

2009

Development of the Social Justice Orientation Scale

Benjamin R. Taylor
Taylor University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pillars.taylor.edu/mahe>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Taylor, Benjamin R., "Development of the Social Justice Orientation Scale" (2009). *Master of Arts in Higher Education Theses*. 1.
<https://pillars.taylor.edu/mahe/1>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses at Pillars at Taylor University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Arts in Higher Education Theses by an authorized administrator of Pillars at Taylor University. For more information, please contact pillars@taylor.edu.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL JUSTICE ORIENTATION SCALE

A thesis

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Department of Higher Education and Student Development

Taylor University

Upland, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Development

by

Benjamin R. Taylor

May 2009

© Benjamin R. Taylor 2009

**Higher Education and Student Development
Taylor University
Upland, Indiana**

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTERS THESIS

This is to certify that the Thesis of

Benjamin Robert Taylor

entitled

Development of the Social Justice Orientation Scale

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the
Master of Arts degree

in Higher Education and Student Development
May 2009

Scott Moeschberger, PhD. Date
Thesis Supervisor

Skip Trudeau, EdD. Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Randall Dodge, PhD. Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Tim Herrmann, PhD. Date
Director, M.A. in Higher Education and Student Development

ABSTRACT

Institutions that are interested in citizenship education are usually interested in Service-Learning. Additionally, those interested in Service-Learning are increasingly noting the importance of the specific learning objective: Social Justice. Few have undertaken a quantitative study of Social Justice Orientation as a learning outcome, and yet many have suggested it as a key outcome in Service-Learning experiences. This study seeks a more holistic understanding of Social Justice education with the expressed purpose of developing an instrument for the measurement of Social Justice Orientation as a Service-Learning outcome. Findings confirm our understanding that Service-Learning truly has the potential to elicit significant development toward such ends, but also suggest that measuring Social Justice Orientation may be more difficult than originally thought.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of folks to whom I am irrevocably indebted. A special thanks goes to my family who instilled in me the love of learning, and more importantly a concrete definition of love through words and action; to my significant other, the lovely Kerrie Schene, for her patience in unconditionally tolerating a full-time graduate student who has probably seemed like only a part-time boyfriend all too often; to Tim Herrmann for honestly believing in me far more than is even appropriate; to Jenny Collins for making the past two years absolutely formational for me as a professional and a person; to the students who participated in my study and the faculty who let me completely hijack their classes to hand out surveys; to the men of the Box, whose integrity, grace, and love have been inversely proportional to the size of our humble accommodations (but we love it so); to Cindi Carder for what I consider an “above and beyond the call of duty” helpfulness; to Scott Moeschberger for being flat-out brilliant; and to Caleb, Matt, Miriam, Polly, Sara, Emily, Heidi, Kyle, Nathan, Brent, Tammi, Laura, Derek, Katie, Barry, Travis, and Kelly for leaving me with absolutely no words that could articulate what they have meant to me, how they have literally made me into a better man than I was, and who they will be for the field of higher education and for the Kingdom of God. There is no other way to explain the blessings that all these people represent except for the fact that Jesus Christ has saved my life and made it into something entirely different and entirely better than I ever could have achieved, let alone imagined, on my own. I think perhaps “thankful” does not nearly cut it...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| PROBLEM STATEMENT..... | 1 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 3 |
| Service-Learning | 3 |
| Service-Learning and Social Justice | 5 |
| Construct Development of the SJOS..... | 9 |
| DISCUSSION OF METHODOLOGY..... | 12 |
| Initial Scale Development | 12 |
| Scale Administration | 13 |
| RESULTS | 15 |
| Demographics..... | 15 |
| Final Scale Development | 17 |
| Convergent Validity | 20 |
| Inferential Statistics..... | 22 |
| DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS | 27 |
| Social Justice Orientation Scale | 27 |
| Effects of Service-Learning on Social Justice Orientation | 29 |

Limitations31

Implications32

Conclusions34

REFERENCES36

APPENDIX A: SJOS 1.0.....41

APPENDIX B: SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITMENT SCALE.....44

APPENDIX C: SJOS 2.045

APPENDIX D: ITEMS DELETED FROM SJOS 2.047

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 Sample Demographics | 16 |
| Table 2 Factor Loadings | 19 |
| Table 3 Subscale Reliability | 20 |
| Table 4 Subscale Correlations | 21 |
| Table 5 Analysis of Covariance for SJC Change Scores | 21 |
| Table 6 Analysis of Covariance for Efficacy Change Scores | 22 |
| Table 7 Regression Analysis for Efficacy Pre-Test Variable | 23 |
| Table 8 Analysis of Covariance for Empathy Change Scores | 23 |
| Table 9 Regression Analysis for Empathy Pre-Test Variable | 24 |
| Table 10 Analysis of Covariance for Spirituality Change Scores | 24 |
| Table 11 T-test Results for Spirituality Change Score | 25 |
| Table 12 Regression Analysis for Spirituality Pre-Test Variable..... | 25 |
| Table 13 Change Score ANCOVA Results | 26 |

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT

As Service-Learning programs continue to become a more regular feature in higher education, institutions are more interested in assessing how such programs specifically contribute to student development and institutional mission (Vogelgeseng & Astin, 2000). Recently, institutions have grown more interested in addressing issues of Social Justice and fostering student commitment to service that will affect change along such lines.

At face value, Service-Learning seems a very sensible practice for bringing students to an orientation toward Social Justice, and many have suggested that there is a valuable area of overlap between Service-Learning and Social Justice education (Butin, 2007). Although there are a number of well-researched benefits and outcomes of Service-Learning, empirical research in assessing Social Justice Orientation as a Service-Learning outcome is scarce. Of particular note is the absence of quantitative assessment of Social Justice outcomes. This is most likely because there has been no effort to identify a holistic understanding of what it means for a student to be oriented toward the idea of Social Justice, and thus no instrument exists that can reliably assess development in this area.

This study seeks to contribute to a better understanding of Social Justice outcomes in higher education, particularly within the realm of Service-Learning. We will propose a holistic model of Social Justice Orientation, including its cognitive and affective constructs. This model will drive the development of a quantitative instrument intended to detect change in some of the necessary developmental outcomes that contribute to such an orientation. Specifically, this instrument will be designed to assess change that occurs as a result of a Service-Learning experience. As such, this instrument will be tested for validity and reliability within the context of an international Service-Learning program. Ideally, this instrument could be used in future assessment of Service-Learning programs and to quantify their contribution to the development of a Social Justice Orientation in students.

This study was chiefly concerned with the following research questions:

1. What constructs define a holistic conceptualization of Social Justice Orientation?
2. Is this a reliable and valid measure for Social Justice Orientation? Is it sensitive to change over the course of a 3-week Service-Learning field project? Does it show significant change in comparison to a 3-week on-campus control group?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Service-Learning

Involvement Theory

For decades, practitioners in higher education have understood student development in the context of what is known as *involvement theory* – that students benefit from and develop more as a result of time and energy spent in the academic experience (Astin, 1984). Student involvement is measured by “the quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest” (p. 528) in a given college experience.

In a rediscovery of one classic aspect of higher education, colleges and universities are now increasingly encouraging undergraduates to take part in some variety of volunteer service (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999). Volunteerism is a well-documented and well-verified mode of student involvement that is typically characterized as a rich, out-of-classroom development experience that, among other outcomes, provides lasting effects on students’ service involvement after graduation (Astin & Sax, 1998; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). However, institutions are becoming more

aware that “course-based” service tends to amplify involvement effects, particularly in the realm of “student-faculty interaction as well as the amount of time and energy that the students devote to the course” (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999, p.189). The discussion on *Service-Learning* begins at this point: where the worlds of scholarship and service meet.

