

SERVICE LEARNING AND ETHNOCULTURAL EMPATHY: DEVELOPING CULTURAL EMPATHY
THROUGH EXPERIENCE

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Sciences

By

Amanda Jean Pieters

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Program:
Educational Leadership

May 2015

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

Service Learning and Ethnocultural Empathy: Developing Cultural Empathy Through
Experience

By

Amanda Jean Pieters

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this *disquisition* complies with North Dakota
State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Thomas Hall

Chair

Dr. Ann T. Clapper

Dr. Elizabeth Roumell

Dr. Kara Gravley-Stack

Approved:

6/18/15

Date

Dr. William Martin

Department Chair

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to explore the impact of experiential learning (through service learning) and ethnocultural empathy in undergraduate students. In other words, how does serving in the community impact how empathetic a person is toward others who are ethnically different than themselves?

The researcher developed a 45 question electronic self-report survey utilizing The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang et al., 2003) to assess mean empathy scores of participants. Research questions addressed: 1) Empathy scores of students who volunteered 10 or more hours, 2) Empathy scores of students who volunteered and served adult populations, 3) Empathy scores of students who are required to volunteer as part of a course, 4) Empathy scores of female students compared to male students.

Results comparing mean SEE scores to each research question showed females and students who volunteer 10 hours or more have higher empathy scores.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the individuals who have helped to support, guide, challenge, and encourage me in completing this thesis.

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Tom Hall, for his guidance, support, many hours spent reading and writing comments for me to review, and his ever familiar encouraging words “Keep on peddling”.

To my committee members, Dr. Kara Gravley-Stack, Dr. Ann Clapper, and Dr. Elizabeth Roumell thank you for the constructive feedback during my thesis proposal and for your time, professionalism, role modeling, energy and dedication for learning and teaching.

I would also like to thank all of the faculty members in the Educational Leadership program at NDSU, who pushed me to grow as a student and a professional, and taught me that I can accomplish a lot more in one semester than I ever thought possible.

And finally, thank you to my family, friends, and colleagues. Mikal, Melissa, Philip, Megan O., Ashley, your continued support and encouraging words were driving forces behind completing this project. Mom, thanks for always being behind me no matter what crazy thing I have ever wanted to take on. To my sister, Megan, thanks for reminding me of the “why” in everything educators do. Andy, thanks for doing my dishes all those nights I had to get back to writing. And to all of my co-workers, current and former students and staff members, thank you for continuing to inspire me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Research Questions	1
Significance of the Study	2
Definition of Terms	2
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Intercultural Sensitivity	4
Empathy Development	7
Ethnocultural Empathy	8
Learning	8
Experiential Learning	10
Transformative Learning	10
Service Learning	12
Effective service learning	12
Students with greater propensity to serve in college	13
Institutions and Pedagogy	13
Challenges with Service Learning	15
Service Learning and Empathy	16
Conclusion	17
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	18
Introduction	18
Purpose of the Study	19
Research Questions	19
Population and Sample	19
Instruments	20
Data Collection	21
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	22

Introduction	22
Statement of the Problem	22
Data Collection Procedures	22
The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE)	25
Research Questions.....	25
Number of Hours Served.....	25
Working With Adult Populations.....	27
Course Requirement	28
Gender.....	29
Summary.....	31
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS	32
Summary.....	32
Conclusions.....	33
Discussion.....	34
Recommendations	40
REFERENCES.....	41
APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT SCALE OF ETHNOCULTURAL EMPATHY	44
APPENDIX B. IRB APPROVAL	51
APPENDIX C. PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT	52

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity	6
2. Kolb's Model with Suggested Learning Strategies.....	9
3. Level of Prior Involvement.....	23
4. Level of Comfort Serving With Different Races/ Ethnicities	24
5. Gender and Class Standing	25
6. Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Serving Fewer or Greater than 10 Hours	26
7. Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Who Serve with Underserved Adult Populations and Those Serving Other Populations	28
8. Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Serving Due to a Course Requirement and Those Choosing to Serve on Their Own	29
9. Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Females Serving Underserved Adult Populations.....	30

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In 2010, Vincent and Velkoff, from the US Census Bureau, wrote that within the next 10 years, the population in the United States will greatly diversify and by the year 2042 the minority population (all people other than non-Hispanic White people) is expected to become the majority. In addition to a changing population demographic, the work-force in the United States is also changing. According to Bushnell (2012), the occupations in the United States expected to gain the most jobs and job openings through 2018 are: health care, science, education, information technology, and protection as well as consumer services. Many of these jobs require working closely with people; many of whom will be ethnically diverse. This will require a workforce of employees who are empathetic to cultural and ethnic differences. Employers are looking for educated, culturally empathetic college graduates to work to meet the needs of the changing population and jobs in the United States.

Purpose of the Study

Based on a review of the literature employers are calling for “ready-to-work” employees with post-secondary degrees who are able to work well with others who have differing ethnic backgrounds than their own. How do we know students are graduating with cultural empathy skills? The purpose of this study was to further explore the impact of experiential learning and ethnocultural empathy in undergraduate students.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Do students with a greater number of service hours, 10 hours or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have fewer than 10 hours of service?
2. To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?
3. Do students who participate in service learning as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?

4. Do female students who serve with underserved populations have a higher ethnocultural empathy score than male students who serve with underserved populations?

Significance of the Study

As students leave college and enter this rapidly changing world they will need to be prepared to enter a global and diverse work place and community. How prepared are students to enter this type of work field? Are students learning and developing cultural empathy in college and if so, where are they developing this kind of learning? Institutions of higher education should examine how students are learning and developing cultural empathy in order to be adaptable and work-ready post-graduation. Cultural empathy is tied closely to intellectual empathy, which is a person's ability to understand the thoughts or feelings of someone who is culturally different (racially or ethnically) than them.

One way to ensure that students develop skills necessary to navigate and support the dynamic environment created by a multicultural society is to foster empathy development (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). Students who participate in experiential learning opportunities, like volunteering their time to serve in the community, potentially have different perspectives and experiences than students who do not. Astin and Sax (1998) described the impact of service participation on undergraduate students this way: "As a consequence of service participation, students become more strongly committed to helping others, serving their communities, promoting racial understanding, doing volunteer work, and working for nonprofit organizations" (p. 256). Promoting racial understanding (or empathy) is an important skill to have not only as a young professional in the work force but also in a world that is continuously transforming.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are important for the purposes of this study. These definitions inform the research questions and conceptualization of this study.

Adult populations- for the purposes of this study adult populations are considered individuals ages 21-59. According to Hehman and Bugental (2013) adulthood is considered 18 years and older, however adolescence is defined as ages 13- 21 (p. 1297). Berg, Calderone, Sansone, Stroguh and Weir (1998) described adults as "aged" after 59 years or older (p. 31).

Ethnicity- According to Philipsen (2003) ethnicity can be defined as “cultural characteristics shared by a group of people, including religion, national origin and language” (p. 230).

Ethnocultural Empathy- Ethnocultural empathy can also be understood as the amount of empathy an individual feels toward someone who is ethnically different from than they are. The phrase ethnocultural empathy evolved from definitions of general empathy, multiculturalism and cultural empathy and also encompasses intellectual empathy and communicative empathy (Wang et al., 2003).

Serving in other ways- refers to working directly with individuals ages birth-21 and 59 + and/or working with animals, doing manual labor, working with individuals who manage, organize or work with the agency.

Service- is the voluntary time a student spends providing a service to other people, an organization or agency. Service experiences can range from serving regularly at the same organization for an entire semester to serving just once, though research suggests students benefit most from service experiences if they participate over time (Philipsen, 2003).

Service learning- Service learning differs from volunteering based on the reflection and/or connection to an academic topic or organizational concept. Service allows an individual to experience said topic or concept and then reflect on their experience to gain deeper understanding (Wilson, 2011). Reflection is a built in component of the curriculum in class. Service learning is also understood as and referred to as service.

Primarily White Institution (PWI)- Predominantly White Institutions are defined as an institution of higher education where 50% or more of the student enrollment is white and or the institution is considered historically white (Brown & Dancy, 2010).

Underserved Populations- refers to individuals who rely on the goods and/or services of an agency and/or community organization. Underserved or unserved populations are also defined as racial and ethnic minorities who live at or below the federal poverty level (Vanderbilt et al., 2013).

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

To be successful in a diverse world, people need to be able to communicate and negotiate among diverse cultures (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). This chapter presents a review of literature beginning with intercultural sensitivity, moving toward empathy development and ethnocultural empathy. Next, learning and service learning are reviewed as well as the role institutions and pedagogy play within service learning. Experiential Learning, Transformative learning and challenges with service learning are explored next and the chapter ends with reviewing connections between service learning and empathy.

Intercultural Sensitivity

The concept of intercultural sensitivity is dependent upon race, culture and ethnicity. All of these constructs intersect with one another when exploring differences between two cultures. While these constructs intersect and overlap in some ways, Philipsen (2003) identified the importance of understanding the difference between race and ethnicity. "Race and ethnicity both have often been used synonymously with culture, as if membership in a racial or ethnic category automatically produces a singular set of cultural idiosyncrasies, which it certainly does not" (p. 231). While all three of these work together, each has individual definitions.

Philipsen (2003) defined race as a social construct that, "as scientists have demonstrated, lacks any credible basis in biology" (p. 231). This definition is still an important construct because it defines a person's social and professional opportunities in society. Lopez (1994) (as cited in Closson, 2013) also agreed that social opportunity is impacted by race. Race is "neither an essence nor an illusion, but rather an on-going, contradictory, self-reinforcing, plastic process subject to the macro forces of social and political struggle and the micro effects of daily decisions"(p. 62). Race is a pliable, shifting, moving construct with social implications. Cultures create behavioral norms and expectations for social interaction. Philipsen (2003) defined culture as, "ways of doing and thinking about things, including habits, norms, values, rituals, and shared understandings or expectations" (p. 231). Encompassing the understanding of race and culture, ethnicity can be defined as "cultural characteristics shared by a group of people, including religion, national origin and language" (p. 230). Race, culture and ethnicity, though different, work together to help inform intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence.

