

Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty and Staff - Articles & Papers

Faculty and Staff

Spring 3-2016

Promoting Global Empathy and Engagement through Real-Time Problem-Based Simulations: Outcomes from a Policymaking Simulation set in Post-Earthquake Haiti

Chad Raymond
Salve Regina University, chad.raymond@salve.edu

Tina Zappile
Stockton University

Daniel J. Beers
Knox College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_staff_pub



Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons, Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Methods Commons, Educational Psychology Commons, Experimental Analysis of Behavior Commons, Higher Education and Teaching Commons, Other Education Commons, Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

Raymond, Chad; Zappile, Tina; and Beers, Daniel J., "Promoting Global Empathy and Engagement through Real-Time Problem-Based Simulations: Outcomes from a Policymaking Simulation set in Post-Earthquake Haiti" (2016). *Faculty and Staff - Articles & Papers*. 59.
https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_staff_pub/59

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty and Staff - Articles & Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

Promoting Global Empathy and Engagement through Real-Time Problem-Based Simulations: Outcomes from a Policymaking Simulation set in Post-Earthquake Haiti

Tina Zappile
Stockton University
tina.zappile@stockton.edu

Daniel J. Beers
Knox College
dbeers@knox.edu

Chad Raymond
Salve Regina University
chad.raymond@salve.edu

Abstract

We introduce a real-time problem-based simulation in which students are tasked with drafting policy to address the challenge of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in post-earthquake Haiti from a variety of stakeholder perspectives. Students who participated in the simulation completed a quantitative survey as a pretest/posttest on global empathy, political awareness, and civic engagement, and provided qualitative data through post-simulation focus groups. The simulation was run in four courses across three campuses in a variety of instructional settings from 2013 to 2015. An analysis of the data reveals that scores on several survey items measuring global empathy and political/civic engagement increased significantly, while qualitative student comments corroborated the results. This format of a real-time problem-based policymaking simulation is readily adaptable to other ongoing and future global crises using the framework provided in this paper.

Keywords: simulation, Haiti, IDP, global empathy, pedagogy, humanitarianism, NGOs, disaster relief, white savior complex

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank the American Political Science Association Teaching and Learning Conference organizers, specifically those responsible for the simulations track(s), for providing the authors a venue to present our individual research and forge a meaningful collaboration that led to this rewarding work. This project benefitted specifically from comments by Victor Asal and two anonymous reviewers. Support was provided by Stockton University's Office of E-Learning, Salve Regina University's interdisciplinary major in Global Studies and its Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Mellon Faculty Career Enhancement program at Knox College. Additional thanks go to the outstanding staff and students at the Institute for Social Work and Social Science in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, who helped facilitate the field research that informed this project.

Following the 7.0 magnitude earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, an estimated 1.5 million Haitians were temporarily resettled in Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps in and around the city of Port-au-Prince. Five years later, approximately 79,000 Haitians remained in 105 displacement sites with 70 percent still in tents (IOM 2015). Many of those who left the camps did not do so out of choice, but were either forcibly evicted or fled to escape poor living conditions and physical insecurity (CCCM Cluster 2011), only to resettle in the city's rapidly expanding slums (IOM 2011). Evidence suggests that a variety of domestic and international actors have failed to meet the basic needs of Haiti's most vulnerable citizens. So what went wrong? We present a policy making simulation first developed by Beers (2013) that takes up this question.

This simulation serves several objectives. First, as a problem-based simulation (Asal and Krotoville 2013), it illustrates to participants the complexities facing politicians and aid workers who must balance competing interests in an environment of imperfect and incomplete information. Second, because the simulation is real-time in the sense that it represents an ongoing situation, it helps students engage with unfamiliar concepts in a more personal and immediate way than role-play exercises about events in the distant past. Real-time simulations thereby have an enhanced ability to engage students in the "complexities of process" (Wedig 2010: 548). Third, the simulation appears to mitigate attitudes inherent in what Cole (2012) has described as the "white-savior industrial complex." As with other simulations that challenge students' idealism (Youde 2008; Schnurr, De Santo, and Green 2014), students come away from this simulation with a more nuanced understanding of problems in the developing world, and the futility of the developed world trying to impose unilaterally-created solutions. Connecting these objectives to learning outcomes, we assert that this simulation's real-time, problem-based features lead to improvements in global empathy and political and civic engagement as key dimensions of global citizenship (Zappile 2013)—outcomes that have become increasingly important to higher education institutions in the United States as benchmarks for curricular internationalization and global education (AAC&U n.d.; Duncan 2013; Olds 2012; Schattle 2009).

To test these propositions, we ran the Haiti IDP policy making simulation on three different campuses, in three classroom-based undergraduate courses and in one online

graduate course. To assess changes in global empathy and political and civic engagement, we administered a pre- and post-simulation survey originally developed for secondary education (Bachen, Hernández-Ramos, and Raphael 2012). We adapted this survey and supplemented it with additional measures of political and civic engagement derived from existing research in these areas (Atkeson 2003; Crookall 2003; Hillygus 2005; Fowler and Pusch 2010). Additionally, students on two of the three campuses in this study met in focus groups as part of the simulation debriefing and were asked long-form questions adapted from the survey developed by Bachen et al (2012). This experimental design eliminates concerns about self-selection into these courses as we demonstrate change in students' level of global empathy over time.

Our results show that this simulation was associated with improvements in students' reported levels of global empathy and political/civic engagement *under certain conditions*. Specifically, the simulation was most effective in shifting student attitudes when implemented over an extended period of time (i.e. 4-5 weeks) in a course that introduced closely related content specifically focusing on humanitarian aid, international development, or international political economy. However, we are unable to distinguish the effect of the timeframe of the simulation separate from its implementation in courses with related content, suggesting that while a longer time period may be more beneficial in affecting change in student attitudes, it was not a necessary condition in our study. This finding supports previous research identifying the success of short-term simulations affecting long-term attitudinal changes (Mills and Smith 2004).

As a 'real-time' problem-based simulation, the framework described here could be applied to a variety of contentious political events currently unfolding in the news—from the Greek financial crisis, to the diplomatic and military conflict in Ukraine, to recent natural and man-made humanitarian emergencies in Nepal and Syria. The timeline and assignments outlined in this paper provide ample materials for customization for a variety of real-time problems. The approach is particularly well-suited to complex political conflicts in which competing stakeholders vie for opposing policy solutions. In a second phase of simulation development, the original author of this Haiti-specific simulation is creating content for an adaptation related to the ongoing Syrian refugee crisis in the Middle East, which will draw on many of the principals and insights

discussed here. Additional information on the adaptability of this simulation precedes the conclusion of this paper.

Global Citizenship as a Learning Outcome

The motivation behind this research was to investigate whether a faculty-driven movement to use international simulations can improve student outcomes in support of educating global citizens. The promise of ‘real-time’ simulations with multi-level problem-based scenarios is that they can be utilized as classroom tools to teach both content and process (Asal and Blake 2006) and advance global citizenship. We emphasize that content knowledge and psychological attitudes towards the rest of the world, alongside political and civic engagement, are foundational for global citizenship. Many institutions of higher education in the United States have identified student learning outcomes related to global awareness, global learning, and civic engagement as particularly important in an “era of global interconnection and rapid societal and economic change” (AAC&U n.d.; c.f. Heuberger 1999; Gillespie 2002; Cruz and Patterson 2005; Carter et al. 2010; Eddy et al. 2013). This is also reflected in the demand for assessment of intercultural or global competence whether for privately developed instruments such as the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) or instruments developed by academics and practitioners and published through the peer-review process such as the one we use in this study.

Global empathy, i.e. cultural empathy (Calloway-Thomas 2010), involves the desire to supportively engage with an ‘other’ who lives outside of one’s nation-state.¹ This builds on defining attributes of empathy that include the ability to: “see the world how others see it; understand another’s current feelings; (be) non-judgmental; and communicate the understanding (of others)” (Wiseman 1996, 1164-65). Global empathy includes both the “intellectual/imaginative apprehension of another’s mental state” and “an emotional response to . . . emotional responses of others”. (Lawrence, Shaw, Baker, Baron-Cohen, and David 2004: 911). People who possess global empathy “come to see

¹ The ‘other’ refers to the in-group out-group bias. See Brewer (1979), Tajfel (1970) for background and Hochschild and Lang (2011) for application of the concept of ‘the other’ in research.

themselves not only as citizens of their local community, nation-state, or ethno cultural group, but also as global citizens willing and able to empathize with other peoples and their situations elsewhere in the world” (Bachen et al 2012: 3). Identification as a global citizen as a component of global empathy infers some degree of political and civic engagement with the broader global community as an expanded peer group—a globally empathetic response may include an urge to take action beyond one’s borders².