Defining Service-Learning

Literature that attempts to normatively and functionally define Service-Learning typically identifies three necessary components. Service-Learning is participation in some form of community service that (a) is part of academic coursework (Vogelgeseng & Astin, 2000), (b) achieves balance between learning goals and service outcomes (Furco, 1996), and (c) involves intentional student reflection on the experience (Felton, Gilchrist, & Darby, 2006; Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004; Eyler, 2001).

These components serve to distinguish Service-Learning as an experience that goes beyond simple volunteer work. It is service that is designed to intentionally help students learn and to fit the institutional mission, leaving a lasting impact on those who participate.

Service-Learning Outcomes

There is well-established documentation of the numerous positive effects for students who participate in Service-Learning. Astin & Sax (1998) identify three generalized developmental outcomes in Service-Learning experience: academic development, civic responsibility, and life skills. Additionally, Eyler, Giles, & Gray (1999) offer a fairly thorough review of research in Service-Learning outcomes, identifying a number of more specific nuances to these main three categories, including

moral development, spiritual growth, cultural and racial understanding, social responsibility, and commitment to service.

Each of these specific outcomes has a relatively thorough body of literature exploring how they are affected by Service-Learning experiences. However, Butin (2007) has noted a lack of overlap between Service-Learning and what is known as “social justice education,” and calls for further exploration of how Service-Learning can find its way into the realm of Social Justice.

Service-Learning and Social Justice

Defining Social Justice Orientation

Before moving any further, it is important to attempt to define what we mean by *Social Justice*. Though there are several different ideas about just what this phrase means, we find the most helpful definition in Bell (1997), who states that:

... social justice is both a process and a goal. The goal of social justice is full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure... [It] involves social actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as a sense of social responsibility toward and with others, their society, and the broader world... The process for attaining [this]... should also be democratic and participatory, inclusive and affirming of human agency and human capacities for working collaboratively to create change (p. 1-2).

One's level of *Social Justice Orientation* could be described as the extent to which he or she is familiar with, sympathetic toward, and/or committed to the “process” and “goal” of Social Justice as mentioned above. Adams, Bell, and Griffin (1997) provide a framework they call “social justice education” that is designed to help people “understand and critically analyze multiple forms of oppression...” (p. xvii). This framework has become a foundational work for research in Social Justice within the realm of education.

In an important exploration of Social Justice learning, Mayhew and Fernandez (2007) focused specifically on different pedagogical approaches and how they foster environments fertile for Social Justice learning within higher education. They examined the effects of four different pedagogical approaches – collaboration with peers, opportunities for reflection, discussions about diversity, and negative interaction with diverse peers – upon “social justice learning.” Findings indicated that Social Justice learning contexts should be created such that students can be involved in “role-taking, reflection, community service, and dialogues with diverse peers” (p. 76). As already noted, it appears that a Service-Learning course would be an ideal context to provide such experiences as reflection (Felton, Gilchrist, & Darby, 2006; Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004; Eyer, 2001) and, of course, service experience (Furco, 1996). However, for Mayhew and Fernandez (2007), Social Justice outcomes were evaluated only on the basis of students’ general perceptions of how well they learned. Their findings are limited in assessing Social Justice as a learning outcome.

Social Justice Orientation As a Service-Learning Outcome

There have been several studies that have contributed to our understanding of Social Justice Orientation as a specific outcome for Service-Learning. Ottenritter (2004)

suggested that Service-Learning provided experiences that opened students' eyes to injustice and inequality, conjecturing that such experiences could foster a sense of Social Justice in participants. Although Butin (2007) has noted that there is untapped potential in collaborative efforts in "justice-learning" (the term he utilizes in describing the area of overlap between Social Justice education and Service-Learning), there are a few recent studies that have attempted to study Social Justice *specifically* within the context of Service-Learning. Wang and Rodgers (2006) quantitatively studied effects of Service-Learning specifically geared toward Social Justice education on college students' cognitive development, finding a significantly higher level of cognitive development in Social Justice oriented courses than in general Service-Learning courses. Mitchell's (2007) qualitative findings suggest that Service-Learning experiences help students reach a greater level of critical thought and commitment regarding Social Justice. A case study performed by Kiely (2004) found that "participation in an international Service-Learning program with an explicit Social Justice Orientation had a significant transformative impact on U.S. students' worldview and lifestyle" (p. 15).

Despite these findings in the qualitative literature, there are no studies that quantitatively explore Social Justice as a specific Service-Learning outcome. Studies have been either non-empirical (Butin, 2007; Ottenritter, 2004), qualitative case studies (Kiely, 2004; Mitchell, 2005), or not specific in measuring a student's development of a Social Justice Orientation as a *specific* outcome of Service-Learning (Astin & Sax, 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Gray, 1999; Mayhew and Fernandez, 2007; Wang & Rodgers, 2006).

This gap in the literature is perhaps due to the lack of quantitative instruments designed to thoroughly measure Social Justice Orientation as an outcome. In Fenzel's

(2002) development of the Spiritual Involvement Scale (SIS), several items were created to specifically assess a Social Justice construct: Social Justice Commitment (SJC).

Though this 6-item scale has fairly good reliability ($\alpha = .75$), it offers only a surface-level evaluation of Social Justice commitment in the context of a larger, more general scale.

Mayhew and Fernandez (2007) developed a “social justice learning scale” in their study of effects of different pedagogical practices on Social Justice learning. The scale evaluated Social Justice outcomes on the basis of students’ general perceptions of how well they learned. Essentially, it was a course evaluation instrument.

However, if Social Justice Orientation is a developmental outcome, there ought to be an instrument that is more versatile than a pedagogical assessment tool. An instrument such as Mayhew and Fernandez’s would not work in studying change longitudinally, nor could it be used effectively in a pre-/post-test study.

The current study seeks to provide a more thorough quantitative measure of orientation to Social Justice. Rather than recording perceptions of pedagogical approaches, we are more concerned with ascertaining “where” a student is in his or her thinking and feeling about the topic of Social Justice. Ideally, such an instrument could be used both as a pedagogical assessment tool, and as a longitudinal development assessment for individuals or groups.

In light of Kiely’s (2004) call for further research that will “enhance educators’ ability to connect Service-Learning more effectively to its transformative and social justice mission” (p. 18), this study seeks to develop an instrument that will quantitatively assess Social Justice Orientation as a Service-Learning outcome. A review of previous

research has provided grounding for constructs that will attempt to measure a student's cognitive and affective orientation toward Social Justice, resulting in the development of the Social Justice Orientation Scale (SJOS). See Appendix A for the complete first version of the SJOS.

Construct Development of the SJOS

Because Social Justice is such a broad concept, creating a definition of Social Justice Orientation presents a unique challenge in terms of identifying the constructs of which it is comprised. For the purpose of this study, Bell's (1997) definition of Social Justice as both *process* and *goal* serves as a general framework. Driven by this definition, four potential constructs were developed for use in the SJOS. Levels of awareness and empathy correlate to an orientation toward the *goal* of Social Justice (Mitchell, 2007; Mayhew & Fernandez, 2007), whereas levels of self-efficacy and spirituality are more tied to its *process* (Werner & McVaugh, 2008; Powers, Cramer, & Grubka, 2007). The following constructs were identified: awareness, empathy, self-efficacy, and spirituality.

