, *14*(3), 243-260. Retrieved from
    https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Smaranda_Boros/publication/228499390_
    The_influence_of_intergroup_contact_and_ethnocultural_empathy_on_employe
    es'_attitudes_toward_diversity/links/02e7e5304db3575dc9000000.pdf

Carrell, L.J. (1997). Diversity in the communication curriculum: Impact on student
    empathy. *Communication Education*, *46*(4), 234-244.
    doi:10.1080/03634529709379098

Case, K. A. (2007) Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: An

evaluation of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(4). 426-

435. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00391.x

Case, K. A., & Stewart, B. (2010). Changes in diversity course student prejudice and

attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of

Psychology*, *37*(3), 172-177. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.488555

Colby, S. L. & Ortman, J. M. (2015). Projections of the size and composition of the

U.S. population: 2014 to 2060. Retrieved from

file:///C:/Users/EKUStudent/Downloads/Censu

s%20Document_Population%20Trends.pdf

Cole, E. R., Case, K. A., Rios, D., & Curtin, N. (2011). Understanding what students

bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity courses on student

attitudes. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *17*(4), 397-405.

doi:10.1037/a0025433

Cross, T., Brazen, B., Dennis, K., & Isaacs, M. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent

system of care*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development

Center.

Doucet, F., Grayman-Simpson, N., & Shapses Wertheim, S. (2013). Steps along the

journey: Documenting undergraduate white women's transformative processes

in a diversity course. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *6*(4), 276-291.

doi:10.1037/a0034334

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Stewart, T. L., Esses, V. M., ten Vergert, M., & Hodson, G. (2004). From intervention to outcome: Processes in the reduction of bias. In W. Stephan & P. Vogt (Eds.), Education programs for improving intergroup relations: *Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 243– 65). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fisher-Borne, M., Cain, J.M., & Martin, S. L. (2015). From mastery to accountability: Cultural humility as an alternative to cultural competency. *Social Work Education*, *34* (2), 165-181. doi:10.1080/02615479.2014.977244

Foronda, C., Baptiste, D.-L., Reinholdt, M. M., & Ousman, K. (2016). Cultural humility: A concept analysis. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, *27*, 210–217. doi:10.1177/1043659615592677

Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural principles in action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*, 793-837. doi: 10.1177/0011000004268802

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*, 330–366. doi:10.17763/haer.72.3.01151786u134n051

Horowitz, J., Parker, K., & Stepler, R. (2017). *Wide partisan gaps in U.S. over how far the country has come on gender equality: Democrats sharply divided along educational lines on whether life is easier for men than for women.* Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/10/14115221/Gender-Equality-Report-FINAL-10.18.pdf

Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187–203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research, *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 595-610. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00422.x

Hurtado, S., Mayhew, M.J., & Engberg, M.E. (2012). Diversity courses and students' moral reasoning: A model of predispositions and change. *Journal of Moral Education*, *41*(2), 201-224. doi:10.1080/03057240.2012.670931

Jones, R.P. & Cox, D. (2017). *America's changing religious identity: Findings from the 2016 American values atlas.* Retrieved from https://www.prri.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/PRRI-Religion-Report.pdf.

Kalinoski, Z.T., Steele-Johnson, D., Peyton, E. J., Leas, K.A., Steinke, J., & Bowling, N. A. (2013). A meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(8), doi:1076-1104. doi:10.1002/job.1839

Kitchenham, A. (2008). The evolution of John Mezirow's transformative learning

theory. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *6*, 104–123. doi:10.1177/

1541344608322678

Kulik, C. T., & Roberson, L. (2008). Common goals and golden opportunities:

Evaluations of diversity education in academic and organizational settings.

Academy of Management Learning & Education, *7*(3). 309-331.

doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251670

Mallinckrodt, B., Miles, J. R., Bhaskar, T., Chery, N., Choi, G., & Sung, M. (2014).