Complicating global empathy and global citizenship is the phenomenon of the ‘white-savior industrial complex’ (Cole 2012): the tendency of the socioeconomically powerful—the “haves” of the developed world—to assume that they know what is best for the culturally-other “have-nots” living in poverty, and to be eager to save them from their own ignorance. Easterly (2007) described this astutely in his dichotomy of “searchers” and “planners” in the field of economic development, wherein “planners” (e.g. international aid agencies) repeatedly invoke the same failed solutions to the

² We recognize that global citizenship and global empathy may be considered ‘essentially contested’ concepts (Collier, Hidalgo, and Maciuceanu 2006; Connolly 1993; Gallie 1956; Qiang 2003), as they meet six of the following seven criteria established by Gallie (1955-56) and described by Collier et al (2006). They are ‘appraisive’, meaning they reflect an achievement of some kind, in this case by both educators and students as global citizenship or empathy are to be earned or achieved. They are ‘internally complex’ in that what it means to achieve global citizenship or empathy varies across and within groups of educators and learners. They also “include(s) a variety of possible components or features—although each concept’s ‘worth is attributed to it as a whole’ (Collier et al 2006, p. 217). They have ‘diverse describability’ in that you can select or focus on one dimension of each concept and by definition, not detract from another. They reflect ‘openness’ in that they are “subject to revision in new situations” (Collier et al 2006, p. 218); conceptions of global education, awareness, citizenship, and empathy depend on a particular normative reaction of stakeholders within a specific time period to current world circumstances. There is also some degree of ‘reciprocal recognition’ of these concepts’ mutability as one person’s idea of global awareness may be driven by content or what someone knows about the world while another may focus on individual attitudes towards global policy or categories of people and in a campus setting we recognize the value in allowing faculty expertise to drive a particular notion of global education. Finally, there is ‘progressive competition’ over definitions of these concepts that plays out across and within campuses at the administrative and faculty level.

problem of poverty. Cole (2012) touched on this long history of well intentioned but ineffective aid projects driven by misguided ideas of what will benefit “others” when coining this phrase in writing about the Kony 2012 campaign. Later, in analyzing the effects of the Kony 2012 campaign among university students, Hershey and Artime (2014) found that pervasive messages reinforcing the white savior complex as described by Cole (2012) can perpetuate damaging stereotypes about the helplessness of citizens in developing countries.

However, if the concept of global empathy is derived from empathy, the defining attributes of empathy should also remain the defining attributes of global empathy. That is, being empathetic or ‘seeing the world how others see it, understand(ing) another’s current feelings, (being) non-judgmental, and communicat(ing) the understanding’ (Wiseman 1996, 1164-65) should also be considered core attributes of empathetic interactions of people across political or geographic borders. The introduction of ‘global’ to the concept of empathy simply defines the boundaries of who the ‘other’ is and where they are located. The white savior complex violates all four of these defining attributes of empathy. Therefore, enhancing global empathy is likely to reduce the tendency to display attitudes and behaviors associated with this troubling complex.

In higher education settings, the white savior complex can manifest itself in a variety of ways including classroom discussions that reflect students’ pre-existing biases³, charity campaigns initiated by university-affiliated student organizations, and social media-driven forms of passive engagement often referred to as “slacktivism.” Thus, part of the pedagogical rationale behind development-related problem-based simulations like the one introduced here is to challenge inaccurate and harmful perceptions about peoples and cultures in developing countries, promoting mutual respect and understanding across cultures.

The Haiti IDP Simulation

³ Explaining the origin of the white savior complex involves a psychological understanding of the roots of the traditional savior complex phenomenon and a combination of ethnocentrism, a lack of cross-cultural empathy, and, potentially, gender roles. While we do not claim to predict the origin here it is instructive to explore how events or experiences can exacerbate this tendency, including previous experience abroad.

The simulation in this study focuses on the estimated 1.5 million Haitians who temporarily resettled in Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps in and around Port-au-Prince after the January 2010 earthquake. The assignment is designed to immerse students in a complex humanitarian emergency as it unfolds, highlighting the problems of incomplete information, competing interests, and the difficult tradeoffs between the immediate needs and long term interests of earthquake survivors. It also encourages students to think critically about how international actors have responded to these challenges in the Haitian case—and what a more inclusive approach to aid and reconstruction might look like—by helping them to see the crisis from the perspectives of both local and international actors affected by the crisis. This section identifies the scenario provided to students, a brief description of stakeholder identities, and a chronological list of assignments and/or activities that comprise the structure and content of the simulation. Details regarding its implementation across a variety of course settings is discussed in the section that follows.

Simulation Background

The 7.0-magnitude earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, 2010, created a humanitarian emergency of staggering proportions. Beyond the tremendous loss of human life and damage to property, the disaster sent more than 10% of the country's population into temporary displacement camps clustered around the capital city of Port-au-Prince. Numerous reports by journalists, humanitarian organizations and independent observers have documented the problems inside Haiti's IDP camps, many of which constitute small cities in their own right. Residents live in makeshift shelters that are structurally unsound and offer little protection from the heavy rains and high winds that routinely visit the island nation. Moreover, camp residents face the daily threats of physical insecurity, inadequate sanitation and poor health conditions. Property theft, vandalism and sexual violence are common occurrences. Basic sanitation services, such as clean water and public toilets, are often inaccessible or inadequate to meet demand. Further, cramped living quarters, poor infrastructure and inadequate sanitation have created a breeding ground for illness, contributing to a deadly outbreak of cholera (a fecal-borne disease) that has devastated the camps.

Data collected by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) suggests

that the number of IDP camp residents in Haiti has steadily decreased over the last five years, from a high of 1.5 million in July 2010, to an estimated of 79,397 residents in January 2015 (IOM 2015). However, according to a randomized survey of more than 1,000 “returned” IDP camp residents, the vast majority of those who left the camps as of 2011 did not do so out of choice. Rather, most fled to escape poor living conditions and physical insecurity in the camps, or were involuntarily evicted (CCCM Cluster 2011). Neither the Haitian government nor its international partners have formally tracked the movement of IDPs. However, observers have documented the rapid growth of squatter settlements on the outskirts of Port-au-Prince, where tens of thousands of Haitians have relocated without access to paved roads, electricity, running water, or other basic social services (Zidor 2012; Trevelyan 2013). Moreover, a technical report commissioned by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) estimates that between 60 and 90 percent of damaged houses deemed unfit for occupation by the Haitian government (so-called "Yellow" and "Red" houses) were inhabited one year after the earthquake (Schwartz 2011). Thus, despite the apparent progress in returning displaced Haitians to their homes, there remain serious questions about the nature of the resettlement process and its long-term implications for Haiti.

As months and years passed, government policymakers and aid workers faced increasing pressure to find a solution to the crisis. Beyond the squalid conditions in the IDP camps and the mounting domestic political pressure to show tangible progress, forced evictions by Haitian landowners and “a reduced presence of NGOs resulting in a continuing reduction of services within camps” have served as compounding factors (Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti 2011). Recently, the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs) urged for a ‘durable solution’ for the ongoing IDP crisis (UN 2014). ECOSOC released its “Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti” in late 2014 identifying continued fragility (E/2014/95), and noting the continued need to support Haitian efforts to improve health, sanitation, and security in existing IDP camps (ECOSOC/6652).

Stakeholder Assignments

Against this backdrop, participants in the Haiti IDP simulation received a fictionalized version of a Haitian government proposal to resettle residents of the

country's IDP camps. This proposal called for the closure of the remaining IDP camps and the payment of a lump sum of money to each household that voluntarily leaves a camp before a government-mandated deadline. Students were then informed that the Interim Commission for the Reconstruction of Haiti (IHRC)—a real bilateral commission headed by Bill Clinton and former Haitian Prime Minister Jean Max Bellerive—had organized an extraordinary panel of experts to evaluate the government's plan and issue an official recommendation. As part of the process, the panel was soliciting written statements and oral testimony from representatives of key stakeholder populations to help it reach a decision. Students were assigned to the following stakeholder groups that had specific and competing objectives to achieve during the simulation:

- Haitian IDP camp residents (improve living conditions, find permanent housing, employment, etc.)
- International NGOs operating in IDP camps (distribute aid to earthquake survivors, raise international profile to generate donations, continue to operate in Haiti)
- Haitian government officials (bring foreign aid programs under the control of the Haitian government, improve both international and domestic public opinion of the Haitian government, get re-elected, help Haitian citizens)
- Haitian business owners (attract investment, especially foreign investment for joint ventures that are only possible with foreign capital, develop a low-cost, high-skill labor force, earn a profit)
- Haitian landowners (regain control of privately-owned land currently occupied by IDP camps, prevent IDPs who leave IDP camps from occupying privately-owned land elsewhere, create an economic climate that attracts both domestic and international private investment)
- Human rights and women's rights advocacy groups (improve the human rights situation in Haiti, protect the environment in Haiti, reduce injustice in Haiti)

Students were divided into the interest groups listed above and tasked with producing both written recommendations and oral testimony for the IHRC. Students moved through the simulation by completing a series of assignments and group activities listed in Appendix A, designed to familiarize them with the social and political

challenges facing post-earthquake Haiti as well as the background and strategic interests of their respective stakeholder groups. Appendix B lists assigned readings provided to student stakeholder groups. This series of assignments was implemented alongside additional class time for students to work in groups or hold group consultations with the instructor. At the end of the simulation period (which lasted between two and five weeks, depending on the course), each group submitted a joint policy proposal, which was shared with the rest of the class. Students also presented their recommendations in a final symposium, which offered an opportunity to debate the relative merits of the proposals, and provided a forum to discuss the parameters of a joint policy recommendation for the IHRC. As part of the debriefing process, each student wrote a short essay identifying the main considerations that shaped their thinking about the project, and assessing whether the course of action recommended by the class would, if implanted, improve the situation of Haitian IDPs.