Awareness

Awareness is a category for observation of cognitive perspective shift, regarding the opening of students' eyes to the plight of disadvantaged people groups (Ottenritter, 2004). This includes a genuine understanding of both the *reality* and the *causes* of oppression and discrimination (Mitchell, 2007). It also includes appreciation for diversity, cultural and racial understanding, and reduction of stereotypes (Eyler, Giles, & Gray, 1999; Perkins, 1992). Important to awareness is an increased people-orientation: mastery of the concepts of reciprocity, fairness, validation of human dignity and worth, responsibility, and respect for those other than oneself (Tyler, 2000). Wang and Rodgers'

(2006) criteria for “defining a Social Justice emphasis” in Service-Learning courses, which included awareness of “social issues,” their causes, and understanding the “changes needed to correct social injustice” (p. 322) were also helpful in development of this construct. Some items were loosely adapted from the *Social Responsibility Scale* (Howard, 1993).

Empathy

Though they did not specifically reference *empathy*, Mayhew and Fernandez (2007) identified “role-taking” (p. 76) as an important pedagogical practice in Social Justice learning. Role taking is often conceptualized within the empathy literature and seems to be similar to perspective taking. Empathy can be defined simply as a person’s reactions to the observed experiences of another (Davis, 1983). This construct is concerned with a student’s tendency to spontaneously adopt another’s point of view (Davis), and ability to transpose oneself imaginatively (Dymond, 1949) into the feelings and actions of another person. Due to research such as Mehrabian and Epstein (1972), who found strong correlation between emotional empathy and tendency to participate in helping behavior, emotional empathy will be the primary focus of the empathy construct in the SJOS. As such, this construct also includes observations about a student’s emotional or affective state, including their feelings of sympathy or concern for the misfortune of others, and personal anxiety felt in the face of their experiences. Thus, we choose here to treat empathy as more affective than cognitive (Duan & Hill, 1996), and as a “relatively stable human ability or personality trait” (p. 263). Some of the items for this construct are adapted from the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Empathy Scale (Caruso & Mayer, 1998) and the Empathy Quotient (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to the confidence in one's own ability to succeed in a given task, specifically, one's belief that he or she can make a sustained commitment to service that will effect social change (Werner & McVaugh, 2000). Schunk (2008) identifies personal assessment of one's past performance as one of the primary inputs that contribute to a student's sense of self-efficacy, and this concept is accounted for by several items within this construct.

Also included is the notion of intrinsic motivation (McAuley, Wraith, & Duncan, 1991) and an assessment of one's belief in the effectiveness of challenging selfishness of larger groups (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2003). The efficacy construct includes items adapted from the *Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

Spirituality

Spirituality is the fourth important construct for the SJOS. Social Justice commitment is at least somewhat characterized by spiritual development (Powers, Cramer, & Grubka, 2007), and religiosity is closely tied to "heightened humanitarianism and a reduction in prejudice" (Perkins, 1992, p. 353). Therefore, it will be important to observe spiritual aspects of students' experience as well. Some items are adapted from the *Faith Maturity Scale* (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993).

Summary

Having explored the background and importance of Social Justice outcomes in Service-Learning, and making note of the need for a quantitative research in this area, this study seeks the development of an instrument that will evaluate students in each of

the four constructs of Social Justice Orientation with acceptable levels of validity and reliability.

CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION OF METHODOLOGY

Initial Scale Development

The SJOS was created to measure growth in each of the four core constructs of Social Justice Orientation as identified in the literature (see Appendix A). For the original scale, 16 items were developed for each of the four constructs. A number of items were adapted from existing scales for each of the constructs: *awareness* (Howard, 1993), *empathy* (Caruso & Mayer, 1998; Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004), *self-efficacy* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), and *spirituality* (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993). The scale featured items making statements relevant to one of the subscales and asked participants to rate their agreement with each given statement on a 6-point Likert scale, with answers ranging as follows: “Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, or Strongly Agree.” Order of items was randomized and 31 of the 64 were designed to be reverse scored.

A preliminary administration of the instrument was given to a group of graduate student colleagues as a part of an advanced research course. Students were asked for feedback and asked to provide a critique of the face validity of the scale. Reliability and factor analyses were performed using scores from the graduate class. As a result, multiple items were revised and twelve were eliminated for various reasons. Several items were

revised based on face validity or unclear wording. Other items were simply omitted in order to improve reliability scores. Because initial factor analysis indicated a wide range of factor loadings, still more items were deleted or re-worded to more accurately capture the nuances of each subscale construct. The revised version of the SJOS included 52 items. Finally, six additional items (the SJC) from the Spiritual Involvement Scale (Fenzel, 2002) were added with the intent to evaluate convergent validity. As mentioned in the literature review above, the SJC offers a surface-level evaluation of commitment to Social Justice, but provided some context for evaluation of convergent validity (see Appendix B for the SJC).

Scale Administration

The revised 52-item version of the SJOS (see Appendix C) was administered to two main groups of undergraduates at a small (approximately 2,000 students), private, Midwestern, evangelical university participating in an intensive, month-long interterm session over the month of January 2009.

Sample Selection

The test group (N=75) was chosen based on enrollment in a course-based, international Service-Learning program. Students from the Service-Learning (SL) group had completed the 1 credit hour, in-class portion of the course during the fall semester (including cross-cultural training and service preparation curriculum) and were then completing the (3 credit hour) field service portion for three and a half weeks over interterm. Students in the course were a part of one of six groups traveling to various locations in South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia to participate in service varying by location. Service included relief work with historically oppressed indigenous people

groups (Paraguay and Southeast Asia), orphaned children (Czech Republic, Ecuador, and Ethiopia), and in areas of past political and/or religious conflict (Northern Ireland and Paraguay). Students experienced manifestations of a variety of Social Justice issues, including AIDS, language preservation, socio-political reconciliation, and in almost every case, results of either extreme poverty or historically oppressive governmental regimes. They also were partnered with local organizations, schools, and/or churches where they could spend significant time building relationships with foreign nationals. Academic requirements of the field experience included significant reflection assignments and readings specific to each culture. It should also be disclosed that the principal investigator participated as an on-field leader for the group in Paraguay, but was careful to avoid sensitizing students regarding specific items on the SJOS.

Five on-campus interterm courses were selected for a control group (N=166). Courses were selected by three criteria: instructor's willingness to participate, typical class standing enrollment (more upperclassmen), and curricular status (three were general education courses in religion, philosophy, and literature, one was a basic core class in the psychology department, and one was a specialized history elective).

Procedure

The SJOS was administered to all participants in a pre-post-test design, with the pre-test given at the outset of interterm (Jan. 4-6) and the post-test at the conclusion of the term (for the treatment group, Feb. 2; for the non-treatment group, Jan. 28). Students in the treatment group were given the instrument while still on-campus, before they departed and after they returned from the field experience. For both groups, surveys were distributed in classroom meeting environments.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographics

Participants' pre- and post- scores were matched using individualized student ID numbers. Cases where respondents indicated an answer between two Likert responses on a single item were averaged when entered (e.g. if a respondent circled both "2" and "3" a score of "2.5" was entered). Cases were eliminated on the basis of missing data, with eleven missing pre-test cases (5 SL, 6 Control), 35 missing post-test cases (16 SL, 19 Control), and seven cases with incomplete data (cases where respondents left more than six items blank). Mean scores were used to replace all other instances of missing data.