Developing a comprehensive scale to assess college multicultural programming.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, *61*(1), 133-145. doi:10.1037/a0035214

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for

Adult and Continuing Education*, *74*, 5–12. doi:10.1002/ace.7401

Muller, J. T., & Miles, J.R. (2017). Intergroup dialogue in undergraduate multicultural

psychology education: Group climate development and outcomes. *Journal of

Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(1), 52-71. doi:10.1037/a0040042

Nagda, B. A., & Zuniga, X. (2003). Fostering a meaningful racial engagement through

intergroup dialogues. *Group processes and Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 111–128.

doi:10.1177/1368430203006001015

Pew Research Center (2013). *A survey of LGBT Americans: Attitudes, experiences, and

values in changing times.* Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-

content/uploads/sites/3/2013/06/SDT_LGBT-Americans_06-2013.pdf

Pew Research Center (2017). *U.S. Muslims concerned about their place in society, but continue to believe in the American dream: Findings from pew research center's 2017 survey of U.S. Muslims.* Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2017/07/09105631/U.S.-MUSLIMS-FULL-REPORT-with-population-update-v2.pdf

Rasoal, C., Jungert, T., Hau, S., Stiwne, E. E., & Anderson, G. (2009). Ethnocultural empathy among students in health care education. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, *32*(3), 300-313. doi:10.1177/0163278709338569

Remer, R. R. (2008). *Influence of diversity courses on undergraduates' ethnocultural empathy, openness to diversity, and awareness of privilege and oppression within a mastery or performance classroom context* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (Document No. 1475174891)

Rosen, D., McCall, J., & Goodkind, S. (2017). Teaching critical self-reflection through the lens of cultural humility: An assignment in a social work diversity course. *Social Work Education*, *36*(3), 289-298. doi:10.1080/02615479.2017.1287260

Roscigno, V. J., Karafin, D. L., & Tester, G. (2009). The complexities and processes of racial housing discrimination. *Social Problems*, *56*(1), 49-69. doi:10.1525/sp.2009.56.1.49

Ross, L. (2010). Notes from the field: Learning cultural humility through critical incidents and central challenges in community-based participatory research. *Journal of Community Practice*, *18*, 315-335. doi:10.1080/10705422.2010.490161

Ryan, C. L., & Bauman, K. (2016). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2015.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2016/demo/p20-578.pdf

Taylor, P., Kochhar, R., Fry, R., Velasco, G., & Motel, S. (2011). Wealth gaps rise to record highs between whites, blacks and hispanics. Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2011/07/SDT-Wealth-Report_7-26-11_FINAL.pdf

Tervalon, M., & Murray-Garcia, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 9, 117-125. doi:10.1353/hpu.2010.0233

Toossi, M. (2012). Labor force projections to 2020: A more slowly growing workforce. *Monthly Labor Review, 135*(1), 43-64. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2012/01/art3full.pdf

Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and instruction affecting critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, *40*, 185–200. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/journal/11162

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017). *Women in the labor force: A databook*. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/womens-databook/2017/pdf/home.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2017). *Hate Crime Statistics, 2016*. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2016/tables/table-1

U.S. Department of Education (2016). *2013-2014 civil rights data collection.* Retrieved

from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/2013-14-first-look.pdf

Worell, J., & Remer, P. (2003). *Feminist perspectives in therapy: Empowering diverse*

women. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Form

The Effects of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes
Consent to Participate in Research

Investigator (Faculty/Staff):   **Student-Investigator:**
Dr. Michael McClellan   Addison Monroe
(859) 622-4381   (717) 994-0770
m.mcclellan@eku.edu
        addison_monroe5@mymail.eku.edu
Cammack 127

Introduction
We invite you to participate in our study on social attitudes in diversity classes. We thank you for your participation in our study. You must be 18 years of age or older.

Investigational Procedures
If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer some basic demographic questions. Participants will then be asked to complete two surveys that measure students' cultural awareness and cultural empathy. At the end of the semester participants will be contacted again through their instructors and be asked to complete the study a second time in order to determine whether and how students were impacted over the course of the semester. The surveys will take no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits
This study involves no more risks than you would normally experience in your everyday life. If you feel in any way affects you negatively, please feel free to contact one of the investigators by phone or email. By participating in this study you may be rewarded by knowing you contributed to psychological research. If both parts of the study are completed, you will be eligible to enter in a raffle for a $15 Walmart gift card. One winner will be selected for every 100 participants that complete both parts of the study and provide a valid email address for contact purposes.