Research Design

To gauge the impact of the simulation on learning outcomes, we integrated the assignment into four courses on three separate campuses (A, B, and C), administering a pre- and post-simulation survey with measures of global empathy and political and civic engagement developed by Bachen et al (2012) and adapted for this study. The sample population included graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in bricks-and-mortar and online courses at both public and private institutions. While the course content and duration of the simulation varied between campuses, all students participated in all of the basic components of the assignment. Table 1 provides a summary of the sample population and more detailed descriptive statistics for our dataset are presented in Appendix C. Table 2 presents a timeline for the implementation of simulation assignments on each campus.

Table 1: Course Sample

Campus	Course	Level	Duration of Simulation	Simulation Related to Course Content
A- Catholic university with	Introduction to International	Lower division	Two weeks	No

2,700 students	Relations	undergraduate		
A	Complex Humanitarian Emergencies	Graduate	Two weeks	Yes
B- Public liberal arts comprehensive university with 8,570 undergrad/grad students	International Political Economy	Upper division undergraduate seminar	Five weeks	Yes
C- Private residential liberal arts college with 1,400 undergrad students	Politics of International Development	Upper division undergraduate	Four weeks	Yes

Table 2: Simulation Timeline Across Campuses

	Campus A: 2-week simulation (undergrad)	Campus A: 2-week simulation (grad, online)	Campus B: 5-week simulation (undergrad)	Campus C: 4-week simulation (undergrad)
Week One	Stakeholder groups assigned; Assignment 1; Assignment 2; Assignment 3; In-class discussion of Assignments 1 and 2	Stakeholder groups assigned; Assignment 1; Assignment 2; Assignment 3; Online class discussion	Course content introduced; Stakeholder groups assigned; Assignment 1	Simulation and related course content introduced; Stakeholder groups assigned; Assignment 1; Assignment 2
Week Two	Assignment 4; Assignment 5; Assignment 6; In-class discussions on Assignment 4, presentation of stakeholder policy proposals; debate on joint policy proposal, debriefing	Assignment 4; Assignment 5; Assignment 6; Online class discussion	In-class group discussions on Assignment 2; Assignment 3	In-class group discussions on Assignment 2; Assignment 3; Groups meet individually with instructor to discuss Assignment 3
Week	n/a	n/a	In-class group	Assignment 4;

Three			sessions to complete Assignment 4	Groups meet individually with instructor to discuss Assignment 4
Week Four	n/a	n/a	Expert panel to adopt policy proposal(s) governed by rules established by students	Assignment 5; Assignment 6; Presentation of stakeholder policy proposals; In-class debriefing and focus group following Assignment 5 & 6
Week Five	n/a	n/a	In-class debriefing and focus group following Assignment 5 & 6	na

The undergraduate course at campus A was an on-campus introductory international relations course with twenty-three students. The course fulfilled a requirement in the university’s general education curriculum and focused on introducing students to basic concepts in international relations and increasing their awareness of and interest in political processes outside of the United States. The online graduate course from campus A contained ten students enrolled in a master’s degree program in international relations. The subject of this course was complex humanitarian emergencies: disaster prevention, mitigation, and response, as well as questions of economic development in the context of human security. Students in this course frequently had lived or worked abroad; many had military backgrounds and as a result some had direct experience with overseas emergency humanitarian relief operations. The simulation began midway into both courses on campus A and took place over a two-week period. The compressed timeline was in part due to the fact that the online graduate course lasted only seven weeks and the students, who were located in a variety of time zones, interacted asynchronously with each other and with the instructor during this

period. Instead of creating a formally organized panel of experts in each class, the instructor moderated an open discussion in each course in which students were tasked with representing the simulation's different interest groups.

The undergraduate course on campus B was an on-campus upper division seminar. This international political economy course is taught within the political science department and fulfills a global studies minor requirement in the university's general studies curriculum. Fifteen students were enrolled, all juniors and seniors. Half of the semester is devoted to topics in economic development with assigned readings by Jeffrey Sachs, Nina Munk, William Easterly, Robert Wade, and Joseph Stiglitz, among others. In this course the simulation was implemented across a five-week time period when students were studying economic development. As noted in Table 2, students in this simulation were given time during class each week to work on assignments in their stakeholder groups, draft their group's proposal, review other proposals, and hold a 100-110 minute in-class expert panel at the end of the semester. For the final expert panel, each group submitted their advisory paper in advance for other groups to review and delivered an oral presentation of their conclusions and policy recommendations. The rules of procedure for the expert panel were created and approved by students representing their stakeholder groups as part of the proceedings. The expert panel was followed by a synchronous online debriefing session using Blackboard Collaborate, which included the focus group questions presented in Appendix D.

The undergraduate course at campus C was an on-campus upper level seminar on the politics of international development. Twenty-seven students were enrolled, the majority of them sophomores and juniors. The course traced the history of western intervention in developing countries, from European colonialism to the present. Topics included post-colonial state-building, neoliberalism and economic development, foreign aid, international organizations and international NGOs. The course serves as an elective for students majoring in Political Science, International Relations, Economics and International Studies.

The IDP simulation was implemented during the last 4 weeks of a 10-week trimester on campus C. Midway through the term, the instructor introduced the simulation with a set of background readings and discussions about Haiti's development

experience before and after the earthquake. The students then divided into stakeholder groups and worked independently outside of class for the next 4 weeks, reading and researching about the IDP situation and meeting regularly with the instructor for one-on-one advising sessions. These meetings are viewed as critical to the implementation on Campus C; without them, students can get lost in a sea of questions and information. To further support this 4 week time period of independent research, the instructor on Campus C also provided students a list of resources with a wealth of information--some grey literature reports, as well as a number of websites and blogs. At the end of the term, the groups submitted written proposals and presented their ideas at a three-hour symposium during the final exam period. The symposium included a debriefing session about lessons learned, as well as a group discussion about the impact of the experience on student attitudes.

To assess how differing conditions in these varied field locations might impact the efficacy of the simulation, we clustered our dataset into the following categories for analysis:

- (1) Complete sample: *All* students in *all* courses (campus A undergraduates and graduates, campus B undergraduates, and campus C undergraduates)
- (2) Subset 1: Students in courses with related content specific to humanitarian crises, humanitarian aid, international development, or international political economy broadly (campus A graduates, campus B undergraduates, and campus C undergraduates)
- (3) Subset 2: Students in courses with related content AND an extended simulation period beyond 2 weeks (campus B undergraduates and campus C undergraduates)

To assess learning outcomes associated with the simulation, we administered a pretest/posttest survey in all four courses, and conducted focus group exit interviews on campus B in 2014 and campus C in 2015; a focus group in campus A was not included due to the limited timeframe allotted for the simulation. Our survey instrument was

adapted from Bachen et al (2012)⁴ with modifications informed by research on simulations in post-secondary education (Fowler and Pusch 2010; Crookall 2003), along with original contributions. The global empathy scale contained seventeen items that combined Bachen et al's (2012, 20) eleven global empathy items including "I share the anger of those in other countries who face injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background," and "I am aware of political, social, and economic barriers that lead to discrimination of people in other countries" with two "interest in future learning" items (Bachen et al 2012, 9), two control items from Bachen et al (2012), and an original item. Cronbach's alpha for our extended 17-item global empathy scale was .816/.852 (pre/posttest); for Bachen et al's original 11-item scale it was .825/.872 (pre/posttest).