Ishiyama and Breuning (2006) discussed intercultural competence as “the ability to perceive and understand different perspectives” (p. 327), while intercultural sensitivity is the way individuals understand cultural difference and process this understanding based on their own experiences (Bennett, 1993). Individuals are capable of developing intercultural sensitivity the more they accommodate cultural difference of others. In this instance the topics of intercultural competence and intercultural sensitivity inform Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (as cited in Mahoney & Schamber, 2004) is a 6 stage model used to describe individual’s responses to cultural difference (see Table 1). Bennett described each stage as increasing in sensitivity toward cultural difference, beginning with “Denial of Difference” as the least sensitive toward cultural difference. The first three stages are classified in the “Ethnocentric Stages”. Themes within these stages include: not recognizing those who fit outside of one’s own cultural understanding, defensive stances protecting an individual worldview, and finally not seeing difference as important, but instead grouping all humans together.

Table 1

Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity		
Type of Stage	Stage	Definition of Stage
Ethnocentric Stages	Denial of Difference	Learners may not have the ability to recognize cultural difference and may dehumanize those seen as outsiders. Learners likely separate themselves from cultural difference to protect their worldview.
Ethnocentric Stages	Defense of Difference	Learners have a dualistic, "us/them" way of thinking and recognize cultural difference as negative. Individuals may defend the positive aspects of personal culture compared to all other cultures.
Ethnocentric Stages	Minimization of Difference	Learners recognize and accept cultural differences with a lens holding all humans as being the same while celebrating "food, flags and festivals" of other cultures.
Ethnorelative Stages	Acceptance of Difference	Learner appreciates cultural difference in behavior and values.
Ethnorelative Stages	Adaptation to Difference	Learners demonstrate an effective use of empathy and intercultural communication.
Ethnorelative Stages	Integration of Difference	This final stage demonstrates the most sensitivity toward cultural difference. Learners have an internalized multicultural frame of reference and see themselves as "in process".

Note. As learners increase sensitivity, stages begin to show acceptance of cultural difference, adaptation and finally integration of one's personal culture and the culture differences of others.

While Bennett (1993) stated that individuals are capable of transcending previous ethnocentric notions of culture to create new relationships across cultural boundaries, Mahoney and Schamber (2004) recognized the challenge to expand individual preconceived ideas about culture. Living in a world where people are afraid to talk about race, students are limited when it comes to communicating with individuals who come from diverse cultures. "Cultural difference is a threatening idea because it challenges an individual to reconsider ethnocentric views of the world and negotiate each intercultural encounter with an open mind and as a unique experience" (p. 312). One way to ensure that students develop skills

necessary to manage the challenges posed by a multicultural society is to foster empathy development (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). Bennett (1993) indicated intercultural change comes from “applying consciousness to culture” (p. 65) and participating in self-reflection.

Empathy Development

How do we develop empathy exactly? And what is it? Wiggins and McTighe (2005) (as cited in Wilson, 2011) identified empathy as the ability to “walk in another’s shoes” and remove ourselves from our own mental and emotional responses in order to better understand someone else’s response. According to Roberts, Strayer and Denham (2014) empathy is defined as, “not so much an emotion as an emotional-cognitive process that results in understanding and ‘feeling with’ others” (p. 1). Empathy allows us to better understand the position of someone else. This is critical when building relationships with individuals who come from different backgrounds and cultures. Empathy can be developed in many ways. Some say empathy is developed through an emotional bond (Wilson, 2011), others concluded empathy is developed through service-learning experiences (Lundy, 2007), and still others argued empathy can be developed through course content and by adapting a transformative learning and reflective pedagogy (Bamber & Hankin, 2011; Chan, 2012; Mahoney & Schamber, 2004; Wilson, 2011). Interacting and building relationships with others promotes empathy development and reflecting on these relationships strengthens changes in perspective or understanding regarding intercultural competence.

Students are often required to participate in a service learning experience that requires working with others. According to Galinsky and Moskowitz (2000), learning through empathy is a powerful way to come to a new understanding and students who interacted with people in need made an emotional connection with them. This emotional connection to people helped students understand a new perspective of the individuals the students were working with. Wilson (2011) observed students creating an emotional bond, “It appears that the emotional bond which develops in the service experience influences the development of empathy particularly” (p. 215). Regardless of how empathy is developed Roberts, Strayer, and Denham (2014) and Galinsky and Moskowitz (2000), stated there are social and cognitive benefits to developing empathy.

Ethnocultural Empathy

Wang, Davidson, Yakushko, Savoy, Tan, and Bleier (2004) designed and tested an instrument to measure cultural empathy or ethnocultural empathy. Ethnocultural empathy can also be understood as the amount of empathy an individual feels about someone who is ethnically different from them. Ethnicity is a set of cultural characteristics shared by a group of people, including (but not limited to) religion, race, national origin and language (Philipsen, 2003). The phrase ethnocultural empathy evolved from definitions of general empathy, multiculturalism and cultural empathy and also encompasses intellectual empathy and communicative empathy. Wang et al. (2003) stated, "Intellectual empathy is the ability to understand a racially or ethnically different person's thinking and/or feeling" (p. 222), while communicative empathy is expressed through words or actions. Similar to Bennett's Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, ethnocultural empathy is a learned ability and a personal trait that can be developed over time.

Empathy can be developed through experience and environment. The environment that an individual is surrounded by impacts their cognitive development. Social interaction between peers, parents and other adults is particularly influential in cognitive development (Piaget, 1952) and environment is crucial to student learning (Astin, 1984). John Dewey (1938) was an educator who advocated for learning grounded in experience (as cited in Philipsen, 2003). Empathy development can be influenced by the environment where learning takes place, the learning experience a student has, and the learning that occurs.

Learning

The basis for experiential learning is rooted in Dewey's (1938) work, *Experience and Education* (as cited in Merriam, Cafarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). Dewey proposed that experience is continuous and the experiential learning process is of fundamental importance to education and adult development (Chan, 2012), while Kolb (1984) defined learning "as the process whereby knowledge is created through transformational experience" (p. 38). Kolb described learning through transformational experiences as experiential learning (see Table 2).

Knowles, Holton and Swanson (2012) (as cited in Merriam & Cafarella, 1991) stated that all people carry around a set of schemata that reflect their experiences that act as a starting point for assimilating new information (p. 189). Dewey (1938), Kolb's Experiential Learning Model (1984) and

Merriam and Cafarella (1991) all described approaches to learning where experience impacts the current perspective of a learner. A learner's prior life experiences are a part of their current learning. Mezierow (2000) took this idea one step further and said that experiential learning is a process that can add to prior knowledge, but also has the potential to actually transform the individual learner based on critical self-reflection and critical thinking of their personal perspectives (as cited in Merriam, Cafarella and Baumgartner (2007)). However, Mezierow recognized that not all learning is transformative and just having an experience is not enough to transform a learner. Merriam, Cafarella and Baumgartner (2007) wrote, "The learner must critically self-examine the assumptions and beliefs that have structured how the experience has been interpreted" (p.134). Kolb (1984) saw learning as a continuous process grounded in experiences, which means that all learning can be seen as relearning.

Table 2

Kolb's Model with Suggested Learning Strategies

Kolb's Stage	4 Steps in the Experiential Learning Cycle	Example Learning/ Teaching Strategy
Concrete Experience	Full involvement in new here-and-now experiences.	Simulation, Case Study, Field Trip, Real Experience, Demonstrations
Observe and Reflect	Reflection on and observation of the learners' experiences from many perspectives.	Discussion, Small Groups, Buzz Groups, Designated Observers
Abstract Conceptualization	Creation of concepts that integrate the learners' observations into logically sound theories.	Sharing Content
Active Experimentation	Using these theories to make decisions and solve problems.	Laboratory Experiences, On-the-Job Experience, Internships, Practice Sessions

Notes. Students can move between stages of experiential learning. Based on the stage of learning a student is in, the learning that occurs may be impacted based on the type of learning/teaching strategy that is selected.

According to Chan (2012) the four elements of Kolb's model require students to experience, reflect, think and act. This process is cyclical and is in response to the learning situation and what has been learned. Chan noted that concrete experience is gained when a learner has direct experience and responds to a situation in that experience.

Piaget (1952) theorized that a person's intelligence is a product of experience accumulated over time. Kolb's learning cycle represent learning as a process during which experience and reflective

observation occur. Service learning, along the same lines, serves as a tool to enhance academic learning by providing opportunities for accumulated and varied experiences over time.

Experiential Learning

The learning environment has a major impact on the type of learning taking place (Svensson & Wihloborg, 2010). Students who participate in real-life activities are able to transform the knowledge learned from the classroom into their own personal understanding (Chan, 2012). Chan conducted a study utilizing Kolb's learning cycle (1984). In that study Chan noted through assessments from students and teachers that the 4 stages of Kolb's experiential learning cycle were present in student experiences. Chan wrote, "The community service type of experiential learning is particularly effective as such learning connects student's emotions and empathy towards the subject matters besides the usual cognitive linkage" (p. 413).

Chan indicated a need for future researchers to continue to explore the best ways to measure student learning and the 4 steps of Kolb's learning cycle. Bamber and Hankin (2011) and Kiley (2005) also stated that there is a need for better ways to measure and identify transformative learning.

Kolb's experiential learning theory is arguably the most popular conceptualization of experiential learning in service learning because of the model's overall simplicity and theoretical clarity. It is easily adaptable to diverse contexts. Service learning experiences require some form of structured reflection to connect experience with concepts, ideas and theories and generate new and applicable knowledge in concrete "real-life" situations (Kiley, 2005).

Transformative Learning

Mezirow (2000) and Freire (1970) viewed learning in adulthood as transformative, and sometimes additive. Transformative learning requires critical thinking and reflection from the learner on their own thoughts and assumptions. Two critical components to this theory include a sociocultural context and that the learner has life experiences. Mezirow and Freire differ on the outcome of transformative learning. Mezirow emphasized personal psychological change and Freire viewed transformative learning in a way that drives social change and individual empowerment (Merriam, Cafarella & Baumgartner, 2007), while Dewey's pragmatic approach to learning demanded that education consider social and cultural

perspectives of learners (Cooks, Scharrer, & Paredes, 2004). From this perspective, education cannot be simply about the transfer of information.