Of the 92 Service-Learning students, 75 respondents completed pre- and post-tests, producing a response rate of 81.5%. Over two-thirds of the sample was female, a number proportionate to actual rates of participation in the Service-Learning experience. Ethnic minorities were somewhat underrepresented in the sample, with only 5.4% (vs. an approximately 10% institution-wide rate). As no freshmen were permitted to enroll in the course, upperclassmen made up 78.7% of the sample, with a 21.3% sophomore representation.

For the on-campus control group, 166 out of 185 submitted completed pre- and post-tests, resulting in an 89.7% response rate. There was relatively even participation with regard to sex, and an institutionally representative number of ethnic minorities, with

9% of respondents identifying themselves as a race other than “Caucasian.”

Upperclassmen made up the majority of the sample, with 35.5% of participants identifying themselves as Freshmen or Sophomores. Complete demographic information is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Demographics.

| Demographic | SL Group | | Control Group | |
|---------------|----------|------|---------------|------|
| | Total | % | Total | % |
| Sex | | | | |
| Female | 51 | 68.0 | 80 | 48.2 |
| Male | 24 | 32.0 | 86 | 51.8 |
| Race | | | | |
| African-Amer. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.8 |
| Asian-Amer. | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2.4 |
| Caucasian | 71 | 94.7 | 151 | 91.0 |
| Hispanic | 2 | 2.7 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Native Amer. | | | 1 | 0.6 |
| Other | 2 | 2.7 | 6 | 3.6 |
| Class | | | | |
| Freshman | 0 | 0 | 33 | 19.9 |
| Sophomore | 16 | 21.3 | 26 | 15.7 |
| Junior | 44 | 58.7 | 60 | 36.1 |
| Senior | 15 | 20.0 | 47 | 28.3 |

Final Scale Development

A Factor Analysis was performed within each construct for each of the four subscales. A standard principal component extraction method was used to assess shared variance and number of significant components within the constructs. A varimax orthogonal rotation was used to determine final factor loadings. The subscales showed significant loadings on a number of components, each scale showing at least four components with eigenvalues above 1.00. This indicated a great deal of variance within the variables of each construct, and that each subscale was not loading on any one main component of measurement. Several items appeared to be measuring some outlying component, loading significantly on a component not shared with any other items within the given construct. However, for the *Empathy*, *Efficacy*, and *Spirituality* subscales, the deletion of just a few items proved helpful in reducing the number of significant components to only one (all other components with eigenvalues below 1.00). Deletions were performed based on the researcher's analysis of face validity and individual factor loadings of given items. There was a great deal of variance within the *Awareness* subscale, with four component loadings, raising questions about the measurability of the *Awareness* construct.

Overall, the *Empathy*, *Efficacy*, and *Spirituality* subscales were found to have acceptable reliability (see Table 4). However, because of low reliability (pre $\alpha = .434$; post $\alpha = .538$), as well as problems with factor analysis discussed above, the decision was made to omit the *Awareness* subscale from the final version of the SJOS. Implications of this omission will be discussed later.

Based on factor analyses as discussed above, 19 items were deleted from the remaining three subscales (see Appendix D). The final version of the SJOS (3.0) included 22 items, the *Efficacy* and *Empathy* subscales each including 7 items, and 8 items for the *Spirituality* subscale. Table 2 shows the final version of the SJOS along with factor loadings. Table 3 shows reliability scores for the final subscales.

Table 2

Factor Loadings.

| Item | Pre | Post |
|---|------|------|
| Efficacy Subscale | | |
| Having an impact on the world is within the reach of most individuals. | .673 | .697 |
| Life is too short to worry about solving the world's problems.* | .608 | .669 |
| I believe I will help a lot of people throughout the course of my life. | .622 | .655 |
| It is difficult for individuals to have influence on larger groups.* | .589 | .639 |
| I am hopeful about the future of the world. | .538 | .613 |
| There's not much you can do to change selfish, stubborn people.* | .449 | .566 |
| I often find myself recruiting my friends to help others. | .532 | .530 |
| Empathy Subscale | | |
| Seeing another person in pain doesn't really bother me.* | .705 | .788 |
| I feel upset if I see someone treated unjustly. | .664 | .736 |
| TV or news stories about injured or sick children greatly upset me. | .679 | .692 |
| It must be hard for non-English speakers to live in the U.S. | .444 | .629 |
| I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems. | .537 | .556 |
| I find it easy to imagine myself in another person's situation. | .547 | .446 |
| I don't see why Americans are perceived as obnoxious.* | .496 | .437 |
| Spirituality Subscale | | |
| My faith inspires me to make a difference in the world. | .716 | .805 |
| I talk about my faith with others. | .600 | .692 |
| When I've helped another person, I've felt closer to God. | .643 | .685 |
| Taking care of others is an important part of my beliefs. | .651 | .659 |
| My life is filled with meaning and purpose. | .565 | .622 |
| God isn't concerned with what I do, just what I believe.* | .557 | .591 |
| I rarely think about spiritual matters.* | .621 | .588 |
| My faith helps me know right from wrong. | .528 | .508 |

Note. * indicates a reversed scored item.

Table 3

| Subscale Reliability. | | |
|-----------------------|------|-------|
| Subscale | Pre* | Post* |
| Efficacy | .650 | .733 |
| Empathy | .671 | .714 |
| Spirituality | .758 | .799 |
| SJOS (3.0) | .812 | .868 |

Note. *Cronbach's Alpha.

Factor Analysis

An analysis based upon eigenvalues suggested that only one component should be retained in each subscale. However, because $N < 250$, communalities $< .70$, and because the retained components did not account for at least 70% of the total variability, the retention of only one component based on eigenvalues alone was questionable. It is entirely possible that the sub-components within each subscale were still generating a significant degree of variance within the three constructs. Because each subscale still contained a sizeable representation of at least two sub-components, it seemed likely that there could be at least one other component retained.

The only support for retention of one component within each subscale is that Scree Plots showed eigenvalues leveling off after only one component. Still, this is problematic because N was slightly less than 250, the minimal value for the reliability of Scree Plot analysis (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002).

Convergent Validity

As previously stated, the six-item Social Justice Commitment scale (SJC) from the Spiritual Involvement Scale (Fenzel, 2002) was also included with the administration

of the SJOS to offer an alternative measure for convergent validity. The SJC showed good reliability (pre $\alpha = .729$, post $\alpha = .778$).

A simple correlation showed relatively strong positive correlations with scores on each of the three subscales and SJC scores. Correlations are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Subscale Correlations with SJC.

| Iteration | Subscale | | |
|-----------|----------|---------|--------------|
| | Efficacy | Empathy | Spirituality |
| Pre-Test | .552 ** | .471 ** | .540 ** |
| Post-Test | .682 ** | .460 ** | .682 ** |
| Change | .162 * | .110 | .192 ** |

Note. ** indicates significance at the $p < 0.01$ level (2-tailed).

* indicates significance at the $p < 0.05$ level (2-tailed).

To evaluate its ability to detect change, a 2 (Group) x 2 (Sex) Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on the SJC change score. The pre-test score was used as a covariate to control for baseline scores. A main effect was found in regard to the *group* variable ($p < .01$), and the pre-test score was found also to have significance ($p < .01$) over change scores (see Table 5 for SJC ANCOVA results).

Table 5

Analysis of Covariance for SJC Change Scores.