Our political and civic engagement scale includes nine items such as "I think it is important to understand history, politics and contemporary social issues." (Bachen et al 2012); this scale is comprised of previously developed items measuring "community engagement" (Bachen et al 2012), alongside adapted and original items. Cronbach's alpha for this 9-item scale was .662/.702 (pre/posttest). Respondents were also asked control questions about their age, gender, and international travel experience. The focus group questions on Campus B and C closely mirrored the questions included in the quantitative survey. The complete survey is provided in Appendix D; Appendix E lists the focus group questions employed as part of the simulation debriefing on Campus B and C.

Towards Greater Global Empathy

The results of our quantitative survey data are presented in Table 3. Reported values are paired mean scores and t-values that allow us to evaluate both the direction of change (Do students display higher/lower levels of global empathy after participating in the simulation?) as well as the magnitude of that change (Can we be confident that the observed increase/decrease is meaningful and not due to random error?). Results are presented for the sample populations identified above: All students in all courses;

⁴ Bachen et al (2012) adapted their survey from Wang et al (2003).

students in courses with related content (Subset 1); and students in courses with related content AND an extended simulation period (Subset 2).

Table 3: Paired T-Test Results for Global Empathy and Political/Civic Engagement

	All Students (n = 55)			Subset 1: Undergrad/Grad Courses with Related Content & Short/Extended Simulation Periods (n = 44)			Subset 2: Undergrad Courses with Related Content & Extended Simulation Period (n = 38)		
	Pre-test sum of means	Post- test sum of means	Pre/Post Change (t value)	Pre-test sum of means	Post- test sum of means	Pre/Post Change (t value)	Pre-test sum of means	Post- test sum of means	Pre/Post Change (t value)
Global Empathy	80.98	82.47	+1.49 (1.85)	82.41	84.30	+1.89 (2.17)*	82.53	84.61	+2.08 (2.11)*
Political/ Civic Engagement	30.07	30.71	+0.64 (1.95)	30.59	31.25	+0.66 (2.09)*	30.97	31.84	+0.87 (2.54)*

**= p<.01; *= p<.05

Overall, the survey results indicate positive and statistically significant changes in attitudes among students in two of the three participant populations (Subset 1 and Subset 2).⁵ These findings hold for both global empathy and civic engagement indicators, providing some initial evidence that the simulation positively contributed to students' global awareness and engagement. However, the data also reveal that the strength of this relationship depends on key contextual factors.

Specifically, the findings suggest that the benefits associated with related course content and extended engagement with the simulation had an important impact on the efficacy of the assignment. Survey responses from Subset 2--students in courses with related content AND an extended simulation period--show the greatest changes in global empathy and political/civic engagement scores. Likewise, responses from Subset 1--students in courses with related content (i.e. humanitarian crises, debates in development,

⁵ Our sample size for the graduate population was 10, therefore we do not report separate graduate results.

international political economy more generally) but not necessarily an extended simulation--indicate a more modest change in attitudes. The entire student population, while trending in a similarly positive direction, does not show a statistically significant change in pre/post attitudes. These results suggest that while Subset 2 experienced the greatest impact from the assignment, it appears that the extended time period was not a necessary condition for the simulation to affect change in student attitudes, as there was also positive change observed in Subset 1. However, introducing the simulation alongside related course content does appear necessary from our results.

A closer examination of changes in individual indicators (see Appendix F and G), reveals further variation within these broad trends. While most of the individual indicators in the global empathy scale show positive change from pre to post, the findings for political and civic engagement are mixed. Underlying the observed positive trend, we find null or slightly negative results for a handful of questions, while the overarching upswing in political/civic engagement appears to be driven by a small subset of indicators. This suggests that, while the simulation did have a net positive impact on student attitudes, the effect on global empathy was stronger and more consistent than the impact on political/civic engagement. It is also important to acknowledge that, in both cases, the data indicate a modest change in pre/post attitudes, not an overwhelming one.

Focus Group Results

Our quantitative findings are further supported by students' qualitative comments from focus group discussions on Campus B in 2014 and Campus C in 2015. Students from these campuses also represent Subset 2 in our quantitative results (i.e. students enrolled in courses with related content and an extended simulation period of 4-5 weeks). These data suggest that the simulation created the conditions for participants to reflect on their own perspectives as (primarily) American university students, as well as to consider critically the role of western actors or outside stakeholders in developing countries such as Haiti.

On campus B, students reported that they had "an Americanized view of disaster relief before starting this project." Moreover, they noted that the experience helped them to learn "how countries' vulnerabilities are more of a socially constructed reality formed by past historical processes," and that problems in developing countries require tailor-

made solutions rather than a uniformly applied strategy. One student observed that accounting for local context is essential to creating effective policy, and that failure to do so can lead to poor implementation and disappointment.

They also acknowledged the difficulties of trying to understand those who live in the developing world. As one student commented, “[N]o one can fully put themselves in another’s shoes to fully grasp what they are going through.” Another student noted that the assignment prompted them to reflect on their own position of privilege: “It definitely can feel embarrassing. You feel ashamed of yourself and what you have...that, I think, anyone can relate to. It makes wanting to seek change or help that much harder because you're ashamed.” The overwhelming message from this campus was that students were able to see the world (Haiti’s IDP crisis, in this case) from the perspective of others without judgment, recognizing that they as outsiders didn’t necessarily know best which policy prescription could effectively address the crisis.

On Campus C, students indicated that the simulation pushed them out of their comfort zone and prompted them to consider other points of view. As one student noted, “[This] assignment is very effective at forcing people to think from perspectives different than their own. It is very easy to criticize development projects from the comfort of our classroom, far removed from the lived realities of people on the ground...I think that the assignment gave me a better understanding of how various actors in these situations are approaching problems.” Another student, who had personally donated to the relief efforts after the 2010 earthquake, remarked that the simulation helped him better understand and empathize with the people who lived through it. “I remember when the earthquake first happened, I was deeply moved by the images I saw on TV. Even though I worked a part time job and had little to my name, I felt compelled to donate \$100 to the Red Cross . . . Now five years later, and after the completion of the project, I feel a much deeper connection to the situation and to the people involved. The final project enabled us to put ourselves in the shoes of the people we represented, and to go through a thought process that was similar to their own. I think this was an immensely valuable part of the project.”

Several students also reported that the assignment improved their understanding of the course material by challenging them to engage with theoretical concepts in a more immediate and concrete way. According to one student, “It’s very different to encounter

complex concepts, analyze them, and go through the frustration of explaining their complexity on an exam, versus actually attempting to create ‘real’ development plans with these ideas... You actually get to understand how complex and difficult international development and foreign aid can be from experience.” Building on this point, another student noted, “This project gave us the opportunity to see that reality on the ground is far more complicated [than it appears]... It allowed us to approach a level of discourse about important ideas that I think we had only touched on previously.”

By far the most common sentiment was that the assignment gave students a new appreciation for the complexity of international aid work—and the lack of simple, ready-made solutions. As one student commented, “I never could have imagined the myriad of political, economic, and societal issues that surrounded [the relief and reconstruction process].” Another student put it more succinctly: “There are simply no easy answers. As we saw today, every solution will draw valid criticism.” Even a student who was born and raised in a developing country said that the assignment taught her about the complexities of the development process: “Even though I lived in a developing country, it is hard for me to actually see the challenges and difficulties the country is facing... While working on this project, I realized it is really hard to help develop a country... It makes me rethink why some of the projects in Haiti failed even though there was a lot of funding available for them.”

Another common observation was that the simulation helped students understand the importance of local input and local buy-in in the context of international aid projects. As one student noted, “We must realize that local peoples’ voices are as important as NGOs’ and governments.” Another observed, “While planning this project, we realized we can’t develop a project without keeping the Haitians’ situations in our minds and the importance of local collaborations.” After reflecting on the experience and the lessons learned from the simulation, another student concluded simply: “It has to start with the people and their needs.”

Overall, these student responses suggest that the Haiti IDP simulation not only promoted feelings of increased global empathy, but for some students it also succeeded in challenging some of the key assumptions underlying the white savior complex. The qualitative responses corroborate the observed positive changes in our quantitative

indicators measuring global empathy (results for individual indicators are reported in Appendix F)--for example, questions GE14 “I can learn a lot from people with backgrounds and experiences that are different from mine” and GE15 “I think it’s important to hear others’ ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine” (Bachen et al 2012). These response reflect a desire and a recognition to ‘see the world as others see it’ (Wiseman 1996, 1165), exhibiting global empathy.

Moreover, the responses indicate that the simulation prompted some students to more highly value the input and agency of local "beneficiary" populations in developing countries, who are vital to the success of international aid interventions. It caused them to acknowledge the complexity of the development process and recognize what they don't know. It even prompted some to reconsider their own position of privilege as citizens of the Global North. This all suggests that the assignment may be an effective tool in challenging some of the underlying assumptions that perpetuate the white savior complex on American college campuses.