Kiley (2005) conducted a longitudinal case study exploring a transformational learning model for service learning. Findings from this study showed five categories of how students experienced transformational learning in service learning: contextual border crossing, dissonance, personalizing, processing, and connecting. "Contextual border crossing" is characterized as the 1) personal (biography, personality, learning style, prior travel etc.), 2) structural (race, class, gender, ethnicity etc.), 3) historical (socioeconomic and political systems) and 4) programmatic factors that intersect to influence the way students experience transformational learning in service learning. "Dissonance" considers participants' prior perspective and the contextual factors of the service-learning experience. A relationship exists between the type of dissonance and intensity of the dissonance and the type of learning that takes place. "Personalizing" is the individual response to different types of dissonance. This is often an emotional experience for participants. "Processing" is a reflection component of the learning process. It means questioning, challenging, analyzing and searching for solutions. Finally, "Connecting" is, "learning to affectively understand and empathize through relationships with community members, peers and faculty. It is learning through nonreflective modes such as sensing, sharing, feeling, caring, participating, relating, listening, comforting, empathizing, intuiting, and doing" (p. 8).

Kiley (2005) also revealed that reflection is only part of a much more holistic set of transformational learning processes unique to service learning. Emotional dissonance from an experience affects student's transformational learning even after their participation in the service learning program has ended. We must use caution before drawing conclusions on students' transformational learning solely to intense socioeconomic phenomena like "culture shock". Kiley posits there is a more complex relationship among context and dissonance in service learning. "This model expands on Mezirow's conceptualization of transformational learning and provides the service learning practitioner with a more advanced conceptual framework for fostering transformational learning in diverse service learning contexts" (p. 17). Kiley agrees with Mezirow that transformational learning will not necessarily occur just because a student participates in a service learning experience. However, research suggests service learning experiences can act as a catalyst for transformative learning.

Service Learning

Service learning is one type of pedagogy that can help develop problem solving, critical thinking and knowledge construction (Wilson, 2011). A basic definition of service learning is, “students serving in the community where classroom concepts can be experienced, then reflecting on their service experience to gain deeper understanding” (Wilson, 2011, p. 208). Wiggins and McTighe (2005) stated that there are six types of understanding that facilitate the transfer of new knowledge during a service learning experience: 1) explanation, 2) interpretation, 3) application, 4) perspective 5) empathy, 6) self-knowledge (as cited in Wilson, 2011). This understanding requires the learner to make connections between their personal experiences in order to make meaning from the experience. Philipsen (2003) agrees with this perspective, “An important aspect of service learning is not just academic learning, but also personal growth and the enhancement of civic responsibility and citizen skills” (p. 232). Philipsen also stated that service learning is one pedagogical approach to help in preparing students to work in a multicultural world. If service learning is implemented well, there is potential for students to learn about themselves and the world through their experience. It enhances academic learning in general, helps integrate theory and practice and can force students to question assumptions regarding racial stereotypes.

Service learning can take many forms. However, there are factors of an individual’s experience during service learning that can more positively impact the learning that occurs. One of these factors can be the level of effective service learning including the quality of instruction and organization of service placements.

Effective service learning

Philpsen (2003) and Wilson (2011) identified characteristics of effective service learning. Effective service learning requires several factors: the service being performed should be connected to the course subject matter, students should be put in high quality placements (ideally a placement that is organized and prepared to work with students participating in service learning), participate in meaningful work (jobs other than busy work such as filing, sweeping etc), and receive support and feedback from the agency staff. The placement should also continue over time. Ideally, students should also work with people from diverse backgrounds in terms of culture, ethnicity, class, education and occupation and diverse life experiences. Part of the learning experience for students is helping them realize that they are dealing with

just the “tip of the iceberg”. In the end students should be able to recognize and connect their experience to global and societal issues.

Wilson (2011) and Mezirow (2000) are cited as stating the critical importance of reflection to the learning process, however, Kiley (2005) cautioned against dependence on measuring learning through reflection. He challenged that in order for service learning practices to advance, there is a need for more relevant and useful theory on why and how service learning is different from classroom pedagogy. Additionally, measuring learning from service learning experiences must become more holistic to avoid falling into old ways, a focus on personal reflection, of assessing and measuring learning. To continue to practice and assess in this way limits opportunities and outcomes from service learning experiences (Kiely, 2005).

Students with greater propensity to serve in college

Cruce and Moore (2012) examined the effects of college student high school involvement and their level of civic-mindedness and propensity to serve during college. Their study helped to identify the students who are more likely to participate in service opportunities.

Based on the results of the study, Cruce and Moore (2012) reported that females were significantly more likely to serve during their first year of college than males. Additionally students who had a parent with some college education and students who earned mostly As were more likely to serve during college. The number of hours per week that students work while attending college also has significant influence on their service participation. Lastly, learning communities and involvement in organizations like fraternities and sororities encouraged students to participate in service opportunities. Through these organizations and communities, students received a consistent message about the value and importance of service. Students who were less likely to participate in service-learning opportunities included: white students, males, and international students.

Institutions and Pedagogy

Based on a study conducted by Ishiyama and Breuning (2006), “Students in the Midwest have traditionally had less exposure to the world beyond the borders of their own country and are less likely to travel abroad” (p. 327). It appears that other educators agree with this statement as internationalization is

a hot topic at institutions of higher education today (Isihyama & Breunin, 2006; Svensson & Wihloborg, 2010).

Internationalization is a term used to describe programs or courses at institutions that will help prepare students to becoming global citizens who are equipped to work in a diversifying world. Often these programs discuss intercultural competence and development. Intercultural competence is one benefit of internationalizing student experiences (Isihyama & Breunin, 2006; Svensson & Wihloborg, 2010). Intercultural competence development means developing critical thinking skills as well as cultural and linguistic skills.

Curriculum intervention in general education courses can influence the development of intercultural sensitivity among students. Mahoney and Schamber (2004) discussed that, historically, there has been an approach where content about other cultures is shared in detail through lectures and text. However, reading or listening about other cultures does not help students prepare to engage and interact with diverse cultures outside of the classroom. One way to ensure students are prepared for out of classroom experiences is to increase their levels of intercultural competency. This calls for a shift to a curriculum that “employs analysis and evaluation. . . (rather) than a curriculum that simply employs comprehension of information “ (p. 326). Svensson and Wihloborg (2010) identified a need for a pedagogical approach to designing internationalization content where educators consider measurable learning outcomes and learner context. Learning context includes “the learner’s prior experience, attitudes, expectations and capabilities” (p. 610).

Svensson and Wihloborg (2010) also discussed the impact of curriculum change, “Intercultural learning has the potential to develop both global and international consciousness, as well as supporting global and international citizenship capabilities and competencies” (p. 609). Intercultural learning must take the form of understanding an experience different from one’s own. Currently educational goals around internationalization are driven and designed based on political, economic or organizational perspectives rather than approached from a teacher and learner perspective (Svensson & Wihloborg, 2010).

Curriculum content is not the only thing that can impact learning. Mahoney and Schamber (2004) argued the importance of instructional technique. They reported instructional techniques evoked a change in intercultural communication exchanges and perceptions about the value of those exchanges.

Additionally, the development level of the students being taught must be taken into consideration when applying pedagogy. Failure to consider the developmental level of students will minimize the impact of student learning.

Experiential learning and service learning can impact student learning, empathy development and intercultural competence. Additional components to consider in student development and learning is the impact of individual institutional approaches to curriculum and program design as well as the pedagogical approaches of educators. Just as Mahoney and Schamber (2004) identified challenges in current curriculum that limits cultural competence learning for students, there are also challenges within service learning experiences that could stunt student learning.

Challenges with Service Learning

Chan (2012) stated:

With the increasing demands from employers looking for competent graduates, the experience gained from an experiential learning project can improve students' career prospects upon graduation, develops their social and human relations in the workplace and provides opportunities for students to put their graduate attributes into practice (p. 406).

While this is nice in theory, other findings suggest that transformative learning does not necessarily take place during or as a result of service learning. There are several factors that come into play when measuring a student's learning following a service learning experience including their level of maturation and analytical skills before entering the experience. These factors can contribute to the amount of learning, meaning and transformation that a student inputs from a particular experience.

One challenge is that service learning may not last long enough for students to deeply question and challenge stereotypes. It is possible that students may instead reinforce negative stereotypes. For example, Philipsen (2003) wrote about the accidental reinforcement of the idea that students who provide service to an underserved population, in this case individuals in a low socioeconomic status, "improves the lives of poor people" (p. 238). This thought process does not help students develop empathy for those who are different from them, but instead reinforces a sense of power and entitlement. Service learning can also mislead students to think that their experience is more profound than it actually is and may draw

premature conclusions. It is critical for the instructor to discuss limitations of the course and help prevent students from rushing to draw conclusions around their experiences.

While there is a lot of support and excitement over students learning from service opportunities Kiley (2005) challenged the traditional way of measuring student learning through reflection.

The emphasis on cognitive reflection stems from the service learning field's dominant culture assumption that the pragmatic and reflective experiential traditions of Dewey (1916, 1933) and Kolb (1984) provide the most adequate philosophical and theoretical framework for understanding and explain the processes of learning unique to service learning contexts and for guiding practice. (p.5)

Researchers need to examine non-reflective forms of learning in service learning to focus more on the intersections and complexity of context and emotional aspects of service learning (Kiley, 2005).

It is important to show students the impact they are making in the community as a result of their service. This kind of visibility helps to increase student community service self-efficacy (Cruce & Moore, 2012). Philipsen (2003) argued that there can be unintentional consequences to service learning and Bammer and Hankin (2011) agree; highlighting the perks of participating in service learning, student synthesis and learning can be stunted. Students may expect that by participating in a service learning experience that they are guaranteed certain outcomes instead of making meaning from the experience themselves.

Service Learning and Empathy

Empathy development can be fostered by service learning. Lundy (2007) conducted research to evaluate the impact of service learning on exam scores and emotional empathy. Service learning was 1 of 3 project options offered to students in the course.

Reflecting on service activities in light of course content may not only foster understanding of course content but may also enhance understanding of others' emotional experiences. Thus emotional empathy, or the ability to vicariously experience other's emotions, may be another positive outcome of programs that offer opportunities for reflection. Emotional empathy has received little attention in the service learning literature. (p. 23)

Findings from this study revealed significantly greater change in pre-to post project empathy scores for students who engaged in service learning compared to those who participated in other projects.

Empathy scores for the service learning group increased 76% and 42% compared to the research paper and interview project. Students who participated in service learning demonstrated higher post empathy scores than other students. It is important to note that this was a self-report measure, so social desirability cannot be ruled out.