Privacy Records
Participant data from this study will be kept anonymous and be de-identified. The de-identified data gathered from Survey Monkey will be encrypted, password-protected, and then stored on a password-protected computer. The deidentified data will only be viewed by members of the research team.

Conclusion
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Changing your mind during the study will not affect your standing at Eastern Kentucky University or your grade in any of your courses. If you choose to participate, you may stop or withdraw at any moment. Two buttons are presented below. Please click on the top button if you are 18 years of age or older and you consent to participate in this study. Please click on the bottom

button if you are under 18 years of age or you do not consent to participate in this project. If you have any questions, please ask one of the investigators.

Please click on one of the buttons below in order to proceed.

| X | I am 18 years of age or older and I consent to participate in this project."

| X | I am either under 18 years of age or I do not give consent to participate in this project.

Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire

Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire

The Effects of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes
Demographics Questionnaire

*1. Would you like to participate in the raffle for a $15 Walmart gift card? To be eligible you must complete both parts of the survey. One winner will be selected for every 100 participants that complete both parts of the study.

◯ Yes

◯ No

*2. Please enter your email below. Your email will be used to contact you for the second part of the study. Your email will also serve as a way for us to contact you if you are to win one of the Walmart gift cards. Your email will not be linked to any of your survey responses or personal information.

[ ]

*3. Which course were you in that allowed you the opportunity to take this Survey? (Please list the course title, course #, and/or instructor)

[ ]

*4. Please describe your gender.

◯ Female

◯ Male

◯ Transgender

◯ Other (please specify)

[ ]

*5. What is your current age in years.

[ ]

*6. What is your race or ethnicity.

[ ]

*7. What is your religious affiliation.

[ ]

Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire (continued)

***8. Please identify your sexual orientation.**

◯ Heterosexual

◯ Bisexual

◯ Gay or Lesbian

***9. Please identify your student classification.**

◯ Freshman

◯ Sophomore

◯ Junior

◯ Senior

◯ Graduate/Professional

***10. What is your current student status?**

◯ Full-Time Student

◯ Part-Time Student

◯ Not Currently Enrolled

***11. What is your academic major?**

[   ]

***12. What is your cumulative student grade point average (GPA)?**

[   ]

***13. Please identify your political affiliation.**

◯ Democrat

◯ Independent

◯ Republican

◯ Other (please specify)

***14. Parental Figure # 1's Highest Level of Education Completed**

◯ Some High School

◯ Completed High School

◯ Some College

◯ Completed College

◯ Some Advanced Degree

◯ Completed Advanced Degree

15. Parental Figure # 2's Highest Level of Education Completed.

◯ Some High School

◯ Completed High School

◯ Some College

◯ Completed College

◯ Some Advanced Degree

◯ Completed Advanced Degree

***16. Did you ever receive free or reduced lunch in high school?**

◯ Yes

◯ No

Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire (continued)

***17. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to race: (mark all that apply).**

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

***18. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to gender: (mark all that apply).**

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

***19. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to social class: (mark all that apply).**

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

*20. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to sexual orientation: (mark all that apply).

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

21. Please list any other awareness of difference trainings that you have participated in and have not specifically been addressed above:

Please rate the amount of interaction you have had with people who are different from you based on the following characteristics.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Not Much Interaction					A Lot of Interaction

*22. Different race than you?

*23. Different gender than you?

*24. Different sexual orientation than you?

*25. Different social class than you?

*26. Have you traveled abroad?