Improvements and Adaptations to Other Crises

In thinking about the evolution of this simulation, the authors have identified a few specific opportunities for improvement and adaptation in the future. First, the results of this study indicate that the success of the assignment depends in part on connecting the simulation to relevant course content. To ensure that students are prepared to engage with the simulation on a high level, and to facilitate meaningful connections between the simulation and the core theoretical concepts introduced in the course, the assignment is clearly most appropriate for courses about directly related subjects, such as international development, international political economy, international organizations, humanitarianism, etc.

The results also suggest that longer duration simulations may have a significant impact on student learning. In the cases analyzed here, the most successful iterations of the simulation imbedded the project in a course on a related topic, and devoted several weeks of course time to the assignment. However, even in the case of the 5-week timeline on Campus B, the simulation was active for only about one third of the semester-long course. Based on student feedback, we believe there may be real benefits to extending the timeline even further in the future, and to devoting even more in-class time

to the simulation. Clearly, these adaptations would involve trade-offs. However, a longer timeline would allow students to plan more effectively and dig deeper into the content of the simulation without resulting in a significant loss of course content, since the simulation can effectively run “in the background” while regular class meeting proceed as normal. Devoting more in-class time to the simulation is more difficult, but the authors’ experiences suggest that some of the most important moments for teaching and learning happen during critical conversations between students and instructors—as they talk through the challenges students are wrestling with, and the choices they are making. Thus, one clear way to improve the simulation is to imbed more structured opportunities for these types of interactions into its design.

Another area for adaptation concerns the in-class execution of the simulation. Through repeated iterations of this assignment (which was first run on Campus C in 2011), the authors have experimented with presentation styles and techniques when leading the simulation. While the simulation can be successfully executed in a “normal” classroom environment, students on our campuses have responded positively to innovations designed to enhance discussion and enrich the role-playing experience. For example, the instructor on Campus B began the capstone symposium at the end of the simulation with a session dedicated to establishing voting rules and other rules of procedure, and identified students during the symposium only by their stakeholder names. On Campus C, the instructor encouraged participants to dress in business attire, created a seating chart and name placards for the delegates, and acted in the role of panel chairman—delivering opening remarks, acting as timekeeper, and formally moderating discussion. Our experiences suggest that these strategies laid the groundwork for more successful class discussion, and encouraged the students to immerse themselves more fully in the simulation experience.

One of the great strengths of this simulation is its adaptability to other global political crises. While focused on post-earthquake Haiti, this format of a real-time problem-based policymaking simulation is readily adaptable to other global crises. The only firm requirement for adapting the simulation to an alternative setting is to identify a conflict that is currently in-process (i.e. it has not been resolved) in which identifiable factions with competing interests disagree about the best course of action. Of course, the

more background knowledge the instructor can bring to the assignment, the better. However, it is not necessary for an instructor to have intimate knowledge of the conflict to run a successful simulation.

Not only does the real-time nature of the simulation stimulate student interest, it allows students to research and identify new information and resources as part of the assignment. Rather than relying on the instructor for a carefully curated set of background materials, the students can become “experts” themselves, teaching each other and the instructor about the topic as the simulation plays out. For example, the creator of this Haiti-specific simulation is adapting the assignment to focus on the ongoing Syrian refugee crisis in the Middle East. The specific stakeholder groups will be modified to include key players in the policy process—namely, the governments of major refugee host countries (esp. Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon), and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which coordinates and oversees international aid to refugees. Further, the fictionalized policy proposal for addressing the crisis will be adapted to the specific conditions of the Syrian crisis. However, the fundamental core of the assignment—which requires students to adopt a stakeholder perspective, develop a policy position, and defend that position during the final symposium—will remain unchanged.

Conclusions

In addition to familiarizing students with the complex decisions facing local and international actors in humanitarian emergencies, our study aims to test whether an in-class simulation can produce measurable gains in global engagement among student participants. Based on data gathered from three campuses, the results suggest that simulations like the one described here can be useful tools to encourage greater awareness of global issues and promote feelings of global citizenship. Specifically, our findings suggest that such simulations can strengthen students’ global empathy and successfully mitigate attitudes associated with the white-savior industrial complex (Cole 2012). Significantly, this outcome appears to be closely related to the duration of the simulation and the content of the course in which it is applied, though we cannot conclusively say which of these factors led to greater positive results in the courses where they were tested. While short-term simulations have been found to positively affect long-

term attitudes (Mills and Smith 2004), students may not reap the full benefits of a ‘real-time’ problem-based simulation without ample time to immerse themselves in the scenario. It is clear that relevant course content is critical to enhancing the benefits of this type of simulation. Building a strong base of related knowledge may make students better equipped to make connections between theory and practice and to immerse themselves in the “complexities of process” (Wedig 2010), shifting the burden of learning from content to process while completing assignments and participating in activities during the active phase of the simulation. That said, the desired learning outcomes of this simulation are strongly correlated with learning outcomes for the courses in which it was implemented. Therefore while our experimental design allows us to identify the effects of the simulation over time, we cannot isolate the effect of good course instruction, as both course objectives and timeframe align with the simulation’s timeframe. It may be possible that the teaching effectiveness of the instructors on Campuses A, B, and C enhanced students’ ability to achieve particular learning outcomes independent of the simulation.

More generally, it appears that real-time problem based simulations like the one described here may be useful tools for achieving desired student learning outcomes connected to specific attitudes and skills rather than content knowledge, as those outcomes are more likely to be achieved through an emphasis on process (Asal and Blake 2006). Further assessment is needed to evaluate the effect of simulation design (e.g. real-time versus historical) and implementation strategies (e.g. holding a policymaking summit with student-created rules or meetings with the instructor) on categories of learning outcomes. For example, real-time simulations of problems or crises in other parts of the world like the one presented here may be better suited to enhance global empathy (an attitude), while simulations within established organizational systems with existing rules such as those involving the United Nations may be better suited to enhance skills (e.g. communication and negotiation). Continuing to explore and delineate the specific skills, content knowledge, and/or attitudes that are likely to be enhanced by different simulations will enable educators to better match available simulations with desired learning outcomes and, in the long-term, build more effective simulations.

References

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (AAC&U). No date. *Strategic Plan 2013-2017: Big Questions, Urgent Challenges: Liberal Education And Americans' Global Future*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities. Available at <http://www.aacu.org/about/strategicplan> (Accessed December 1, 2013).

ASAL, VICTOR. (2005) Playing Games with International Relations. *International Studies Perspectives* 6: 359- 373.

ASAL, VICTOR, AND ELIZABETH L. BLAKE. (2006) Creating Simulations for Political Science Education. *Journal of Political Science Education* 2 (1): 1-18.

ASAL, VICTOR, AND JAYSON KRATOVILLE. (2013) Constructing International Relations Simulations: Examining the Pedagogy of IR Simulations Through a Constructivist Learning Theory Lens. *Journal Of Political Science Education* 9 (2): 132-143.

ATKESON, LONNA RAE. (2003) Not All Cues Are Created Equal: The Conditional Impact of Female Candidates on Political Engagement. *The Journal of Politics* 65 (04): 1040-1061.

BACHEN, CHRISTINE M., PEDRO F. HERNÁNDEZ-RAMOS AND CHAD RAPHAEL. (2012) Simulating REAL LIVES: Promoting Global Empathy and Interest in Learning Through Simulation Games. *Simulation & Gaming* 43 (4): 437-460.

BEERS, DANIEL. (2013) Policymaking in Post-Earthquake Haiti: A Real-Time Classroom Simulation. Paper presented at the annual Teaching & Learning Conference of the American Political Science Association, Long Beach, CA, February 8-10, 2013.

BREWER, MARILYNN B. (1979) In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 86 (2): 307-324.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS, CAROLYN. (2010) *Empathy in the Global World: An Intercultural Perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT (CCCM) Cluster. 2011) Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) Return Survey: Initial Results. *International Organization for Migration*. Available at http://www.cccmhaiti.info/pdf/IDP_Return_Survey_Narrative_Report_March_2011_FIN

AL.pdf (Accessed December 1, 2012).

CARTER, DUNCAN, GIL LATZ, PATRICIA M. THORNTON. (2010) Through a New Lens: Assessing International Learning at Portland State University. *JGE: The Journal of General Education* 59(3): 172-181.

COLE, TEJU. (2012) The White Savior Industrial Complex. *The Atlantic*. Mar 21 2012, 7:15 AM ET. Available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/> (Accessed December 1, 2014).