Perspective taking, empathy, cultural competence and relationship building are all outcomes of service learning. Wilson (2011) reported “82% of service-learning students expressed understanding of others’ perspectives in their reflective writing”(p. 214) compared to 46% of students who participated in the book discussion in Wilson’s study. Students are positively impacted and individual intolerance, prejudice and ignorance are all likely to be impacted when an experiential learning process includes classroom learning and outside of classroom work (Philipsen, 2003). Eyler et al. (1991) stated, “Service learning helps reduce stereotypes and contributes to cultural and racial understanding as well as improves citizenship skills and faculty-student relationships” (p. 232) (as cited in Philipsen, 2003). Service learning can influence cultural empathy in students (Lundy, 2007; Philipsen, 2003; Wilson, 2011).

Research shows that many students are impacted in positive ways, emotionally and developmentally when they have a chance to participate in experiential learning outside of the classroom. Specifically students deepen or continue to develop empathy for others.

Conclusion

Part of the learning experience for students participating in service is helping them realize that they are just skimming the surface of more complex systems, problems or social injustices (Philipsen, 2003). Similarly, understanding the learning that occurs by students participating in service is not always abundantly clear, and as more and more institutions require service as part of the curriculum, what is it that students are gaining? This study seeks to examine the ethnocultural empathy scores of undergraduate students who participate in service experiences. By examining the ethnocultural empathy scores of undergraduate students who participate in service learning experiences knowledge may be gained regarding what transferable, culturally competent skills students are developing.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Employers need competent, confident, and ready-to work graduates. According to Beard 2009; Quinn and Shurbille, 2009 (as cited in Chan, 2012) there is demand from employers for competent college graduates who can demonstrate requisite social skills and academic achievements (Wilson, 2011) as well as adequate cultural empathy. With a diversifying and rapidly changing demographic in the US how prepared are students to enter the work field? Are students learning and developing cultural empathy in college and if so, where are they developing this kind of learning?

Students who participate in experiential learning opportunities, like serving in the community, have different experiences than students who don't. Astin and Sax (1998) described the impact of service participation on undergraduate students this way: "As a consequence of service participation, students become more strongly committed to helping others, serving their communities, promoting racial understanding, doing volunteer work, and working for nonprofit organizations" (p. 256). Promoting racial understanding (or empathy) is an important skill to have as a young professional in a diversifying work-force and world. While serving outside of the classroom is beneficial to student development, some students are more predisposed to serve than others. According to the research, students who are less likely to participate in service activities include: white students, males, international students (Cruce & Moore, 2012). Astin and Sax (1998) also identified students who valued materialistic things as less likely to serve in college.

The work-force in the United States is changing. According to Bushnell (2012), the occupations that are expected to gain the most jobs and job openings through 2018 are: health care, science, education, information technology, and protection as well as consumer services. Many of these jobs are jobs that require working closely with other people. There continues to be a shift from a "goods-producing to a service-providing economy and increasing demand for an educated workforce" (p. 92). As our country moves toward a service-based economy with a rapidly changing population, employers are looking for educated, culturally empathetic grads to work. Institutions of higher education should examine how students are learning and developing in their cultural empathy in order to be adaptable and work-ready post-graduation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to further explore the impact of experiential learning and ethnocultural empathy in undergraduate students. Ethnocultural empathy is the empathy an individual has or feels for those of a different race or ethnicity than their own. Ethnocultural empathy is similar to cultural empathy, but is more specific focusing on racial or ethnic difference. Based on a review of the literature employers are calling for “ready-to-work” employees with secondary degrees who are able to work well with others that have ethnic backgrounds different than their own.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Do students with a greater number of service hours, 10 hours or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have fewer than 10 hours of service?
2. To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?
3. Do students who participate in service learning as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?
4. Do female students who serve with underserved populations have a higher ethnocultural empathy score than male students who serve with underserved populations?

Population and Sample

In this study the researcher used a non-probability convenience sampling technique. The sample was drawn from a population of undergraduate college students attending a religiously affiliated, private 4-year liberal arts institution in the upper Midwest. The total number of students enrolled is approximately N = 2,531. The survey was sent to n = 577. Of the 577 students the survey was sent to, 196 (34%) participate in Campus Service Commission (CSC), and the remaining 381 (66%) students were identified from academic course lists that require or required service as part of the course. CSC is a student run organization that partners with nine community agencies. Any student at the college interested in taking part in a service learning experience can go through CSC to be placed with an agency in the community.

CSC also manages the number of hours students serve and facilitates a reflection following a service experience. The reflection component is designed to help participating students make connections to their personal development and world view as well as draw parallels from their experience serving with the agency to what they are learning in the classroom. The students from these groups have had exposure to service learning, either required (through their class) or by choice (through involvement with CSC).

The population receiving the survey were full-time undergraduate students who have served with a community agency off campus at least once since the time they arrived to campus as new students. Participants were able to identify with any class standing based on anticipated graduation year (or number of semesters they've lived on campus). The study's sample was randomly selected from an email list of students who were identified as having served off campus in the community at least once since the time they arrived on campus. This email list was obtained through several avenues: a campus organization, CSC, academic courses that require service as part of the course, and other student organizations that require service hours. All email addresses of students were copied into one continuous column of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and any duplicates removed.

Participants were encouraged to complete the survey by being entered to win a \$50 gift card upon completion of the survey.

Instruments

The instrument used in this study was the Scale for Ethnocultural Empathy, designed and tested by Wang, Davidson, Yakushoko, Bielstein Savoy, Tan, and Bleier (2003). I acquired permission to use The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy via email correspondence with Dr. Meghan Davidson. A copy of permission granted by Davidson is included in the appendix and IRB application.

The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) is a 31 item questionnaire, and the first empirical measure to provide support for the "theoretical construct of empathy in multicultural settings" (p. 231). This instrument measures cultural empathy toward individuals who have racially and ethnically different backgrounds than our own. Individuals self-report responses to each question. This instrument is broken down into four categories and measures: Empathetic Feeling and Expression, Empathetic Perspective Taking, Acceptance of Cultural Differences, Empathetic Awareness. The first category (questions # 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26, 30), Empathetic Feeling and Expression, "includes items that

pertain to concern about communication of discriminatory or prejudiced attitudes or beliefs as well as items that focus on emotional responses to the emotions and/or experiences of people from racial or ethnic groups different from their own” (p. 224). The second category (questions # 2, 4, 6, 19, 28, 29, 31) measures Empathetic Perspective Taking which is composed of “items that indicate an effort to understand the experiences and emotions of people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds by trying to take their perspective in viewing the world” (p. 224). The third category, (questions # 1, 5, 8, 10, 27) measures Acceptance of Cultural Difference including items that “center on the understanding, acceptance, and valuing of cultural traditions and customs of individuals from differing racial and ethnic groups” (p. 224). Finally, the fourth category, Empathetic Awareness, (questions # 7, 20, 24, 25) measures items “that appear to focus on the awareness or knowledge that one has about the experiences of people from racial or ethnic groups different from one’s own” (p. 224). The researcher will also ask several demographic questions of the studies participants.

Wang et al. (2003) showed validity and reliability of this instrument through three different studies. Study 1 was conducted as instrument development and exploratory factor analysis. The primary purpose of Study 2 was to “examine the stability of the factor structure obtained in Study 1. . . and to examine additional validity of the SEE” (p. 226). Study 3 was to determine test-retest reliability. The instrument was validated from data sets collected from undergraduate students at three Midwestern colleges or universities. The results of these studies support the existing research and provide evidence for high internal consistency and test-retest reliability.

Following the 31 item SEE scale, there are 14 demographic questions.

Data Collection

A 45 item survey was sent to 577 undergraduate students. The questionnaire was designed and sent through Qualtrics. Qualtrics is a survey design web-based program. The questionnaire is made up of Likert scale questions and closed ended demographic questions.

Once the researcher obtained IRB approval, the first round of surveys was sent via email on March 5th, 2015. A reminder email was sent to participants who had not yet started the survey on March 11th. The final email reminder was sent on March 15th. The survey closed on Monday March 16th at 11:59pm. A winner of the \$50 gift card was randomly selected and the winner notified on March 19th.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter will cover several sections including: the statement of the problem, a description of the population sample and demographic information reported, and a description of the inferential statistical tests conducted to test each of the research questions posed in this study.

Statement of the Problem

This quantitative study was designed to examine ethnocultural empathy in students who attend a private, four-year residential, religiously affiliated liberal arts college who serve off-campus in the community. Four research questions were posed:

- 1) Do students with a greater number of service hours, 10 hours or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have fewer than 10 hours of service?
- 2) To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?
- 3) Do students who participate in service learning as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?
- 4) Do female students who serve with underserved populations have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than male students who serve with underserved populations?

Data Collection Procedures

Once the survey was closed responses were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and were reviewed by the researcher. Thirteen responses were eliminated from the spreadsheet before it was analyzed due to major sections of missing data or because participants indicated that they did not want to participate in the survey. Based on the number of returned surveys, 0.059 % of responses were eliminated. Once the data was reviewed, it was uploaded into data analysis software, Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). The researcher used SPSS to run a variety of analyses on the data.

The sample was drawn from a population of undergraduate college students attending a religiously affiliated, private 4-year liberal arts institution in the upper Midwest. The total number of

students enrolled at this institution is 2, 531. The survey was sent to $n = 577$. One hundred and ninety six (196) of these students were involved in community service through the Campus Service Commission (CSC) a student-run organization that partners with nine community agencies. The remaining 381 students were involved in community service through courses that required service learning as part of the course.

All students receiving the survey were full-time undergraduates who served with a community agency off campus at least once since the time they arrived on campus. Participants identified with any class standing based on their anticipated graduation year.

Of the 577 surveys sent, 214 were completed and returned. Thirteen (13) of the returned surveys were omitted from the final analysis either because the respondents indicated that they did not wish to participate in the study (3) or the instrument was only partially completed (10). This left 201 surveys that could be analyzed for a usable return rate of 34.8%.