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Pre-Test | 1 | 50.861** | .000 |
| Group | 1 | 40.597** | .000 |
| Sex | 1 | 18.308 | .813 |
| Group X Sex | 1 | 0.056 | .175 |
| Error | 236 | (4.543) | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

** $p < .01$.

Inferential Statistics

Efficacy Subscale

Scores for the *Efficacy* subscale were totaled and used to generate a change score. A 2 (group) x 2 (*sex*) Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on the change scores. The pre-test score was used as a covariate to control for baseline scores.

Within the *Efficacy* subscale, the only significant ($p = .000$) main effect was found for the *group* variable (see Table 6). Participants in the SL group showed an estimated marginal mean change score of 1.72, with a control group score of -.17, indicating that those in the SL group changed at a significantly greater amount than the control group.

Table 6

Analysis of Covariance for Efficacy Change Scores.

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Pre-Test | 1 | 25.900** | .000 |
| Group | 1 | 21.926** | .000 |
| Sex | 1 | .733 | .393 |
| Group X Sex | 1 | .063 | .803 |
| Error | 236 | (7.031) | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.
** $p < .01$.

In addition, the pre-test covariate was found to have a significant effect ($p = .000$), suggesting that baseline pre-test scores were affecting change scores. In a further exploration of this baseline main effect, a t-test revealed a significant effect ($t = 3.785$; 239 ; $p < .001$). The means indicate that the SL group ($\bar{x} = 32.24$) was scoring higher on baseline condition than the control group (mean = 30.15). In addition a simple regression analysis showed that the baseline condition negatively predicted ($\beta = -.247$) the change

score for the *Efficacy* subscale (see table 7). This indicates that an increase in baseline scores is predictive of a decrease in change scores.

Table 7

Regression Analysis for Efficacy Pre-Test Variable.

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
|----------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| Pre-Test Score | -.173 | .044 | -.247 ** |

Note. $R^2 = .061$, ** $p < .01$

Empathy Subscale

A 2 (group) x 2 (*sex*) Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on the change scores for the *Empathy subscale* (see Table 8). The pre-test score was used as a covariate to control for baseline scores. Main effects were found for both *Group* and *Gender* ($p=.001$). There appeared to be no interaction effect ($p=.557$). SL participants averaged an estimated marginal change score of .994, control -.201. Male participants overall had a negative change score (-.220), while women showed the most change, with an average score of 1.01.

Table 8

Analysis of Covariance for Empathy Change Scores.

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Pre-Test | 1 | 56.636** | .000 |
| Group | 1 | 11.187** | .001 |
| Sex | 1 | 11.122** | .001 |
| Group X Sex | 1 | .346 | .557 |
| Error | 236 | (5.945) | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

** $p < .01$.

The pre-test covariate was, as in the *Efficacy* subscale, found to have a significant main effect ($p=.000$), and the subsequent t-test analysis ($t = 1.967$; 239; $p < .050$) showed

that the SL group ($\bar{x} = 33.09$) scored a higher baseline than the control ($\bar{x} = 31.98$). A regression showed that the baseline condition negatively predicted ($\beta = -.356$) the change score for the *Empathy subscale* (see table 9). This indicates that an increase in baseline scores is predictive of a decrease in change scores in the *Empathy subscale* as well.

Table 9

| Regression Analysis for Empathy Pre-Test Variable. | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|----------|
| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| Pre-Test Score | -.240 | .041 | -.356 ** |

Note. $R^2 = .127$, ** $p < .01$

Spirituality Subscale

In a 2 (group) x 2 (*sex*) Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for the *Spirituality subscale*, an interaction effect was found ($p=.019$) between the *Group* and *Gender* variables (ANCOVA results are shown in Table 10).

Table 10

| Analysis of Covariance for Spirituality Change Scores. | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|
| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
| Pre-Test | 1 | 13.707** | .000 |
| Group | 1 | 18.531 | .000 |
| Sex | 1 | .090 | .764 |
| Group X Sex | 1 | 5.558* | .019 |
| Error | 236 | (5.605) | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

** $p < .01$.

* $P < .05$

To ascertain the source of the interaction, two T-tests were performed, once on the data split by *Group* and with the grouping variable *Gender*, and then again vice versa. Significance was detected when means were compared for males with regard to the

Group variable ($p=.004$). The mean change score for males in the SL group was 1.2917, while males in the control group came in at -.5873, indicating that the source of the interaction was the male SL group ($N=24$). See Table 11 for *Group* variable T-test results.

Table 11

T-test Results for Spirituality Change Score
(Grouping Variable: *Group*).

| Sex | t | df | p | Mean Difference | SL Mean | Control Mean |
|--------|-------|-----|------|-----------------|---------|--------------|
| Female | 1.292 | 129 | .199 | 0.494 | 0.569 | 0.075 |
| Male | 2.965 | 108 | .004 | 1.879 * | 1.292 | -0.587 |

Note. Equal variances are assumed.

* $p < .05$ (2-tailed)

The pre-test covariate was, as in the other two subscales, found to have a significant main effect ($p=.000$), and the subsequent t-test analysis ($t = 4.570$; 239; $p < .000$) showed that the SL group ($\bar{x} = 42.57$) scored a higher baseline than the control ($\bar{x} = 40.41$). A regression showed that the baseline condition negatively predicted ($\beta = -.138$) the change score (see table 12). This indicates that an increase in baseline scores is predictive of a decrease in change scores also in the *Spirituality subscale*.

Table 12

Regression Analysis for Spirituality Pre-Test Variable.

| Variable | B | SE B | β |
|----------------|-------|------|---------|
| Pre-Test Score | -.097 | .045 | -.138 * |

Note. $R^2 = .019$

* $p < .05$

A summary of ANCOVA results for all subscales, including estimated marginal mean change scores for each given demographic, can be found in Table 13.

Table 13

Change Score ANCOVA Results.

| Demographic | Efficacy | Empathy | Spirituality |
|---------------------|----------|---------|--------------|
| Significance | | | |
| Group | .000 | .001 | .000 |
| Sex | .393 | .001 | .764 |
| Group x Sex | .803 | .557 | .019 |
| Covariate (Pre-) | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Mean Change | | | |
| Service-Learning | 1.719 | .994 | 1.182 |
| Control | -.166 | -.201 | -.366 |
| Female | 0.942 | 1.010 | .460 |
| Male | 0.611 | -.217 | .356 |
| SL Female | 1.935 | 1.503 | .824 |
| SL Male | 1.503 | .485 | 1.539 * |
| Control Female | -0.050 | .517 | .096 |
| Control Male | -0.282 | -.920 | -.828 * |

Note. * $p < .05$

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Social Justice Orientation Scale

Initial factor analysis of the SJOS indicated that identifying any single significant factor in each subscale was difficult. Because the scale was initially designed to detect a number of components within each construct, this is not altogether very surprising. For instance, literature regarding the *Spirituality* scale identified two main research components: vertical and horizontal spirituality (the former indicating a personal spirituality, the latter referencing the social aspects of spirituality), as well as two or three sub-components within these. Thus, there are a number of potentially distinct factors accounted for within the subscales. This is a likely cause for the amount of variance within each of the four constructs.

The *Awareness* subscale had perhaps the widest range of sub-components, including the factors: reality and causes for oppression, experiential knowledge, fairness, responsibility, and ethnocentrism. Even an evaluation of the face validity of these sub-components proves problematic, as there could be variance in a given participant's thinking on, for instance, principles of responsibility versus principles of ethnocentrism. A completely ethnocentric person could very well indicate a high level of responsibility. Because of the way the scale measures each of these sub-components, the scores for the

two would likely be negatively correlated, resulting in a higher level of variance in a factor analysis of the subscale. Although the *Awareness* subscale proved problematic in analysis of factors, its reliability scores were ultimately the reason for its omission from the final scale, as will be seen below.