COLLIER, DAVID, FERNANDO DANIEL HIDALGO AND ANDRA OLIVIA MACIUCEANU. (2006) Essentially contested concepts: Debates and applications, *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11 (3): 211–246.

CONNOLLY, WILLIAM E. (1993) *The Terms of Political Discourse* (3rd ed. The first published in 1974). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

CROOKALL, D. (2003) Guest Editorial: International Relations and Simulation. *Simulation & Gaming* 34: 221-225.

CRUZ, BÁRBARA C. AND JENNIFER MARQUES PATTERSON. (2005) “Cross-Cultural Simulations in Teacher Education: Developing Empathy and Understanding,” *Multicultural Perspectives* 7(2): 40-47.

DUNCAN, ARNE (2013). Building a Stronger Pipeline of Globally-Competent Citizens. *U.S. Department of Education*, November 18. Available at <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/building-stronger-pipeline-globally-competent-citizens> (Accessed June 10, 2015).

EASTERLY, WILLIAM. (2007) *The White Man’s Burden. Why the West’s Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done SO Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York: Penguin Press.

ECOSOC. (2014) “Economic and Social Council Takes Action on Haiti, South Sudan; Considers Information and Communications Technology Access, Security” 2014 Session, 52nd & 53rd Meetings (AM & PM) ECOSOC/6652. November 18, 2014.

ECOSOC. (2014a) “Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti” E/2014/95. October 8, 2014.

EDDY, PAMELA L., JAMES P. BARBER, NEAL HOLLY, KIM BRUSH, LESLIE BOHON AND MADELEINE F. GREEN. (2013) Internationalizing a Campus: From

Colonial to Modern Times. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 45(6): 43-50.

FOWLER, SANDRA M. AND MARGARET D. PUSCH (2010) Intercultural Simulation Games: A Review (of the United States and Beyond). *Simulation & Gaming* 41(1): 94-115.

GALLIE, W. B. (1955-1956) Essentially contested concepts. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56: 167 – 198.

GALLIE, W. B. (1956) Art as an essentially contested concept. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 6: 97 – 114.

GILLESPIE, SUSAN (2002) The Practice of International Education in the Context of Globalization: A Critique. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 6(3): 262-267.

HERSHEY, MEGAN, AND MICHAEL ARTIME. (2014) Narratives of Africa in a Digital World: Kony 2012 and Student Perceptions of Conflict and Agency in Sub-Saharan Africa. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (3): 636-641.

HILLYGUS, D. SUNSHINE. (2005) The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior* 27 (1): 25-47.

HOCHSCHILD, JENNIFER L., AND CHARLES LANG. (2011) Including Oneself and Including Others: Who Belongs in My Country? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 634: 78–97.

HEUBERGER BARBARA, DIANE GERBER AND REED ANDERSON. (1999) Strength through Cultural Diversity: Developing and Teaching a Diversity Course. *College Teaching* 47 (3): 107-113.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM). (2011) *Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) Return Survey: Initial Results*. Available at http://www.eshelter-cccmhaiti.info/pdf/IDP_Return_Survey_Narrative_Report_March_2011_FINAL.pdf (Accessed December 1, 2012).

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM). 2015. “Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM).” International Organization for Migration. Available at <http://iomhaitidataportal.info/dtm/> (Accessed January 5, 2015).

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM). (2014) Four and a

half years after devastating quake, 92 per cent of displaced population has left camps in Haiti” Available at <http://www.iom.int/cms/en/sites/iom/home/news-and-views/press-briefing-notes/pbn-2014b/pbn-listing/four-and-a-half-years-after-deva.html> (Accessed December 1, 2014).

LAWRENCE, EJ, P. SHAW, D. BAKER, S. BARON-COHEN, AND A.S. DAVID. (2004) Measuring empathy: reliability and validity of the Empathy Quotient. *Psychological Medicine* 34: 911–924.

MILLS, VANESSA AND REBEKAH SMITH. (2004). Short- and Long-term Effects of Participation in a Crosscultural Simulation Game on Intercultural Awareness. *Australian Government Department of Defense DSTO-TR-1636*. Available at <http://digext6.defence.gov.au/dspace/bitstream/1947/3927/1/DSTO-TR-1636%20PR.pdf> (Accessed June 10, 2015).

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ENVOY FOR HAITI. (2011) IOM: Fewer Haitians Leaving Displacement Camps Than Before. Press release, June 23, 2011. Available at <http://www.haitispecialenvoy.org/pressand-media/press-releases/fewer-haitians-leaving-displacement-camps/> (Accessed November 1, 2012).

OLDS, KRIS. (2012) Global citizenship: What are we talking about and why does it matter? *Inside Higher Ed*, March 11. Available at <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/globalhighered/global-citizenship-%E2%80%93-what-are-we-talking-about-and-why-does-it-matter> (Accessed February 1, 2015).

QIANG, ZHA. (2003) Internationalization of Higher Education. *Policy Futures in Education* 1 (2): 248-270.

SCHATTLE, HANS. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*, edited by Ross Lewin. New York: Routledge.

SCHNURR, MATTHEW A., ELIZABETH DE SANTO, AND RACHAEL CRAIG. (2012) Using a Blended Learning Approach to Simulate the Negotiation of a Multilateral Environmental Agreement. *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (2): 109-120.

SCHNURR, MATTHEW A., ELIZABETH M. DE SANTO, AND AMANDA D. GREEN. (2014) What do students learn from a role-play simulation of an international negotiation? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 38 (3): 401-414.

SCHWARTZ, TIMOTHY. (2011) Building Assessments and Rubble Removal in Quake-Affected Neighborhoods in Haiti. Technical report commissioned by USAID Haiti. May 13, 2011. Available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADY468.pdf

TAJFEL, HENRI. (1970) Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination. *Scientific American* 223 (5): 96-102.

TREVELYAN, LAURA. (2013) Fear that slum will replace earthquake camps in Haiti. BBC News. June 20, 2013. Available at <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-22992359>

UNITED NATIONS (UN). 2014. UN rights expert urges durable solutions for Haiti's displaced, vulnerable. UN News Centre. July 4, 2014. Available at <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=48205#.Vlf-eKaiqXQ>.

WANG, YUE-WEI, M. M. DAVIDSON, O.F. YAKUSHKO, H.B. SAVOY, J.A. TAN, AND J.K. BLEIER (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 50: 221-234.

WEDIG, TIMOTHY. (2010) Getting the Most from Classroom Simulations: Strategies for Maximizing Learning Outcomes. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (3): 547-555.

WISEMAN, THERESA. (1996) A concept analysis of empathy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 23: 1162-1167.

YOUDE, JEREMY. (2008) Crushing Their Dreams? Simulations and Student Idealism. *International Studies Perspectives* 9 (3): 348-356.

ZAPPILE, TINA. (2013) "Connecting a Simulation to Student Outcomes: ICONS and Global Awareness." Paper presented at the annual Teaching & Learning Conference of the American Political Science Association, Long Beach, CA, February 8-10, 2013.

ZIDOR, KENDI. (2012) In Canaan, Haiti Unsupervised Building Creates Danger. International Center for Journalists. August 2, 2012. Available at <http://www.icfj.org/news/canaan-haiti-unsupervised-building-creates-danger>

APPENDIX A: Haiti IDP Simulation Assignments

Assignment 1: Play one of the following simulations up to three times or until “winning,” whichever comes first:

- <http://ayiti.globalkids.org/game/>
- <http://www.insidedisaster.com/experience/Main.html#>

Write a response that is equivalent to at least one page to one of the following questions:

- What were the most helpful and harmful choices that you made in the Ayiti game? Why were they helpful or harmful? What does the structure and outcome of the game tell you about decision making by impoverished Haitians?
- Which role – journalist, victim, or aid worker – did you choose in the Inside Disaster simulation? What were the effects of the decisions you made? Were these effects expected? Why?

Assignment 2: Read:

- Valerie Kaussen, “States of Exception – Haiti’s IDP Camps,” *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine* 62, 9, February 2011, p. 37-42.
- “Haiti Earthquake Victims Evicted From Tent Camps,” BBC, 24 April 2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-22275857>.
- Office of the Secretary-General’s Special Advisor on Community-Based Medicine & Lessons from Haiti, “IOM: Fewer Haitians Leaving Displacement Camps Than Before,” June 23, 2011, <http://www.haitispecialenvoy.org/press-and-media/press-releases/fewer-haitians-leaving-displacement-camps/>

Write a response that is equivalent to at least one page to the following question:

What is the main problem in the management of the IDP camps in Haiti? Why is this the main problem?

Assignment 3: Read at least two of the items listed for your interest group (at least one must be a scholarly journal article; these are marked with an *). You are welcome to do additional reading/research, but you must reference what is assigned to your group in your writing.