Based on a request from committee members, two demographic questions were added to the survey asking about participant's prior involvement in service and level of comfort serving with individuals who were racially/ethnically different than themselves prior to coming to college. Regarding involvement with service prior to coming to the institution, 199 participants responded to this question. Sixty-two percent (62%) of participants indicated they were highly involved or involved with service, twenty-eight percent (28%) of participants reported being somewhat involved in service, and eight percent (8%) reported no involvement in service prior to college. A breakdown of level of involvement can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Level of Prior Involvement					
Level of Involvement	Men $n= 42$	Women $n=158$	Transgender $n= 2$	Total	Percentage
Highly Involved	10	43	1	54	26%
Involved	12	60	-	72	36%
Somewhat Involved	9	47	-	56	28%
Not Involved	10	6	1	17	8%
Other	0	0	-	0	1%
Did Not Report	1	2	-	3	1%
Total	42	158	2	202	100%

Regarding comfort levels serving individuals who were racially/ethnically different than participants, fifty-two percent (52%) of the 199 respondents, reported being somewhat or very comfortable serving with those who were ethnically/racially different, nineteen percent (19%) reported being neither comfortable nor uncomfortable, eighteen percent (18%) reported being uncomfortable, and ten percent (10%) indicated very uncomfortable. A comfort and involvement breakdown of the 198 participants can be found in table 4.

Table 4

Level of Comfort Serving With Different Races/ Ethnicities					
Level of Comfort	Men <i>n</i> =42	Women <i>n</i> =158	Transgender <i>n</i> =2	Total	Percentage
Very Uncomfortable	9	12	-	21	10%
Somewhat Uncomfortable	4	31	1	36	18%
Neither Comfortable Nor Uncomfortable	10	29	-	39	19%
Somewhat Comfortable	9	46	-	55	28%
Very Comfortable	9	38	1	48	24%
Other	0	0	-	0	0%
Did Not Report	1	2	-	3	1%
Total	42	158	2	202	100%

In terms of ethnicity, ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents identified themselves as Non-Hispanic White/Euro American. Women made up 78% (*n*=157) of the respondents and men 20% (*n*=42). Two respondents (2%) identified themselves as Transgender. A gender and class standing breakdown of the 201 participants can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Gender and Class Standing					
Class Standing	Men <i>n</i> =32	Women <i>n</i> =155	Transgender <i>n</i> =2	Total	Percentage
Freshman	7	46	-	53	26%
Sophomore	4	31	1	36	18%
Junior	14	36	1	51	25%
Senior	7	39	-	46	24%
Other	0	3	-	3	1%
Did Not Report	10	2	-	12	6%
Total	42	157	2	201	100%

The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE)

The instrument used in this study was the Scale for Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE), designed and tested by Wang, Davidson, Yakushoko, Bielstein Savoy, Tan, and Bleier (2003). The SEE is a 31-item questionnaire, and the first empirical measure to provide support for the “theoretical construct of empathy in multicultural settings” (p. 231). This instrument is comprised of four subscales: Empathetic Feeling and Expression, Empathetic Perspective Taking, Acceptance of Cultural Differences, Empathetic Awareness. In developing the instrument, Wang et al. (2003) found high internal consistency and test-retest reliability for the scale and its subscales. All 31 responses were measured on a 6-point Likert scale; strongly disagree, moderately disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, moderately agree, strongly agree. Ethnocultural empathy scores were computed for each of the four representative subscales by averaging the items corresponding to each one. The next section reports the findings for each of the study’s four research questions.

Research Questions

Research Question #1. Do students with higher service hours, 10 or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have less than 10 hours of service?

Number of Hours Served

The first research question focused on examining whether students who served 10 hours or more had more ethnocultural empathy than students who served fewer than 10 hours. To test if students who served 10 hours or more would have overall higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who

served less than 10 hours, a *t*-test was conducted. Those who served 10 hours were compared to those who served fewer than 10 hours with each of the four subscales of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE): Empathetic Feeling and Expression, Empathetic Perspective Taking, Acceptance of Cultural Differences, Empathetic Awareness. The independent variable was length of service (i.e., fewer than 10 hours, greater than 10 hours), and the dependent variables were the four ethnocultural empathy subscales. All significant values are reported at $p < .05$. One significant difference was identified. Students who served greater than 10 hours ($M=5.1$, $SD = .747$) reported more Acceptance of Cultural Differences than students who served fewer than 10 hours ($M=4.85$, $SD = .834$), $t(199) = 2.54$, $p = .012$.

Students who served fewer than 10 hours and greater than 10 hours did not differ significantly in their reported Empathetic Feeling and Expression, $t(199) = .893$, $p = .372$; Empathetic Perspective Taking, $t(199) = .611$, $p = .541$; or Empathetic Awareness, $t(199) = .971$, $p = .333$. Table 6 reports the results relative to ethnocultural empathy of those serving more or less than 10 hours.

Table 6

Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Serving Fewer or Greater than 10 Hours						
SEE Subscale	Fewer than 10 hours ($n = 78$)		Greater than 10 hours ($n = 123$)		$t(199)$	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Empathetic Feeling and Expression	4.62	.738	4.71	.696	.893	.372
Empathetic Perspective Taking	3.35	.928	3.43	.939	.611	.541
Acceptance of Cultural Differences	4.85	.834	5.14	.747	2.54	.012
Empathetic Awareness	4.98	.761	5.05	.756	.971	.333

Research Question #2. To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?

Working With Adult Populations

The second research question examined how students who worked with underserved adult populations (individuals ages 21 - 59 who receive goods or services from a service agency) differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with this population. To test if students who served with adult populations would have higher ethnocultural empathy scores, a *t*-test was conducted to examine this inquiry.

The independent variable was clientele (i.e., serving with underserved adult populations, serving with all other populations), and the dependent variables were the four ethnocultural subscales. No significant difference was identified between those who worked with underserved adult populations ($M = 4.72$, $SD = .663$) and those who worked closely with other populations ($M = 4.65$, $SD = .753$) in their reported Empathetic Feeling and Expression, $t(198) = .697$, $p = .487$. Additionally, no significant difference was identified between those who served with underserved adult populations ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .886$) and those who worked closely with other populations, ($M = 3.36$, $SD = .977$) in their reported Empathetic Perspective Taking, $t(198) = .769$, $p = .442$. In their reported Acceptance of Cultural Differences $t(198) = 1.49$, $p = .129$, no significant difference was identified between those who served with underserved adult populations ($M = 5.11$, $SD = .721$) and those who worked closely with other populations ($M = 4.97$, $SD = .860$). Finally, no significant difference was identified between students who served with underserved adult populations ($M = 5.13$, $SD = .669$) and students who worked with other populations ($M = 4.97$, $SD = .832$) in their reported Empathetic Awareness, $t(198) = 1.54$, $p = .124$. Table 7 reports the results relative to ethnocultural empathy of those who served with underserved adult population versus other populations.

Table 7

Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Who Serve with Underserved Adult Populations and Those Serving Other Populations

SEE Subscale	Underserved Adult Population (<i>n</i> = 106)		Other Populations (<i>n</i> = 94)		<i>t</i> (198)	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Empathetic Feeling and Expression	4.72	.663	4.65	.753	.697	.487
Empathetic Perspective Taking	3.46	.886	3.36	.977	.769	.442
Acceptance of Cultural Differences	5.11	.721	4.97	.860	1.49	.129
Empathetic Awareness	5.13	.669	4.97	.832	1.54	.124

Note: For Research Question #2 one participant did not respond therefore the *n* = 200 vs. 201.

Research Question #3. Do students who serve as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?

Course Requirement

The third research question explored if students who served as part of a course requirement had higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time. To test this research question, a *t*-test was conducted. The independent variable was whether service was required or not (i.e., required for a course, serving on their own time through CSC or other), and the dependent variables were the four ethnocultural subscales.

No significant difference was identified between those who reported having no course requirement to serve in the community ($M = 4.68$, $SD = .647$) and those who reported being required to serve in the community for a course ($M = 4.71$, $SD = .714$) in their reported Empathetic Feeling and Expression $t(184) = 2.68$, $p = .789$. No significant difference was identified between those who reported having no course requirement to serve in the community ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .986$) and those who reported being required to serve in the community for a course requirement ($M = 3.38$, $SD = .895$) in their reported

Empathetic Perspective Taking, $t(184) = 1.18, p = .235$. There was also no significant difference identified between those who reported having no course requirement to serve in the community ($M = 5.10, SD = .670$) and those who reported being required to serve in the community for a course requirement ($M = 5.02, SD = .813$) in their reported Acceptance of Cultural Differences $t(184) = .587, p = .558$. Lastly, no significant difference was identified in their reported Empathetic Awareness, $t(184) = 1.26, p = .206$, between those who reported having no course requirement to serve in the community ($M = 4.92, SD = .746$) and those who reported being required to serve in the community for a course requirement ($M = 5.08, SD = .703$). Table 8 reports the results relative to those who served as part of a course requirement versus serving of their own volition.

Table 8

Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Those Serving Due to a Course Requirement and Those Choosing to Serve on Their Own

SEE Subscale	Not Required for a Course ($n = 44$)		Required for a Course ($n = 142$)		$t(184)$	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Empathetic Feeling and Expression	4.68	.647	4.71	.714	.268	.789
Empathetic Perspective Taking	3.57	.986	3.38	.895	1.18	.235
Acceptance of Cultural Differences	5.10	.670	5.02	.813	.587	.558
Empathetic Awareness	4.92	.746	5.08	.730	1.26	.206

Note: For Research Question #3 fifteen participants did not respond therefore the $n = 186$ vs. 201.

Research Question #4. Do female students who serve with underserved populations have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than male students who serve with underserved populations?

Gender

The fourth and final research question explored if female students who served with underserved populations (any aged individual receiving goods and/or services of a particular service agency) had

higher ethnocultural empathy scores than male students who served with underserved populations. To test this research question, a *t*-test was conducted. Though the previous analyses were computed using the entire sample, this analysis only included those participants who worked with underserved populations. The independent variable was gender (i.e., male or female), and the dependent variables were the four ethnocultural empathy subscales. Two significant differences were identified. Female students, who served with underserved populations ($n = 88$, $M = 4.78$, $SD = .616$) reported more Empathetic Feeling and Expression than male students, who served with underserved populations ($n = 16$, $M = 4.32$, $SD = .764$), $t(102) = 2.59$, $p = .011$. Females who worked with underserved populations also reported more Empathetic Awareness ($M = 5.17$, $SD = .644$), than male students who worked with underserved populations ($M = 4.81$, $SD = .727$), $t(102) = 2.03$, $p = .044$. Female and male students who served with underserved populations did not report statistically significant differences in Empathetic Perspective Taking, $t(102) = .696$, $p = .488$ or Acceptance of Cultural Differences, $t(102) = 1.96$, $p = .052$. Table 9 reports the ethnocultural empathy scores of the 88 females versus the 16 males who serve with underserved adult populations.