◯ Yes

◯ No

27. Are women in this country currently discriminated against because of their sex when compared to men?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not sure

28. Are people of color (e.g. African Americans, Hispanics, etc.) discriminated against in this country because of their race?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Appendix C: EMC/RSEE

Appendix C: EMC/RSEE

The Effect of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes

EMC/RSEE

Instructions: The statements below are opinions you may have heard expressed at one time or another. Please indicate your current level of agreement with each statement using the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

_____ 1. I think it is important to be educated about cultures and countries other than my own.

_____ 2. Members of minorities tend to overreact all the time.

_____ 3. I feel uncomfortable when interacting with people from different cultures.

_____ 4. It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person of another racial or ethnic background other than my own.

_____ 5. The U.S. has a long way to go before everyone is truly treated equally.

_____ 6. I don't care if people make racists statements against other racial or ethnic groups.

_____ 7. I welcome the possibility that getting to know another culture might have a deep positive influence on me.

_____ 8. When in America, minorities should make an effort to merge into American culture.

_____ 9. I often find myself fearful of people of other races.

_____ 10. It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.

_____ 11. For two babies born with the same potential in the U.S. today, in general it is still more difficult for a child of color to succeed than a White child.

_____ 12. I get disturbed when other people experience misfortunes due to their racial or ethnic background.

_____ 13. I admire the beauty in other cultures.

_____ 14. I do not understand why minority people need their own TV channels.

_____ 15. I doubt that I can have a deep or strong friendship with people who are culturally different.

_____ 16. It is difficult for me to relate to stories in which people talk about racial or ethnic discrimination they experience in their day to day lives.

_____ 17. I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society.

_____ 18. I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own.

_____ 19. I would like to work in an organization where I get to work with individuals from diverse backgrounds.

_____ 20. I fail to understand why members from minority groups complain about being alienated.

_____ 21. I really don't know how to go about making friends with someone from a different culture.

_____ 22. I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.

_____ 23. Today in the U.S, White people still have many important advantages compared to other ethnic groups.

_____ 24. I share the anger of people who are victims of hate crimes (e.g., intentional violence because of race or ethnicity).

_____ 25. I would like to have dinner at someone's house who is from a different culture.

_____ 26. I feel irritated when people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds speak their language around me.

_____ 27. I am afraid that new cultural experiences might risk losing my own identity.

_____ 28. I don't know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.

_____ 29. I am aware of how society differentially treats racial or ethnic groups other than my own.

_____ 30. I rarely think about the impact of a racist or ethnic joke on the feelings of people who are targeted.

_____ 31. I am interested in participating in various cultural activities on campus.

_____ 32. Minorities get in to school easier and some get away with minimal effort.

_____ 33. I do not know how to find out what is going on in other countries.

_____ 34. I am aware of institutional barriers (e.g., restricted opportunities for job promotion) that discriminate against racial or ethnic groups other than my own.

_____ 35. When I hear people make racist jokes, I tell them I am offended even though they are not referring to my racial or ethnic group.

_____ 36. Most Americans would be better off if they knew more about the cultures of other countries.

_____ 37. I am really worried about White people in the U.S. soon becoming a minority due to so many immigrants.

_____ 38. I am not reluctant to work with others from different cultures in class activities or team projects.

_____ 39. Racism is mostly a thing of the past.

_____ 40. When I see people who come from a different racial or ethnic background succeed in the public arena, I share their pride.

_____ 41. A truly good education requires knowing how to communicate with someone from another culture.

_____ 42. I think American culture is the best culture.

_____ 43. In America everyone has an equal opportunity for success.

_____ 44. When I know my friends are treated unfairly because of their racial or ethnic backgrounds, I speak up for them.

_____ 45. I welcome being strongly influenced by my contact with people from other cultures.

_____ 46. I think members of the minority blame White people too much for their misfortunes.

_____ 47. I believe the United States is enhanced by other cultures.

_____ 48. People who talk with an accent should work harder to speak proper English.

Appendix D: Shortened Demographics Questionnaire

Appendix D: Shortened Demographics Questionnaire

The Effects of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes
Demographics Questionnaire

*1. Would you like to participate in the raffle for a $15 Walmart gift card? To be eligible you must complete both parts of the survey. One winner will be selected for every 100 participants that complete both parts of the study.