Write a policy proposal that is no longer than three pages that conforms to your group’s objectives. The proposal should be framed as an argument that will persuade the panel of experts to implement a policy that is aligned with the objectives specified for your group.

Your proposal should clearly and concisely:

- Identify the existing problem and its cause(s).
- Identify a solution to the problem that aligns with your objectives.
- Explain the specific steps required to implement the solution.
- Present the argument for why your recommendation is better than alternatives.

In addition to submitting your essay as Assignment 3, post a copy in your group's Canvas

work area so that your teammate(s) can read it.

Assignment 4: Using your group's Canvas work area, collaborate with the other member(s) of your interest group on a joint policy proposal that is 3-4 pages long. Your proposal should present a plan for the IDP camps that conforms to your interest group's objectives. In this proposal, your job is to convince others that your team has the best plan. Be sure to support your argument with references to readings for the simulation. In addition to your group submitting this proposal as Assignment 4, one member of your group needs to post a copy of it in the online discussion for the class. Read the proposals of the other groups so that you can comment on them.

Assignment 5: In this assignment you will be evaluating the performance of yourself and your teammate(s). For each member of your team (including yourself), assign a score (a score of 1 being the person who made the most valuable contribution) and *discuss the reasons for the score*. Each member of your team must be given a different score. For example, if your group has three members, you will rate each member from most to least valuable with a 1, 2, or 3, but each number can be used only once. Remember -- a score of 1 means most valuable contribution.

Assignment 6: Read at least one of the following:

- Philippe R. Girard, *Paradise Lost: Haiti's Tumultuous Journey from Pearl of the Caribbean to Third World Hot Spot*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2005, p. 200-213 [E-reserve].*
- Anthony Oliver-Smith, "Haiti and the Historical Construction of Disasters," *NACLA Report On the Americas*, 43, 4, July/August 2010, p. 32-36.*

Write a short essay on the following: Will the policy recommended to the panel of experts (the plan created by the class), if implemented, do anything to prevent or mitigate the effects of a future earthquake-related disaster? Or will the problem of IDPs and IDP camps occur again? Why?

Appendix B: Reading List for Stakeholder Groups

Haitian IDP Camp Residents

- Phillip Wearne, “Beyond Relief, Beyond Belief,” *New Internationalist* 449, January/February 2012, p. 14-19.*
- Mark Schuller, “‘They Forgot about Us!’ Gender and Haiti’s IDP Camps, Interview and Translation,” *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 11, 1, April 2011, p. 149-157.*
- Deborah Sontag, “Rebuilding in Haiti Lags After Billions in Post-Quake Aid,” *The New York Times*, December 21, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/24/world/americas/in-aiding-quake-battered-haiti-lofty-hopes-and-hard-truths.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>

Employees of Foreign Humanitarian Relief Organizations

- Michael J. Hopmeier, Jean William Pape, David Paulison, Richard Carmona, Tim Davis, Kobi Koleg, Gili Shenhar, Colleen Conway-Welch, Sten H. Vermund, Janet Nicotera, and Arthur L. Kellerman, “Reflections on the Initial Multinational Response to the Earthquake in Haiti,” *Population Health Management* 13, 3, 2010, p. 105-113.*
- Hanna Mattinen and Kate Ogden, “Cash-based interventions: lessons from southern Somalia,” *Disasters* 30, 3, 2006, p. 297-315.*
- Phillip Nieburg et al., “Evacuated populations: lessons from foreign refugee crises,” *New England Journal of Medicine* 353, 15, October 12, 2005, p. 1547-1549.*

Haitian Government Officials

- Robert B. Zoellick, “How to Rebuild Haiti,” *Current*, 43, 4, March/April 2010, p. 34-35 (*reprinted from Politico*).*
- Alex Dupuy, “Disaster Capitalism to the Rescue: The International Community and Haiti After the Earthquake,” *NACLA Report On the Americas*, 43, 4, July/August 2010, p. 14-19.*
- Christine Mikolajuk, “Thanks but no thanks: the other face of international humanitarian aid,” *Harvard International Review*, Winter 2005.*
- Louise C. Ivers, “A Chance to Right a Wrong in Haiti,” *The New York Times*, February 23, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/23/opinion/a-chance-to-right-a-wrong-in-haiti.html?_r=0&adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1361615295-5IRSmyA9tLfNjphJwMq4Sg
- Jim Kennedy et al., “The Meaning of ‘build back better’: evidence from post-tsunami Aceh and Sri Lanka,” *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 16, 1, March 2008, p. 24-36.*

Haitian Business Owners

- Alex Dupuy, “Disaster Capitalism to the Rescue: The International Community and Haiti After the Earthquake,” *NACLA Report On the Americas*, 43, 4, July/August 2010, p. 14-19.*
- Coco McCabe, “Haiti’s entrepreneurs keep life going,” Parts 1 & 2, *First Person*, Oxfam America, January 28, 2010, <http://firstperson.oxfamamerica.org/2010/01/28/haitis-entrepreneurs-keep-life-going/>
- “Haiti tackles business reforms to boost recovery, job creation,” *News & Views*, The World Bank, November 5, 2012, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/05/business-haiti-recovery-jobs>
- Charlie Cray, “Disaster profiteering: the flood of crony contracting following Hurricane Katrina,” *Multinational Monitor Survey*, September/October 2005, p. 19-24.*

- Jason Beaubien, “Will ‘Made In Haiti’ Factories Improve Life In Haiti?,” NPR, February 14, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/2013/02/14/170783895/will-made-in-haiti-factories-improve-life-in-haiti>
- Henri-Claude Müller-Poitevien, “Haiti’s Battle to Shake Off a Poor Reputation,” The Huffington Post, July 8, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/henriclaude-mullerHenri-Claude%20M%C3%BCllerPoitevien/haitis-battle-to-shake-of_b_1657699.html?

Haitian Landowners

- Maura O’Connor, “Two Years Later, Haitian Earthquake Death Toll in Dispute,” *Columbia Journalism Review*, January 12, 2012, http://www.cjr.org/behind_the_news/one_year_later_haitian_earthqu.php?page=all&print=true
- Maura R. O’Connor, “A Quake-Scarred Nation Tries a Rural Road to Recovery,” *The New York Times*, December 24, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/25/world/americas/in-countryside-stricken-haiti-seeks-both-food-and-rebirth.html?ref=global-home&pagewanted=all&r=0>
- Deborah Sontag, “Rebuilding in Haiti Lags After Billions in Post-Quake Aid,” *The New York Times*, December 21, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/24/world/americas/in-aiding-quake-battered-haiti-lofty-hopes-and-hard-truths.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>
- Anthony Oliver-Smith, “Haiti and the Historical Construction of Disasters,” *NACLA Report On the Americas*, 43, 4, July/August 2010, p. 32-36.*

Employees of Human Rights, Environmental, and Social Justice Organizations

- Beverly Bell, “‘We Bend, but We Don’t Break’: Fighting for a Just Reconstruction in Haiti,” *NACLA Report On the Americas*, 43, 4, July/August 2010, p. 28-31.*
- Elizabeth Gibbons and Richard Garfield, “The Impact of Economic Sanctions on Health and Human Rights in Haiti, 1991-1994,” *American Journal of Public Health* 89, 10, October 1999, p. 1499-1504.*
- Michele Wucker, “Haiti: So Many Missteps,” *World Policy Journal* 21, 1, Spring 2004, p. 41-49.*
- Louise C. Ivers, “A Chance to Right a Wrong in Haiti,” *The New York Times*, February 23, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/23/opinion/a-chance-to-right-a-wrong-in-haiti.html?_r=0&adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1361615295-5IRSmyA9tLfNjphJwMq4Sg

Appendix C: Descriptive Statistics for Student Sample

	Undergraduates	Graduates
Number of students	57	10
Average age of students	21.14 (median = 20)	33.67 (median = 32)
Percent Male	52.24	40
Average no. of times traveled outside of U.S.	4.43 (median = 3)	35.8 (median = 24.5)*
Percentage of students who visited family outside of U.S.	45.61	30
Percentage of students with family from developing country	15.79	30
Percentage of U.S. citizens	82.46	90

* For graduate students, responses ranged from 3 to 150; three graduate students reported traveling outside the U.S. fewer than 20 times. The average drops to 23.11 when excluding the student who reported 150 visits outside the U.S.

APPENDIX D: Survey Instruments for Global Empathy and Civic/Political Engagement

Political Engagement Scale⁶

(strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

1. I am interested in political issues.
2. I think it is important to understand history, politics and contemporary social issues.
3. I would be willing to give up some free time to work for a political or social cause.