Table 9

Ethnocultural Empathy Scores of Females Serving Underserved Adult Populations						
SEE Subscale	Males ($n = 16$)		Females ($n = 88$)		$t(102)$	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Empathetic Feeling and Expression	4.32	.764	4.78	.616	2.59	.011
Empathetic Perspective Taking	3.59	.987	3.42	.872	.696	.488
Acceptance of Cultural Differences	4.78	.936	5.16	.667	1.96	.052
Empathetic Awareness	4.81	.727	5.17	.644	2.03	.044

Note: For Research Question #4 ninety-seven participants did not respond therefore the $n = 104$ vs. 201.

Summary

The researcher concluded that there were significant differences in the findings for the first research question, students who served 10 or more hours reported more Acceptance of Cultural Differences than students who served fewer than 10 hours. Statistically significant findings also existed for the fourth research question, where females showed greater Empathetic Awareness and Empathetic Feeling and Expression than males. For the second and third research questions there were no statistically significant differences in the findings. The next chapter will include a short summary of this study, as well as conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

How prepared are students to enter a rapidly diversifying work place, community and world? Are students learning and developing cultural empathy in college and if so, where are they developing this kind of learning? The purpose of this quantitative study was to further explore the impact of experiential learning and ethnocultural empathy in undergraduate students.

To address this inquiry, the following research questions were analyzed and discussed:

1. Do students with a greater number of service hours, 10 hours or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have fewer than 10 hours of service?
2. To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?
3. Do students who participate in service learning as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?
4. Do female students who serve with underserved populations have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than male students who serve with underserved populations?

In order to explore and examine the questions posed in this study, the researcher developed an electronic self-report survey utilizing The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (Wang et al., 2003) to explore the empathy scores of students who participated in various forms of service learning.

Post-data collection, the mean scores for research question one, students who served 10 hours or more and those who served fewer than 10 hours, were compared with each of the four subscales of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE): Empathetic Feeling and Expression, Empathetic Perspective Taking, Acceptance of Cultural Differences, Empathetic Awareness, by running a *t*-test in SPSS. The researcher analyzed the results for research question two by conducting a *t*-test in SPSS to compare the four SEE subscales with students who served primarily with adult populations and students who served with all other types of populations. The researcher also performed data analysis to answer research question three conducting a *t*-test in SPSS to compare students who were required to serve as part of a class and students who served on their own to the four SEE subscales. Finally, a *t*-test in SPSS was

conducted to answer research question four, where the mean scores of male and female students were compared to the four SEE subscales. Based on recommendations of the committee, the researcher identified the frequencies of respondents based on gender for survey questions forty-four and forty-five which asked about involvement with service prior to college and level of comfort serving with those ethnically or racially different than them prior to college.

The researcher concluded that there were significant differences in the findings for research question one; students who served 10 or more hours reported more Acceptance of Cultural Differences than students who served fewer than 10 hours. Statistically significant findings also existed for research question four, where female students showed greater Empathetic Awareness and Empathetic Feeling and Expression than male students. For research questions two and three there were no statistically significant differences in the findings.

Conclusions

The first research question of this study asked, "Do students with higher service hours, 10 or more, have more ethnocultural empathy than students who have less than 10 hours of service?" The researcher found statistically significant results where students who served 10 hours or more had higher empathy scores in the SEE subscale Acceptance of Cultural Differences than those who served fewer than 10 hours. There is more likely acceptance of cultural differences the more time students spend serving in the community. Based on the findings in this study, it could be recommended that a minimum of 10 hours is required for students to serve in the community to increase the level of acceptance students have toward cultural difference, as students who served 10 hours or more showed significant results in the data. However, it is unclear how many hours students should serve to also show statistically significant results in the three other subscales: Empathetic Feeling and Expression, Empathetic Perspective Taking, and Empathetic Awareness.

The second research question posed in this study asked, "To what extent do students who have exposure to underserved adult populations in their service differ in their ethnocultural empathy scores than students who do not serve with underserved adult populations?" Statistically significant results were not found for this research question. Based on the findings in this study, it can be concluded that the type of population students serve does not necessarily impact their ethnocultural empathy development. The

results of this study would indicate that working with adult populations does not have a significant impact on ethnocultural empathy development compared to working with children, young adults, animals or doing physical labor. Experiential learning and empathy development may not be contingent upon a specific type of service in the community or population that is served.

The third research question of this study asked, “Do students who serve as part of a course requirement have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than students who serve on their own time?” Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that service in the community that is tied to a class requirement does not necessarily impact ethnocultural empathy development in students.

The fourth research question asked, “Do female students who serve with underserved populations have higher ethnocultural empathy scores than male students who serve with underserved populations?” Based on the findings of this study, female students are more empathetic than male students.

Based on this study’s results two overall conclusions can be made: 1) students who spend more time serving in the community are more likely to develop ethnocultural empathy, 2) female students are more likely to serve in the community and have more ethnocultural empathy than male students.

Discussion

At the start of this research, the researcher set out to investigate how and if college students at a small, private, religiously affiliated, liberal arts institutions in the upper Midwest are developing ethnocultural empathy.

After analyzing the data, it became clear to the researcher that students at this institution are developing ethnocultural empathy in some ways, however, there are also modifications instructors at the institution can consider to continue to develop ethnocultural empathy in students. In research question one, statistically significant results were reported for The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) subscale Acceptance of Cultural Differences for students who served 10 or more hours. This finding supports the literature which says students who participate in service learning demonstrate higher empathy scores than other students (Lundy, 2007). Additionally, Wilson (2011) observed students creating an emotional bond with individuals they were serving with. Wilson posited that it is this emotional connection that directly influences empathy development. Students who spend more time (10 hours or more) with

individuals they serve with are more likely to build an emotional bond with the individual they are serving. The more students learn about and connect with someone who is different than them, the more likely any previously held misconceptions, stereotypes or judgements toward cultures other than their own can be broken down. Learning someone else's story and background through interactions while serving in the community can be powerful in helping to shift the worldview and lens of cultural/ ethnic understanding of the student who is participating in the service. This kind of interaction and learning may also be carried back to the classroom with the student.

Research question two examined the type of population students served with. Based on the findings of this study there was no statistical significance whether students served with underserved adult populations (for the purpose of this study, individuals ages 21-59) or any other population including, children, individuals over the age of 59, animals or providing manual labor. The results of this research contradict Wilson's (2011) findings where students connected with individuals they served in the community, forming an emotional bond. The emotional bond is suggested to be directly related to empathy development. According to the findings in this study, it made no difference for students to serve with adults, children, people over the age of 59, animals, or providing manual labor for an organization. This causes the researcher to question if an emotional bond was formed between students in this study and those they served in the community. The researcher believed that creating an emotional connection with an adult from an underserved population would encourage ethnocultural empathy development in the student. As the data from this study shows, students were not significantly impacted based on the type of population they served.

It is important for faculty and staff at the institution where this survey was distributed to consider the current developmental level and prior experiences students in their classes hold and then consider the population with which their students will be serving. Svensson and Wihloborg (2010) discussed the importance of learner context for students participating in service learning. Learner context includes "the learner's prior experience, attitudes, expectations and capabilities" (p. 610). Considering learner context could potentially help students be better prepared to interact with a population of people who may or may not be culturally or ethnically different than themselves. It is worth noting that the demographics for the larger community reflect the same demographics of students who responded to the survey. According to the U.S. Census Bureau in 2010, 90% of individuals living in the community where the survey was issued

identified as Caucasian, and 92% of survey participants identified as Caucasian. These demographics, in conjunction with the findings, from the study cause the researcher to question how “culture shock” or lack thereof, plays a role in ethnocultural empathy development.

Students who serve with others who are ethnically different than themselves, may experience a “culture shock”, especially if they have not spent a lot of time with people of a different ethnicity. The ethnic demographic break down of study participants (92% Caucasian), is reflective of the ethnic demographic breakdown of the larger community (90%; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Students are likely interacting with people who look like them and are not viewing those individuals they are serving in the community as ethnically different. This could result in students not experiencing as much of a “culture shock” as they may get by serving those who were ethnically different. While a student may serve an individual from a lower socio-economic status than the student is from, the student may not immediately recognize this as a difference or understand how socio-economic status can impact culture. The inability to see others as ethnically different or recognize diversity as more than race or ethnicity, may prevent students from gaining ethnocultural empathy. Instructors of the course or service organization could focus on helping students to understand diversity beyond race/ethnicity prior to students participating in serving in the community.

Dewey (1938), Kolb (1984), Merriam and Cafarella (1991) all view experience as a factor that impacts the perspective of the learner. Students who served individuals in the community did not have an experience where they viewed those they served as ethnically or culturally different than themselves. If the experience a student has outside of the classroom reflects a similar ethnic demographic they are surrounded by on a daily basis, students may be less likely to make meaning from the experience. On the other hand, Piaget (1952) theorized that a person’s intelligence is a product of experience over time. It is important to consider that the amount of time a student participates in service in the community in one semester is not the only factor to contribute to student learning and development. While the findings of this study show that serving 10 hours or more in the community supports ethnocultural empathy development, is 10 hours of experience really enough make a transformation in a person’s life?

Ethnic and cultural awareness is important for students, especially given the stories and heated conversations in the news and in our society today about race. It is important to continue to help students at a Primarily White Institution (PWI) learn about races and ethnicities other than their own and the

complex intersections of identity. Predominantly White Institutions are defined as an institution of higher education where 50% or more of the student enrollment is white and or the institution is considered historically white (Brown & Dancy, 2010). Additionally, it is crucial that educators in higher education continue to consider learner context when designing curriculum or considering pedagogy. Working with a predominately white student population, at a PWI in the upper Midwest, it is important to learn details about the previous experiences (context) of the students who will be going to serve ethnically diverse individuals in the community. Focusing on learner context (Svensson & Wihloborg, 2010) better prepares students to interact with those who are different, but it should also inform the instructors understanding of students' current developmental level and understanding of concepts of the course/Campus Service Commission. Understanding learner context will also allow instructors to better teach complex concepts like racial identity development and identity intersections as well as better explore and expand concepts of diversity to help students see diversity beyond race/ethnicity. Grasping these concepts is an important part of ethnic and cultural awareness.