◯ Yes

◯ No

*2. Please enter your email below. Your email will be used to contact you for the second part of the study. Your email will also serve as a way for us to contact you if you are to win one of the Walmart gift cards. Your email will not be linked to any of your survey responses or personal information.

> [   ]

*3. Which course were you in that allowed you the opportunity to take this Survey? (Please list the course title, course #, and/or instructor)

> [   ]

*4. Please identify your political affiliation.

◯ Democrat

◯ Independent

◯ Republican

◯ Other (please specify)

*5. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to race: (mark all that apply).

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

*6. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to gender: (mark all that apply).

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

*7. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to social class: (mark all that apply).

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

*8. Please rate your exposure to diversity training which focused on awareness of individual differences with specific regard to sexual orientation: (mark all that apply).

☐ I've not had any formal diversity training.

☐ I've completed a formal diversity training workshop through work or school

☐ I've completed numerous formal diversity training workshops through work or school

☐ I've completed a college course related to diversity training

☐ I've completed numerous college courses related to diversity training

9. Please list any other awareness of difference trainings that you have participated in and have not specifically been addressed above:

10. What was the length of the diversity course you are currently enrolled in (1 full semester, 8 weeks, etc.)?

11. Was the diversity course you were enrolled in an online course, in-class course, or combination of online and in-class?

Please rate the amount of interaction you have had with people who are different from you based on the following characteristics.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Much Interaction					A Lot
of Interaction					

*12. Different race than you?

*13. Different gender than you?

*14. Different sexual orientation than you?

*15. Different social class than you?

*16. Have you traveled abroad?

○ Yes

○ No

17. Are women in this country currently discriminated against because of their sex when compared to men?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not sure

18. Are people of color (e.g. African Americans, Hispanics, etc.) discriminated against in this country because of their race?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Appendix E: Qualitative Measure

Appendix E: Qualitative Measure

The Effects of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes
Qualitative Measure

1. Do you feel like this course has helped you better understand what life is like for people who are different than yourself [e.g. race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class]? Please briefly explain.

>

2. Are you now more familiar with the traditions and values of cultures other than your own? Please briefly explain.

>

3. If you witness someone making discriminating statements towards an individual because he or she belongs to a different culture [e.g. race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class] are you more likely to intervene than you were at the start of the semester?

◯ Yes
◯ No

4. What specific course content that helped you to better understand what life is like for people who are different than yourself [e.g. race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class]? Please briefly describe the content that helped you the most.

>

5. What class-related experiences (group or individual) helped you to better understand what life is like for people who are different than yourself [e.g. race, religion, sex, sexuality or social class]? Please briefly describe the experiences that helped you the most

>

Appendix F: Debriefing Statement

Appendix F: Debriefing Statement

The Effects of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes
Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating our study, "The Effect of Diversity Classes on Social Attitudes". We hope that you enjoyed the experience of expanding the research on diversity education

We looked at two groups of participants in this study. You were either recruited for this study because you were in a diversity course or because you signed up through sona-systems for research credit. Both groups of participants took a survey at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester.

We were primarily interested in two things. We were interested in whether or not a participant's awareness of privilege and oppression was altered from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. We were also interested in whether or not levels of ethnocultural empathy were altered from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. We hypothesized that students who were enrolled in a diversity course would see improvements in both the of these areas. We also hypothesized that the improvements that the diversity course participants had would be significantly larger than the improvements made by participants who were not enrolled in a diversity course (participants who signed up on sona-systems).

By participating in this research, you have expanded the knowledge we have on diversity education. This study will strengthen previous research findings as well as provide insight for future research directions. The expansion of diversity education research will lead to a more culturally competent workforce in a society that grows more diverse every year.

Please keep this debriefing form for your records. If you have any comments, questions, or concerns regarding your participation in this study, please contact one of the research investigators below. Thank you again for your participation in our study.

Addison Monroe
Graduate Student Researcher
addison_monroe5@mymail.eku.edu
(717)994-0770

Tajana K. Graves
Student Researcher
tajana_graves@mymail.eku.edu

Dr. Michael McClellan
Faculty Researche
rm.mcclellan@eku.edu