Within the *Efficacy* subscale, removed items were those dealing with “general self-efficacy” and “personal experience/performance evaluation.” Remaining items were oriented toward social self-efficacy, including “sustained commitment to service”, “social change”, and “challenging larger groups.”

A strong majority of the items deleted from the *Empathy subscale* were from the “affective empathy” and “social empathy” sub-components. Remaining items were taken exclusively from the “perspective-taking” and “Social Justice specific empathy” sub-components. Thus, results for this subscale are only with regard to these two sub-components, rather than the construct as a whole as developed in the literature.

The final version of the *Spirituality* subscale primarily reflected the “personal vertical” and “Social Justice-related horizontal” sub-components. Other sub-components were completely omitted, except the one item cross-reference with “efficacy,” which had the strongest loading by far.

It is important to note that, for each of the subscales, item omission was performed blind to sub-component category. An item was only deleted either because of weaknesses in reliability during the first administration, or variance in factor analysis during final scale development. It was only after omissions were made that the final scale was analyzed in light of original theoretical constructs. The fact that factor analysis

derived variance along the lines of these original constructs suggests an initial confidence in the validity of these constructs.

Reliability

Reliability scores were acceptable for the final three subscales. However, the *Awareness* subscale had low Cronbach's alpha scores which could not be increased significantly by deletion of any items. Ultimately, this was the reason the subscale had to be omitted from the final version of the SJOS.

Convergent Validity

Scores from the SJOS were found to have statistically significant correlation with those of the SJC. This contributes to the convergent validity of the SJOS. Pre- and post-test scores all had strong positive correlations with a high degree of significance. However, correlations were less significant for change scores on the *Efficacy* subscale and insignificant for change scores on the *Empathy subscale*. This suggests that compared to the SJC, the SJOS possesses a higher degree of sensitivity with regard to changes in some constructs – especially *Empathy* – over a 1-month period. The SJC appears to more specifically measure change in the *Spirituality* construct. This was not entirely unexpected, as the SJC is a subscale within the Spiritual Involvement Scale (Fenzel, 2002).

Effects of Service-Learning on Social Justice Orientation

Each of the three subscales was shown to have both convergent validity and to be sensitive to change in students during the 3-week field experience portion of a SL course. Significant change was also detected, in some cases, with regard to gender. The initial research questions regarding sensitivity to change and significance of change in

comparison to a control group are both addressed. These findings are consistent with qualitative findings showing the “significant transformative impact” of international Service-Learning on students (Kiely, 2004, p. 15), and more specifically how Service-Learning experiences can lead to higher levels of commitment to Social Justice (Mitchell, 2007).

The other research question, regarding constructs that define a holistic conceptualization of Social Justice Orientation, is not fully addressed. While elements of three constructs identified in the literature were measured, several more went unmeasured due to variances in the results. Furthermore, an entire research construct – *awareness* – had to be completely discarded from measurement. For a scale to truly measure Social Justice Orientation in the context of Service-Learning, it cannot lack what has been identified as such an important construct in Social Justice outcomes, as well as one typically affected by Service-Learning experiences (Wang and Rodgers, 2006).

Perhaps Social Justice is such a multi-layered, complex issue existing both as a “process” and a “goal” (Bell, 1997, p.1) that it will take a great deal more research to fully develop a theoretical understanding of it as a learning outcome.

Efficacy

The main effect detected within this subscale indicated that participants in the SL group showed statistically significant change in comparison with the control group. The SJOS was sensitive to change in that particular construct of Social Justice Orientation with regard to *Group*. Students who participated in the international SL experience displayed a significant increase in their *Social Justice Efficacy* orientation.

Empathy

The two main effects detected within this subscale indicated that participants in the SL group showed statistically significant change in comparison with the control group, and that women displayed a significant change in comparison with men. The SJOS was sensitive to change in regard to both *Group* and *Gender*. Students who participated in the international SL experience, as well as female students, displayed a significant increase in their *Social Justice Empathy* orientation.

Spirituality

Because of the interaction effect found within this subscale, it was concluded that a more complex effect was being detected by the SJOS. The results indicate that males participating in the international SL experience were the root of the interaction effect; they displayed a significant increase in their *Social Justice Spirituality* orientation compared to control group males and all females.

Limitations

Design

There are several limitations resulting from the design of this study. The sample was problematic, due to a somewhat small N value for the male Service-Learning group, a lack of ethnic diversity, and the fact that only one institution was studied. Diversity is a particularly important element in research regarding Social Justice Education because of the obvious role that racial or cultural issues can play in how a person views Social Justice.

Because of the way the Service-Learning course is set up, randomization of sample selection was not possible. This selection issue was perhaps the greatest design threat, especially because pre-test scores were shown to significantly affect change scores

on each subscale. Students enrolling in an international SL experience could be doing so because of a predisposition to engaging issues of Social Justice. This or any number of characteristics of the SL sample could be confounding results.

Ideally, more Service-Learning courses would be selected in addition to the one used, creating the opportunity to overcome the threat of selection. Also, a Control group with fewer first-year students would have been more helpful in making a comparison between SL and Control groups.

Scale

The greatest limitation in the validation of the SJOS is the fact that the entire *Awareness* subscale had to be eliminated due to low reliability and problematic factor analysis. The strong support *Awareness* receives from the literature brings the construct validity of the SJOS into question. An *Awareness* construct needs to be part of any scale that attempts to measure Social Justice Orientation. One guess as to why this construct proved to be so difficult to measure is that there are a number of components within the notion of awareness, and that more sub-constructs should be included when attempting to assess levels of awareness regarding Social Justice. This would explain the high degree of component variance within the *Awareness* subscale on the SJOS.

Reliability scores were also suspect, especially for the *Efficacy* and *Empathy* pretests. Additionally, factor loadings were difficult to accurately assess due to problematic eigenvalues and discrepancies over component retention. These limitations make it impossible to comment on the reliability or validity of the SJOS with any degree of certainty.

Implications

Implications for Future Research

The constructs of Social Justice Orientation may have a wider range of nuances than originally thought. Further research is necessary to understand how sub-components within each of the four main constructs can be measured quantitatively. Research on the *Awareness* construct in particular would help to advance understanding of this important cognitive aspect of Social Justice Orientation.

Because of the limitations of the host institution for this study, further research should be conducted on institutions of various religious affiliation and size, as well as on varying Service-Learning courses.

More research is also necessary on the effect demographic factors, especially gender, can have on a Service-Learning or Social Justice education experience. This study confirms that constructs such as *Empathy* and *Spirituality* can be significantly affected by gender, and indicates there may be a significant relation between gender and Social Justice education.

Finally, further revision and administration of the SJOS could contribute greatly to a scholarly understanding of Social Justice educational outcomes within higher education. A scale with greater reliability and less variability within its constructs would be ideal. Replication of this study, along with the use of the SJOS, is welcomed and encouraged.

Implications for Practitioners

Student Affairs professionals, administrators, and faculty members alike all need to better understand the outcomes of Service-Learning. This study contributes a more holistic theoretical framework in which to think about Social Justice education and its

outcomes, and provides preliminary evidence of the significance Service-Learning experiences can possess in fostering an orientation to Social Justice in students. Service-Learning needs to be a priority for practitioners who view Social Justice Orientation as an educational outcome.