Research question three explored if empathy scores would differ based on the individual motivation of the student to serve in the community or if the student was required to serve for a course. Based on the results in this study, there were no statistically significant results regarding empathy development when service learning is required for a course versus when a student seeks out opportunities to serve in the community on their own. This causes the researcher to question the construction of the curriculum for courses that require service learning, as well as: the influence of the type of service that is required in the course, the population students are asked to serve, and the number of hours the student is required to serve.

Philipsen (2003) stated that service learning is one pedagogical approach to help in preparing students to work in a multicultural world. Philipsen goes on to suggest if service learning is implemented well, there is potential for students' to learn about themselves and the world through their experience. How are the learning goals of a course or Campus Service Commission, measured, and how is the curriculum assessed? Kiley (2005) questioned the traditional approaches to assessment (mainly the use of student personal reflection) as the best way to measure learning outcomes and curriculum goals. Based on this study, findings for students who served in the community as part of a class do not support Philipsen's statements and may support Kiley's ideas and call to expand how service learning is

assessed. Examples of different types of assessment to measure learning outcomes for service learning could be: pre and post-tests measuring attitude and/or level of comfort regarding topics associated with the service learning experience, administering The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy as a pre and post-test for students to measure change in levels of ethnocultural empathy, building a portfolio demonstrating what they learned from their service experience by providing artifacts. It is also important to acknowledge, as previously mentioned discussing research question two, that not all learning and development is achievable in one semester. Additionally changing the way learning outcomes are measured may require instructors to deeply consider what they are measuring and desiring students to demonstrate as a result of their service learning experience, as not all students may demonstrate personal development occurred.

The researcher also wonders how content and information is delivered in the classroom and in the campus organization, Campus Service Commission. Mahoney and Schamber (2004) identified instructional technique as an important component that impacts learning, specifically the need to shift from a curriculum that focuses primarily on the comprehension of information and instead focuses on analysis and evaluation. According to Mahoney and Schamber, shifting instructional technique to support analysis and evaluation evoked a change in perception of the value in intercultural communication exchanges. Instruction that regularly assesses for analysis of content, rather than comprehension of content is an example of an effective instructional technique. Svensson and Wihloberg (2010) discussed the need for a shift in curriculum design and call for more instruction and evaluation to help students make meaning in understanding a different experience outside of their own view.

As educational leaders, we must be reflective practitioners and researchers to ensure we make necessary changes to pedagogy and curriculum to meet the learning and developmental needs of our students and learning goals of our institution. It is written into the mission statement of the institution where this study was conducted that students will be prepared to “influence the affairs of the world. . .”. Educators and administrators must also be globally aware and versed in pedagogy that will help students be ready to live out this mission. Additionally, faculty and staff must continue to reflect on ways to make service learning meaningful to students. This could include highlighting the importance of cultural competence desired by employers, creating a marketing campaign to recruit more students to participate in service learning, and modifying the first-year student curriculum to send first-year students into the community early in their college careers to establish a foundation and enjoyment of service.

The fourth and final research question focused on differences between genders. Female students showed statistically significant results for two of four SEE subscales, Empathetic Feeling and Expression ($p = .011$) and Empathetic Awareness ($p = .044$), and showed data nearing significance for a third subscale ($p = .052$). If the sample would have been larger, it is possible this additional subscale would have been statistically significant. Female students also showed a higher involvement level prior to coming to college (65% indicated they were highly involved or involved) than male students (52% of male participants indicated they were highly involved or involved). Additionally, there is a larger percentage of male students who reported being very uncomfortable or somewhat uncomfortable (31%) than female students (27%). The results for this research question caused the researcher to consider how or if the current institutional system, and curriculum impacts females differently than males. Additionally, the researcher wonders if female students synthesize outside of the classroom experiences differently than males. Several questions arose for the researcher: How can educators encourage empathy development in male students? Is the pedagogical approach and curriculum design, which is primarily focused on reflection, best suited to help males learn and make meaning from their experiences? Would requiring projects such as building a portfolio based on their experience and providing recommendations for improvement for the program or service they spend time with allow male students to empathize with the clientele the organization serves? Would creating a business plan for their own non-profit service organization force male students to think outside of the box regarding the needs of their clientele? If there were a different pedagogical approach to service learning, would males have higher ethnocultural empathy scores? For example, could requiring students to research the history of the organization they are working with and conduct interviews with members of the staff there create an impact on male students? According to Cruce and Moore (2011) females have a greater propensity to serve in the community during their first year of college. More female students were involved with service prior to coming to college. How can we recruit male students to participate early on in their college careers or even their high school careers? A slightly higher percentage of male students indicated higher levels of discomfort serving with individuals of a different race/ethnicity prior to coming to college than female students. If males are not getting involved until later in their college career, is it impacting their empathy development or are male students coming to college with less empathy and cultural understanding than female students?

Many factors go into learning. It is not the sole responsibility of faculty or staff members at an institution of higher education to force a student to learn or make meaning from their experiences, but it is important that faculty and staff are aware of best practices to maximize learning opportunities.

Transformative learning, where a personal psychological change occurs (Mezirow, 2000), does not necessarily take place during, or as a result of service learning. Learning and empathy development are life long, on-going, ever changing parts of a person's development. Similar to Bennett's Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, ethnocultural empathy is a learned ability and a personal trait that can be developed over time. As people continue to move toward a dynamic changing ethnic population, current and future generations of students will need to be equipped with skills to continue to support their own personal development and awareness of cultural differences.

Recommendations

Based on the researcher's review of literature, there has been limited research and investigation around the topics of service learning and empathy development in college students. This study can act as a catalyst for future research on college student empathy development and service learning at small, private, religiously affiliated colleges in the Mid-West.

Additional research studies at this institution focusing on ethnocultural empathy development and service learning may provide information to inform curriculum design, pedagogical style and educational philosophies. It could also act as a catalyst to build relationships and collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs. This study could also be adjusted to learn more about male student empathy development and service involvement, as well as current pedagogical approaches to service-learning and curriculum design. Additionally, this study could also be adapted to be a mixed-method study, incorporating qualitative data collection. Interviews or focus groups with students would provide more detailed insight into how they feel their service learning experience impacted them. Lastly, results of this study can be presented to colleagues at the institution who require service learning as part of their course requirement, who focus on civic engagement, or who have an interest in the cultural empathy students at the institution have toward those who are ethnically different than themselves.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 518-529.
- Astin, W. A., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.
- Bamber, P., & Hankin, L. (2011). Transformative learning through service-learning: No passport required. *Education & Training, 53*(2), 190-206.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00400911111115726>
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards Ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.). *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Berg, C. A., Strough, J., Calderone, K. S., Sansone, C., & Weir, C. (1998). The role of problem solving in understanding age and context effects on strategies for solving everyday problems. *Psychology and Aging, 13*(1), 22-44.
- Brown, C., M. II, & Dancy, T. II. (2010). Predominantly white institutions. In K. Lometey (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of African American education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. 524-527. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978141297166.n193>
- Bushnell, E. J. (2012). Looking forward: New challenges and opportunities. *New Directions for Student Services, 138*. doi: 10.1002/ss.20008
- Closson, R. (2013). Racial and cultural factors and learning transfer. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 137*. Doi:10.1002/ace.20045
- Cooks, L., Scharrer, E., & Paredes, M. C. (2004). Toward a social approach in learning in community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 44*-56.
- Cruce, T. M., & Moore III, J. V. (2012). Community service during the first year of college: What is the role of past behavior? *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(3), 399-417.
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2012). Exploring an experiential learning project through kolb's learning theory using a qualitative research method. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 37*(2), 405-415. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10/1080/03043797.2012.706596>
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.

- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*(4), 708-724.
- Hehman, J. A., & Bugental, D. B. (2013). "Life stage-specific": variations in performance in response to age stereotypes. *Developmental Psychology* *49*(7), 1296-1406. doi: 10.1037/a0029559
- Ishiyama, J., & Breuning, M. (2006). How international are undergraduate political science programs at liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities in the Midwest? *Political Science and Politics*, *39*(2), 327-333.
- Kiley, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5-22.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lundy, B. L. (2007). Service learning in life-span developmental psychology: Higher exam scores and increased empathy. *Teaching of Psychology*, *34*(1), 23-27.
- Mahoney, S. L., & Schamber, J. F. (2004). Exploring the application of a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity to a general education curriculum on diversity. *The Journal of General Education* *53*(3), 311-334. DOI 10.1353/jge.2005.0007
- Merriam, S. B., Cafarella, R. S. (1991). *Learning in adulthood*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., Cafarella, R. S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates, *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. (pp. 3-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Philipsen, M. I. (2003). Race, the college classroom, and service learning: A practitioner's tale. *Journal of Negro Education*, *73*(2), 230-240.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York: International Universities Press.

- Roberts, W., Strayer, J., & Denham, S. (2014). Empathy, anger, guilt: emotions and prosocial behavior. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035057>
- Svensson, L., & Wihlbom, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: the need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education, 60*(6), 595-613.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *State and country quickfacts*. Retrieved from: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/38/3825700.html>
- Vanderbilt, A. A., Isringhausen, K. T., VanderWielen, L. M., Wright, M. S., Slashcheva, B., & Madden, M. A. (2013). Health disparities among highly vulnerable populations in the United States: a call to action for medical and oral health care. *Med Educ Online*.
- Vincent, G. V., & Velkoff, V. A. (2010). The next four decades the older population in the United States 2010 to 2050: Population estimates and projections. *U.S. Census Bureau*.
- Wang, Y., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(2), 221-234.
- Wilson, J. C. (2011). Service-learning and the development of empathy in US college students. *Education + Training, 53*(2), 207-217. doi: 10.1108/00400911111115735

APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT SCALE OF ETHNOCULTURAL EMPATHY

Wang et al.

This survey is designed to measure people's empathy toward individuals who are ethnically different than themselves. There are no right or wrong answers. Think about your experiences serving the Fargo-Moorhead community. Please answer each question based on the likert scale listed. Do your best to answer honestly. Do not linger on each question, answer based on your initial reaction to the question.