(very often, sometimes, rarely, never)

4. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: read a newspaper or watched/listened to television/radio news?
5. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: attended a political meeting, rally, fundraiser or other political event?
6. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: participated in a protest, march or public demonstration?
7. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: talked about politics or government with family or friends?
8. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: volunteered to work without pay for a civic or community organization?
9. Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: contacted a public official (including by email) to express your opinion?

Global Empathy Scale⁷

(strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

1. I am aware of how the political and social rights (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) of people in other countries can be quite different from my own.
2. I am aware that people in other countries can have their freedoms or rights taken away.
3. I am aware of political, social, and economic barriers that lead to discrimination of people in other countries.
4. It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person living in a different country than my own.
5. I can relate to the frustration that some people of different countries feel about having

⁶ All nine of these political/civic engagement questions are directly cited from the ‘community engagement’ section of the Bachen et al (2012) survey instrument and slightly adapted for our sample of college students as the Bachen (2012) sample was under 18.

⁷ Questions # 1-11 are directly cited from Bachen et al’s (2012) global empathy scale; questions #12, 13, & 16 are directly cited control items from their instrument; questions #14 and 15 are directly cited items from their “Interest in Future Learning about other Countries” variable (Bachen et al 2012, 9); question #17 is original.

- fewer opportunities due to the economic, political, or social circumstances of their countries.
6. I feel motivated to help promote changes that improve people's living conditions in different parts of the world.
 7. I am likely to participate in events that promote equal rights for people in other countries.
 8. I feel supportive of those in other countries who may experience injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background.
 9. I can see myself taking action (e.g., signing a petition or sending money) to help those in another country who are experiencing discrimination because of their political or social background.
 10. I share the anger of those in other countries who face injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background.
 11. I feel that being actively involved in global or international issues is my responsibility.
 12. It is difficult for me to relate to stories about the political or social discrimination people from different countries face in their day-to-day lives. (answer set flipped for coding)
 13. I know a lot of information about social and political events that happen in countries other than my own.
 14. I can learn a lot from people with backgrounds and experiences that are different from mine.
 15. I think it's important to hear others' ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine.
 16. It is difficult for me to relate to people in other countries whose political rights or economic opportunities are quite different from my own. (answer set flipped for coding)
 17. I am interested in working in a country where injustice, discrimination, or poverty is common.

Additional Controls⁸

1. What is your age? (I am ____ years old)
2. What is your gender? F/M
3. Are you a citizen of the USA? Y/N
4. Approximately how in your life have you traveled outside of the USA?]
5. Have you ever visited family members outside of the US? Y/N
6. If your answer to the previous question was "yes" (I have visited family members outside the USA), in which country or countries did the visit(s) occur?

⁸ These additional controls were also adapted from the Bachen et al (2012) instrument.

Appendix E: Focus Group Questions⁹

Preamble: The following questions will be asked to the entire group with responses recorded anonymously. These questions are asking if your attitudes towards these issues have changed as a result of your experience of representing stakeholders in a country outside your own in the simulation you just completed.

1. Are you more aware of how the political and social rights (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) of people in other countries can be quite different from your own? Why or why not?
2. Are you more aware that people in other countries can have their freedoms or rights taken away? Why or why not?
3. Are you more aware of political, social, and economic barriers that lead to discrimination of people in other countries? Why or why not?
4. It is easier for you to understand what it would feel like to be a person living in a different country than your own? Why or why not?
5. Can you relate more to the frustration that some people of different countries feel about having fewer opportunities due to the economic, political, or social circumstances of their countries? Why or why not?
6. Do you feel more motivated now to help promote changes that improve people's living conditions in different parts of the world? Why or why not?
7. Are you more likely to participate in events that promote equal rights for people in other countries? Why or why not?
8. Are you more supportive of those in other countries who may experience injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background? Why or why not?
9. Can you see yourself taking action (e.g., signing a petition or sending money) to help those in another country who are experiencing discrimination because of their political or social background? Why or why not?
10. Do you share the anger of those in other countries who face injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background? Why or why not?
11. Do you feel that being actively involved in global or international issues is your responsibility?
12. Is it difficult for you to relate to stories about the political or social discrimination people from different countries face in their day-to-day lives? Why or why not?
13. Do you know a lot of information about social and political events that happen in countries other than your own?
14. Can you learn a lot from people with backgrounds and experiences that are different from your own?
15. Do you think it's important to hear others' ideas even if you find their ideas very different from your own? Why or why not?
16. Is it more or less difficult for you to relate to people in other countries whose political rights or economic opportunities are quite different from your own? Why or why not?
17. Are you any more interested in working in a country where injustice, discrimination, or poverty is common?

⁹ These questions are directly cited from Bachen et al (2012); see notes in Appendix D for the specific citation for each question.

Appendix F: Group Means and Paired T-Test Results for Global Empathy

Subset 2: Students in courses with related content AND an extended simulation period
(n= 38)

GLOBAL EMPATHY INDICATORS	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	Pre/Post Change	Paired t-test t-value
GE1: I am aware of how the political and social rights (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) of people in other countries can be quite different from my own. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.63	5.66	+0.03	0.24
GE2: I am aware that people in other countries can have their freedoms or rights taken away. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.76	5.789	+0.026	0.255
GE3: I am aware of political, social, and economic barriers that lead to discrimination of people in other countries. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.579	5.789	+0.21	2.249*
GE4: It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person living in a different country than my own. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.18	4.316	+0.131	0.68
GE5: I can relate to the frustration that some people of different countries feel about having fewer opportunities due to the economic, political, or social circumstances of their countries. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.289	4.474	+0.18	0.827
GE6: I feel motivated to help promote changes that improve people's living conditions in different parts of the world. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.21	5.16	-0.05	0.39
GE7: I am likely to participate in events that promote equal rights for people in other countries. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.63	4.63	0	0
GE8: I feel supportive of those in other countries who may experience injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.42	5.5	+0.079	0.72
GE9: I can see myself taking action (e.g., signing a petition or sending money) to help those in another country who are experiencing discrimination because of their political or social background. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.97	5	+0.03	0.22
GE10: I share the anger of those in other countries who face injustice because of their political or social (e.g., ethnic, racial, or gender) background. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.789	5.184	+0.395	3.08**

GE11: I feel that being actively involved in global or international issues is my responsibility. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.84	4.95	+0.11	0.73
GE12: It is difficult for me to relate to stories about the political or social discrimination people from different countries face in their day-to-day lives. [<i>Disagree=1; Agree=6</i>]	3.42	3.37	-0.05	0.31
GE13: I know a lot of information about social and political events that happen in countries other than my own. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.26	4.868	+0.605	4.36***
GE14: I can learn a lot from people with backgrounds and experiences that are different from mine. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.63	5.74	+0.11	1.00
GE15: I think it's important to hear others' ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.737	5.816	+0.08	0.9
GE16: It is difficult for me to relate to people in other countries whose political rights or economic opportunities are quite different from my own. [<i>Disagree=1; Agree=6</i>]	3.71	3.71	0	0
GE17: I am interested in working in a country where injustice, discrimination, or poverty is common. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	4.44	4.66	+0.21	1.24
COMPOSITE INDEX [Positive=12; Negative=26]	82.526	84.605	+2.0789	2.11*

Notes: *p<0.10, **p<0.05, ***p<0.001

Appendix G: Group Means and Paired T-Test Results for Political and Civic Engagement

Subset 2: Students in courses with related content AND an extended simulation period
(n= 38)

POLITICAL/CIVIC ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	Pre/Post Change	Paired t-test t-value
PE1: I am interested in political issues. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.47	5.45	-0.026	0.2059
PE2: I think it is important to understand history, politics and contemporary social issues. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.71	5.84	+0.132	1.959
PE3: I would be willing to give up some free time to work for a political or social cause. [Agree=6; disagree=1]	5.18	5.13	-0.053	0.42
PE4: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: read a newspaper or watched/listened to television/radio news? [Often=4; never=1]	3.55	3.711	+0.158	2.229*
PE5: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: attended a political meeting, rally, fundraiser or other political event? [Often=4; never=1]	2.13	2.18	-0.053	0.403
PE6: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: participated in a protest, march or public demonstration? [Often=4; never=1]	1.289	1.737	+0.447	3.468**
PE7: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: talked about politics or government with family or friends? [Often=4; never=1]	3.71	3.63	-0.08	1
PE8: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: volunteered to work without pay for a civic or community organization? [Often=4; never=1]	2.48	2.58	+0.13	0.868
PE9: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often have you engaged in the following: contacted a public official (including by email) to express your opinion? [Often=4; never=1]	1.47	1.58	+0.11	1.07
COMPOSITE INDEX [Positive = 29; Negative = 9]	30.97	31.84	+0.868	2.54*

Notes: *p<0.10, **p<0.05, ***p<0.001