The hope is that the SJOS could eventually take the form of an assessment tool. Practitioners could base learning objectives on the constructs of Social Justice Orientation and have the ability to evaluate how well such objectives were being achieved. Practitioners would be able to better understand the things that were happening in the minds and hearts of their students with regard to how they view the world and their role in helping offer relief and empowerment for the oppressed.

There are also implications for practice with regard to gender differences in students. Women and men seem to experience Service-Learning differently, and their learning may vary based upon the given construct or experience. Ultimately, it is the researcher's hope that this study contributes to the *process* and *goal* of Social Justice (Bell, 1997), helping to advance the cause of the impoverished and the voiceless by empowering students who will play roles in helping to overturn oppressive systems and reach out to those who suffer.

Conclusion

The SJOS represents the humble beginnings of an effort in quantifying a student's orientation toward Social Justice. It is entirely possible that there are elements of Social Justice Orientation that are difficult to measure, and therefore difficult to assess as outcomes of Service-Learning. However, this study has found that aspects of efficacy, empathy, and spirituality can, in fact, be measured to some degree. Moreover, change in a

student's cognitive and affective levels of these constructs can be detected even over the course of a fairly short Service-Learning experience.

For educators concerned with bringing about Social Justice through their students, an investment in Service-Learning seems to be in order. There is great possibility in creating Service-Learning programs where students can encounter issues of Social Justice face-to-face, especially in cross-cultural settings. Such programs have the potential to bring the next generation on-board with the processes and goals of Social Justice, equipping them to become agents of social change around the globe. In a world where the darkness of oppression and suffering is such a daily reality for so many, higher education has a role to play in raising up those ready to shine a light of hope through the service of Social Justice, those who have truly heard the lesson of the ancient prophet in Isaiah 1:17 (New International Version) and taken it to heart:

Learn to do right! Seek justice, encourage the oppressed. Defend the cause of the fatherless, plead the case of the widow.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251-263.
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-202.
- Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathizing quotient (EQ): An investigation of adults with Asperger Syndrome and high-functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34, 163- 175.
- Butin, D. W. (2007). Justice-learning: Service-learning as justice-oriented education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40, 1-7.
- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.

- Benson, P. L., Donahue, M. J., & Erickson, J. A. (1993). The faith maturity scale: conceptualization, measurement, and empirical validation. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 5, 1-26.
- Caruso, D. R., & Mayer, J. D. (1998). A measure of emotional empathy for adolescents and adults. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.
- Duan, C., & Hill, C. E. (1996). The current state of empathy research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43(3), 261-274.
- Dymond R. F. (1949). A scale for the measurement of empathetic ability. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 13(2), 127-133.
- Eyler, J. (2001). Creating your reflection map. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2001(114), 35.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E. Jr., & Gray, C. J. (1999). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-1999*. Unpublished manuscript. Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, 425(23), 785-791.
- Felton, P., Gilchrist, L. Z., & Darby, A. (2006). Emotion and learning: Feeling our way toward a new theory of reflection in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Service Learning*, (Spring), 38-46.
- Fenzel, M. (2002). Spiritual Involvement Scale. *Unpublished Instrument*.

- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. *Expanding Boundaries: Service and Learning*, 1(1), 2-6.
- Giles Jr, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of Service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 77-85.
- Hatcher, J. A., Bringle, R. G., & Muthiah, R. (2004). Designing effective reflection: What matters to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(1), 38-46.
- Howard, J. (1993). Social responsibility inventory. *Unpublished Instrument*, University of Michigan.
- Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5-20.
- Mayhew, M., & Fernandez, S. (2007). Pedagogical Practices that Contribute to Social Justice Outcomes. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(1), 55-80.
- McAuley, E., Wraith, S., & Duncan, T. E. (1991). Self-efficacy, perceptions of success, and intrinsic motivation for exercise 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(2), 139-155.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 525-543.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2002). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

- Mitchell, T. D. (2005). *Service-learning and social justice: Making connections, making commitments*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2007). Critical service-learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(2), 101-112.
- Ottenritter, N. W. (2004). Service learning, social justice, and campus health. *Journal of American College Health*, 52(4), 189-191.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Perkins, H. W. (1992). Student religiosity and social justice concerns in England and the United States: Are they still related? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31(3), 353-360.
- Poole, D. L., & Davis, T. S. (2006). Concept mapping to measure outcomes in study abroad programs. *Social Work Education*, 25(1), 61-77.
- Powers, D. V., Cramer, R. J., & Grubka, J. M. (2007). Spirituality, life stress, and affective well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 35(3), 235-243.
- Schunk, D. (2008). *Learning theories: An educational perspective*. Columbus, OH: Pearson-Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: Nfer-Nelson.

- Tyler, T. R. (2000). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 117-125.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 25-34.
- Wang, Y. & Rodgers, R. (2006). Impact of service-learning and social justice education on college students' cognitive development. *NASPA Journal*, 43(2), 316-337.
- Werner, C. M., & McVaugh, N. (2000). Service-learning" rules" that encourage or discourage long-term service: Implications for practice and research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 117-125.

APPENDIX A: SJOS 1.0

Initial scale developed from constructs and sub-components shown

Note: * indicates reverse-scored item

Awareness (16 items)

- Reality and causes of oppression (Items 1-3)
 - Diversity appreciation (Item 4)
 - Possession of stereotypes (Item 5)
 - Experiential knowledge (Items 6-8)
 - Fairness (Item 9)
 - People Orientation (Item 10)
 - Human dignity and worth (Items 11-12)
 - Responsibility (Items 13-14)
 - Egocentrism & ethnocentrism (Items 15-16)
1. Poverty results from a lack or personal responsibility.*
 2. Most poor people are victims of bad things that happen beyond their control.
 3. My position in society is not a very powerful one.*
 4. I generally spend time with those similar to myself.*
 5. I can usually pick up on most aspects of culture after a short visit.*
 6. It is difficult for me to imagine what it's like to be poor.*
 7. I am well-informed about what's going on in the world.
 8. I know someone who is a victim of oppression.
 9. The most important thing with any game is to play fair.
 10. When I'm very busy, the last thing I want to do is have a lighthearted conversation.*
 11. Someone who doesn't accept a charitable donation is just ungrateful.*
 12. It is not worth trying to save one person's life if it will endanger many others.*
 13. It is my fault that there are poor people in the world.
 14. I speak up if I see something that is unfair.
 15. I generally make decisions based on how I will be benefited.*
 16. It annoys me when I see fellow citizens that are not very patriotic.*

Empathy (16 items)

[Mostly from *Multi-Dimensional Emotional Empathy Scale* Caruso & Mayer, 1998
AND *Empathy Quotient* Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004)]

- Perspective-taking; Imaginative Transposition (Items 1-4)

- Social Empathy (Items 5-8)
- Social Justice specific Empathy (Items 9-12)
- Affective Empathy (Items 13-16)

1. I find it easy to imagine myself in another person's situation.
2. Seeing another person in pain doesn't really bother me.*
3. I don't see why Americans are perceived as obnoxious.*
4. I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems.
5. I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another.
6. It's frustrating to have to keep explaining things to people.*
7. Being around people who are depressed brings my mood down.
8. I often find it difficult to judge if something is rude or polite.*
9. It makes me mad to see someone treated unjustly.
10. It must be hard for non-English speakers to live in the U.S.
11. I can't stand it when people beg for money.*
12. TV or news stories about injured or sick children greatly upset me.
13. When someone else is crying, I may start to cry as well.
14. I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people's feelings.*
15. Too much is made of the suffering of pets or animals.*
16. I cry at the sad parts of books or movies.