This survey is voluntary and you can quit the survey at any time. By completing the survey participants will be entered for a chance to win a \$50 gift card to Target. Submission for the gift card will not attach your name to your survey results.

When you have completed the survey click "submit" after question 44. You will be taken to a separate screen at which time you may enter your name to win a \$50 gift card to Target.

Please respond to each item using the following scales:

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

Q1. I feel annoyed when people do not speak standard English.

Q2. I don't know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.

Q3. I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own.

Q4. I know what it feels like to be the only person of a certain race or ethnicity in a group of people.

Q5. I get impatient when communicating with people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, regardless of how well they speak English.

Q6. I can related to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.

Q7. I am aware of institutional barriers (e.g., restricted opportunities for job promotion) that discriminate against racial or ethnic groups other than my own.

Q8. I don't understand why people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds enjoy wearing traditional clothing.

- Q9. I seek opportunities to speak with individuals of other racial or ethnic backgrounds about their experiences.
- Q10. I feel irritated when people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds speak their language around me.
- Q11. When I know my friends are treated unfairly because of their racial or ethnic backgrounds, I speak up for them.
- Q12. I share the anger of those who face injustice because of their racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- Q13. When I interact with people from other racial and ethnic backgrounds, I show my appreciation of their cultural norms.
- Q14. I feel supportive of people of other racial and ethnic groups, if I think they are being taken advantage of.
- Q15. I get disturbed when other people experience misfortunes due to their racial or ethnic background.
- Q16. I rarely think about the impact of a racist or ethnic joke or the feelings of people who are targeted.
- Q17. I am not likely to participate in events that promote equal rights for people of all racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- Q18. I express my concern about discrimination to people from other racial or ethnic groups.
- Q19. 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.
- Q20. I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society.
- Q21. I don't care if people make racist statements against other racial or ethnic groups.
- Q22. When I see people who come from a different racial or ethnic background succeed in the public arena, I share their pride.
- Q23. When other people struggle with racial or ethnic oppression, I share their frustration.
- Q24. I recognize that the media often portrays people based on racial or ethnic stereotypes.
- Q25. I am aware of how society differentially treats racial or ethnic groups other than my own.
- Q26. I share the anger of people who are victims of hate crimes (e.g., intentional violence because of race or ethnicity).
- Q27. I do not understand why people want to keep their indigenous racial or ethnic cultural traditions instead of trying to fit into the mainstream.

Q28. It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.

Q29. I feel uncomfortable when I am around a significant number of people who are racially/ethnically different than me.

Q30. 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.

Q31. 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.

Please respond to the following demographic questions:

Q32. With which gender do you most closely identify?

- Male
- Female
- Other: _____

Q33. Since the time you have arrived as a **new student** to Concordia, approximately how many hours total have you spent serving the community off-campus? (*Answer based on time you serve during the academic year. DO NOT include summer service involvement*)

- Less than 2 hours
- At least 2 hrs. but less than 6 hrs.
- At least 6 hrs. but less than 10 hrs.
- At least 10 hrs. but less than 14 hrs.
- At least 14 hrs. but less than 18 hrs.
- At least 18 hrs. but less than 22 hrs.
- At least 22 hrs. but less than 26 hrs.
- More than 26 hrs.

Q34. Since August 2014, when you arrived to Concordia for **this** academic year, how many hours **total** have you spent serving the community off-campus? Round to the nearest hour.

- Less than 2 hours
- At least 2 hrs. but less than 6 hrs.

- At least 6 hrs. but less than 10 hrs.
- At least 10 hrs. but less than 14 hrs.
- At least 14 hrs. but less than 18 hrs.
- At least 18 hrs. but less than 22 hrs.
- At least 22 hrs. but less than 26 hrs.
- More than 26 hrs.

Q35. Choose one of the following populations have you spent the *most* time working with based on your response to question 34?

- When I serve, I do more manual labor (stock boxes, food shelves, fold clothing, sort items, shovel, etc.)
- I serve primarily with animals
- I work directly with clientele (people who receive goods/services from the place you serve)
- I work directly with people who manage, organize or work with the place I serve.

Q36. Choose one of the following age groups you spent the *most* time working with based on your response to question 34.

- Children (ages infant-12 years old)
- Adolescents (ages 12-18)
- Young Adults (19-24)
- Adults (ages 25-58)
- Older Adults (59 years and older)
- I didn't work directly with people

Q37. Based on your response to question 35, approximately how many hours have you spent serving this population since August 2014?

- Less than 2 hours
- At least 2 hrs. but less than 6 hrs.
- At least 6 hrs. but less than 10 hrs.
- At least 10 hrs. but less than 14 hrs.
- At least 14 hrs. but less than 18 hrs.

- At least 18 hrs. but less than 22 hrs.
- At least 22 hrs. but less than 26 hrs.
- More than 26 hrs.

Q38. Based on your response to question 36 regarding population, which agency, location or provider do you primarily serve with?

- Church or religiously affiliated organization
- Food Pantry/ Providing Meals
- Animal Rescue/ Shelter
- Care giving
- Companionship
- Other: _____

Q39. What year were you born?:

- 1998
- 1997
- 1996
- 1995
- 1994
- 1993
- 1992
- 1991 or prior

Q40. What is your anticipated college graduation year?

- May 2015
- Dec 2015
- May 2016
- Dec 2016
- May 2017
- Dec 2017
- May 2018

- Dec 2018
- May 2019
- Other: (fill in)

Q41. Are you a transfer student? Y or N

Q42. I spend time serving off campus in the community because:

- My course(s) require service hours
- I became involved with Campus Service Commission (CSC)
- Both, through involvement with CSC and course requirements

Q 43. Choose all that apply. I most closely identify my race/ ethnicity as:

- Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
- Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
- Latino or Hispanic American
- East Asian or Asian American
- South Asian or Indian American
- Middle Easter or Arab American
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Other: (write in)

Q44. How involved were you with service prior to coming to Concordia?

- Highly involved
- Involved
- Somewhat Involved
- Not Involved

Q 45. Prior to coming to college, how comfortable were you serving (or volunteering) with people of a different race/ ethnicity than you?

- Very uncomfortable
- Somewhat uncomfortable
- Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable
- Somewhat comfortable

Very comfortable

Thank you for your time participating in this survey. If you would like to submit the survey without entering to win a \$50 Target gift card, [click here to submit](#):

To be entered to win a \$50 gift card to Target, enter your name below. By entering your name here, all previous questions remain anonymous.

First and Last Name:

Email:

APPENDIX B. IRB APPROVAL



February 25, 2015

Dr. Thomas Hall
Educational Leadership

Re: IRB Certification of Exempt Human Subjects Research:
Protocol #HE15185 , "Service Learning and Ethnocultural Empathy: Developing Cultural Empathy Through Experience"

Co-investigator(s) and research team: Amanda Pieters

Certification Date: 2/25/15 Expiration Date: 2/24/18
Study site(s): Concordia College
Sponsor: n/a

The above referenced human subjects research project has been certified as exempt (category # 2) in accordance with federal regulations (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects). This determination is based on the original protocol with revised consent screen (received 2/25/15).

Please also note the following:

- If you wish to continue the research after the expiration, submit a request for recertification several weeks prior to the expiration.
- The study must be conducted as described in the approved protocol. Changes to this protocol must be approved prior to initiating, unless the changes are necessary to eliminate an immediate hazard to subjects.
- Notify the IRB promptly of any adverse events, complaints, or unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others related to this project.
- Report any significant new findings that may affect the risks and benefits to the participants and the IRB.

Research records may be subject to a random or directed audit at any time to verify compliance with IRB standard operating procedures.

Thank you for your cooperation with NDSU IRB procedures. Best wishes for a successful study.

Sincerely,

Kristy Shirley

Digitally signed by Kristy Shirley
DN: cn=Kristy Shirley, o=NDSU,
ou=CIP,
email=kristy.shirley@ndsu.edu, c=US
Date: 2015.02.25 12:27:58 -0600

Kristy Shirley, CIP, Research Compliance Administrator

For more information regarding IRB Office submissions and guidelines, please consult www.ndsu.edu/irb. This Institution has an approved FederalWide Assurance with the Department of Health and Human Services: FWA00002439.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

NDSU Dept 4000 | PO Box 6050 | Fargo ND 58108-6050 | 701.231.8995 | Fax 701.231.8098 | ndsu.edu/irb

Shipping address: Research 1, 1735 NDSU Research Park Drive, Fargo ND 58102

NDSU is an EO/AA university.

APPENDIX C. PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

Permission Request: Use of Ethnocultural Empathy Scale for Thesis Research

3 messages

Amanda Pieters <pietersaman1@gmail.com>
To: mdavidson2@unl.edu

Sat, Nov 22, 2014 at 3:14 PM

Dear Dr. Davidson,

My name is Amanda Pieters and I am a graduate student at North Dakota State University in the Educational Leadership Program. I am writing to request your permission to use The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) as the primary instrument to collect data for my thesis research.

My research interest for this study is to examine the ethnocultural empathy scores of undergraduate students who spend time volunteering in adult populations compared to undergraduate students who spend time volunteering with other populations.

If you have suggestions for other articles, resources or journals that are relevant to my topic, your recommendations would be greatly appreciated.

If you're interested, I am happy to send a copy of my findings to you.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Amanda Pieters

Director of Park Region Hall
Assistant Director of Orientation
Concordia College
Moorhead, MN 56562

M. Meghan Davidson <mdavidson2@unl.edu>
To: Amanda Pieters <pietersaman1@gmail.com>

Sun, Nov 23, 2014 at 2:36 PM

Hi Amanda,

You are welcome to use the SEE in your research. Best of luck!

Meghan

M. Meghan Davidson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Licensed Psychologist
Counseling Psychology Program
University of Nebraska – Lincoln
114 Teachers College Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0345
402-472-1482
mdavidson2@unl.edu

From: Amanda Pieters <pietersaman1@gmail.com>
Date: Saturday, November 22, 2014 at 3:14 PM
To: Meghan Davidson <mdavidson2@unl.edu>
Subject: Permission Request: Use of Ethnocultural Empathy Scale for Thesis Research
[Quoted text hidden]

Amanda Pieters <pietersaman1@gmail.com>
To: "M. Meghan Davidson" <mdavidson2@unl.edu>

Mon, Nov 24, 2014 at 10:29 AM

Wonderful news! Thanks Meghan!
Amanda
[Quoted text hidden]

--