Efficacy (16 items)

- General self-efficacy (Items 1-3)
 - Belief that one can make a sustained commitment to service (Items 4-5)
 - Belief that one can effect social change (Items 6-8)
 - Intrinsic motivation (Items 9-11)
 - Belief in the effectiveness of challenging selfishness of larger groups (Items 12-13)
 - Personal experience/performance evaluation (Items 14-16)
1. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
 2. It is not easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.*
 3. I'm overwhelmed by the number of things I should be doing.*
 4. I believe I will help a lot of people throughout the course of my life.
 5. Life is too short to worry about solving the world's problems.*
 6. Having an impact on the world is within the reach of most individuals.
 7. The world's problems are almost overwhelmingly too big to tackle.*
 8. I am hopeful about the future of the world.
 9. I enjoy accomplishing things even if no one will ever know about them.
 10. It is important to me to receive recognition for good performance.*
 11. I often find myself recruiting my friends to help others.
 12. There's not much you can do to change selfish, stubborn people.*
 13. It is difficult for individuals to have influence on larger groups.*
 14. My efforts to help others have not been in vain.
 15. I often doubt my ability to work effectively.*

16. People have indicated that I am very helpful.

Spirituality (16 items)

- “Vertical” spirituality (7 items)
 - Personal (Items 1-3)
 - Specific/practical religiosity (Items 4-6)
 - Morality (Item 7)
 - “Horizontal” spirituality (6 items)
 - Social Justice related spiritual belief (Items 8-10)
 - Morality/Ethics (Items 11-13)
 - Cross-referenced quadrant construct items (3 items)
 - Awareness (Item 14)
 - Empathy (Item 15)
 - Efficacy (Item 16)
1. My life is filled with meaning and purpose.
 2. I rarely think about spiritual matters.*
 3. I talk about my faith with others.
 4. I doubt the existence of God.*
 5. I regularly take part in religious practices (prayer, worship, etc.).
 6. I don’t necessarily hold to a specific set of religious beliefs.*
 7. My faith helps me know right from wrong.
 8. When I’ve helped another person, I’ve felt closer to God.
 9. My faith is relevant to political and social issues.
 10. My religious beliefs require that I take special care of others.
 11. God isn’t concerned with what I do, just what I believe.*
 12. I do the right thing even when it is not easy.
 13. People’s physical sufferings are brought on only by their own sins.*
 14. I feel solidarity with other people of faith around the world.
 15. God has blessed others much more than me.*
 16. My faith inspires me to make a difference in the world.

APPENDIX B: SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITMENT SCALE

(Fenzel, 2002; used with permission from author)

[6 items; alpha=.75]

Please indicate how **true** or **characteristic** each statement is of you by circling the appropriate number to the right of the statement. Use the following scale:

- 0 = Not at all (or never) true of me
 1 = Not very (or seldom) true of me
 2 = Sort of (or sometimes) true of me
 3 = Mostly (or frequently) true of me
 4 = Definitely (or always) true of me

It is important to try to make the world a better place. 0 1 2 3 4

I desire to help other people. 0 1 2 3 4

It is important that I share my time and gifts with others in need. 0 1 2 3 4

My spirituality enables me to forgive when I am mistreated. 0 1 2 3 4

I have no desire to get involved in social action. * 0 1 2 3 4

I try to change things that are unjust in the world. 0 1 2 3 4

* Item to be reverse scored.

APPENDIX C: SJOS 2.0

Items from instrument given to participants

Note: * indicates reverse-scored item;

Subscales: A=*Awareness*; F=*Efficacy*; M=*Empathy*; S=*Spirituality*

Please circle the number that best reflects your level of agreement.

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Slightly Disagree

4 = Slightly Agree

5 = Agree

6 = Strongly Agree

| Item | Subscale |
|--|----------|
| My position in society is not a very powerful one.* | A |
| It is difficult for me to imagine what it's like to be poor.* | A |
| I speak up if I see something that is unfair. | A |
| I am well-informed about what's going on in the world. | A |
| I know someone who is a victim of oppression. | A |
| Poverty usually results from a lack of personal responsibility.* | A |
| The most important thing with any game is to play fair. | A |
| Most poor people are victims of bad things that happen beyond their control. | A |
| It is my fault that there are poor people in the world. | A |
| I generally make decisions based on how I will be benefited.* | A |
| It annoys me when I see fellow citizens that are not very patriotic.* | A |
| There's not much you can do to change selfish, stubborn people.* | F |
| Having an impact on the world is within the reach of most individuals. | F |
| I believe I will help a lot of people throughout the course of my life. | F |
| The world's problems are almost overwhelmingly too big to tackle.* | F |
| I often find myself recruiting my friends to help others. | F |
| I often doubt my ability to work effectively.* | F |
| It is difficult for individuals to have influence on larger groups.* | F |
| When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions. | F |
| People have indicated that I am very helpful. | F |
| I am hopeful about the future of the world. | F |
| It is not easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.* | F |
| Life is too short to worry about solving the world's problems.* | F |

| | |
|---|---|
| TV or news stories about injured or sick children greatly upset me. | M |
| I don't think people should beg for money.* | M |
| I don't see why Americans are perceived as obnoxious.* | M |
| Seeing another person in pain doesn't really bother me.* | M |
| I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another. | M |
| It must be hard for non-English speakers to live in the U.S. | M |
| I cry at the sad parts of books or movies. | M |
| I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people's feelings.* | M |
| I find it easy to imagine myself in another person's situation. | M |
| Being around people who are depressed brings my mood down. | M |
| I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems. | M |
| I feel upset if I see someone treated unjustly. | M |
| When someone else is crying, I may start to cry as well. | M |
| My faith helps me know right from wrong. | S |
| I don't necessarily hold to a specific set of religious beliefs.* | S |
| People's physical sufferings are brought on only by their own sins.* | S |
| I talk about my faith with others. | S |
| I regularly take part in religious practices (prayer, worship, etc.). | S |
| I feel solidarity with other people of faith around the world. | S |
| I do the right thing even when it is not easy. | S |
| I sometimes doubt the existence of God.* | S |
| God isn't concerned with what I do, just what I believe.* | S |
| My faith inspires me to make a difference in the world. | S |
| Taking care of others is an important part of my beliefs. | S |
| When I've helped another person, I've felt closer to God. | S |
| I rarely think about spiritual matters.* | S |
| My life is filled with meaning and purpose. | S |
| God has blessed others much more than me.* | S |
| My faith is relevant to political and social issues. | S |

APPENDIX D: ITEMS DELETED FROM SJOS 2.0

(not including the entire Awareness subscale)

| | |
|---|---|
| The world's problems are almost overwhelmingly too big to tackle.* | F |
| I often doubt my ability to work effectively.* | F |
| When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions. | F |
| People have indicated that I am very helpful. | F |
| It is not easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.* | F |
| I don't think people should beg for money.* | M |
| I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another. | M |
| I cry at the sad parts of books or movies. | M |
| I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people's feelings.* | M |
| Being around people who are depressed brings my mood down. | M |
| When someone else is crying, I may start to cry as well. | M |
| I don't necessarily hold to a specific set of religious beliefs.* | S |
| People's physical sufferings are brought on only by their own sins.* | S |
| I regularly take part in religious practices (prayer, worship, etc.). | S |
| I feel solidarity with other people of faith around the world. | S |
| I do the right thing even when it is not easy. | S |
| I sometimes doubt the existence of God.* | S |
| God has blessed others much more than me.* | S |
| My faith is relevant to political and social issues. | S |