

2012 Global Perspectives Inventory Administration Results

Introduction/Administration

In spring 2012, UGA administered the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) as a tool to assess student learning and development regarding global and intercultural awareness as defined in the learning outcomes for the World Languages and Culture portion of UGA's Core Curriculum Area IV. A list of the learning outcomes for Area IV can be found in Appendix A, and the alignment of those outcomes with GPI questions is presented in Appendix B. The GPI was first piloted in spring 2011 as a potential measure for assessing this area of the Core. The 2011 pilot yielded minimal response rates; therefore, the GPI was administered again in spring 2012 with changes to sampling procedures as described below.

The following research questions have guided both the 2011 and 2012 administrations of the GPI:

1. Do UGA students who have completed Area IV of the Core Curriculum indicate comparable or more developed perspectives on global and intercultural awareness than peers?
2. Do students completing Area IV of the Core Curriculum with different types of courses indicate different levels of developed perspectives on global and intercultural awareness?

The population of students surveyed consisted of juniors who had already completed or were currently enrolled in their last course of the three required courses for this section of the Core Curriculum. All students who fell into this category (N=3161) were surveyed. Those who responded and gave consent to access their course records were divided into three subgroups according to the types of courses they completed to satisfy Area IV of the Core Curriculum:

- All language courses (Lang)
- No language courses (NL)
- A combination of language and humanities courses (Mixed)

The survey was administered electronically and was open from April 16, 2012 through May 4, 2012. Personalized emails were sent to students in the targeted population to request their

participation. Students were asked to complete the survey online via a link included in the request email, and reminder emails were sent throughout the administration period.

A total of 236 students participated in the GPI in 2012, marking an increase over 2011 (N=64). The response distribution of participants by group is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. GPI Sample Groups and Response Rates

Group	# Responses	Total Population	Response Rate
All Language (Lang)	87	865	10.06 %
No Language (NL)	15	316	4.75%
Combination of both (Mixed)	134	1980	6.77%

Results

GPI Domains

The GPI results are organized into thematic domains, with measurement scales in each domain (see Appendix C for definitions). In Table 1, scales in bold represent those most closely aligned with the learning outcomes defined for the World Languages and Culture portion of UGA's Core Curriculum Area IV. The scores are reported for the three student subgroups, as described above, as well as the UGA mean of all students responding, and, for comparison, a Norm Group reported by the GPI. The norm group consists of students (N=9,351) at 20 public, doctoral level institutions who have taken the GPI between August 2008 and December 2011.

Table 2. GPI Domains/Scales Mean Scores, UGA and Norm Group

GPI Domain	Mix (n=134)	Lang (n=87)	NL (n=15)	UGA (n=236)	Norm Group (n=9351)
Cognitive Knowing	3.74	3.76	3.39	3.72	3.56
Cognitive Knowledge	3.74	3.65	3.57	3.70	3.63
Intrapersonal Identity	4.11	4.06	4.22	4.10	4.13
Intrapersonal Affect	3.88	3.81	3.82	3.85	3.81
Interpersonal Social Responsibility	3.75	3.61	3.51	3.69	3.66
Interpersonal Social Interaction	3.51	3.54	3.23	3.50	3.54
Community	3.98	3.85	3.74	3.92	na

Comparison to Norm Group

Results for the first research question, regarding UGA's performance compared to peers, indicate that UGA scored higher than the Norm Group in the GPI Domains of Cognitive Knowing,

Cognitive Knowledge, Intrapersonal Affect, and Interpersonal Social Responsibility. A one-sample t-test (see Appendix D) on scores of these domains revealed that only the Cognitive Knowing domain test scores of the UGA group were significantly higher than the scores of the Norm Group. The two domains in which UGA scored lower than the Norm Group, Intrapersonal Identity and Interpersonal Social Interaction, are domains that are least aligned with the Area IV General Education learning outcomes. Neither of the differences in these domains was statistically significant.

Subgroup mean comparisons

The second research question addressed the difference in scores between the Language, No Language and Mixed subgroups. The GPI means were higher for UGA students in the Mixed group than for students in the Language group in three of the four domains most closely aligned with Area IV outcomes: Cognitive Knowledge, Intrapersonal Affect, Interpersonal Social Responsibility. However, independent-sample t-tests indicate that differences between the domain scores of the Mixed and Language groups were not statistically significant. Although the No Language group appears to have significantly lower scores in several domains, the low response rate for that group (N=15) make it impossible to draw reliable comparisons between that group and the other subgroups.

Discussion

Results from the 2012 GPI administration indicate that UGA students perform as well or better than students at the institutions in the Norm Group. Furthermore, the higher number of responses this year allows for more detailed comparisons of student respondents in the All Language and Mixed groups. Results from the No Language group, while too few to draw reliable conclusions, suggest that the role of language study in promoting global awareness may be a useful area for focused research. However, the lack of significant difference between subgroups with adequate sample sizes suggests that the specific courses UGA students take in Area IV may not be the primary factor in their development in this area.

This finding corresponds to a clear shortcoming of using the GPI as a measure of curricular learning, especially as currently administered. The GPI is not designed as a focused measure of curricular learning. Rather, it measures levels of global understanding that may be the result of many college experiences, both in and out of the classroom. The pilot administrations at UGA did not control for a variety of potential experiences that could affect learning in this area, including participation in study abroad, service-learning, courses taken outside Area IV that have similar learning outcomes, or a myriad of extracurricular and socio-cultural factors. In addition, the “snapshot” of students at a particular moment in their college experience provides no information about student growth over time.

Additionally, there are indications that variability in students' comprehension of the GPI items may reduce the validity of the results. Feedback elicited by at a round table discussion at the 2012 Southern Association of Institutional Research¹ conference confirms this possibility. Researchers from other colleges and universities that use GPI agreed that students may not completely understand the context and meaning of some of the GPI questions. UGA may wish to explore the issue of the internal validity of the GPI before subsequent administration of this measure.

Also to be noted, two of the Area IV outcomes mention language and/or linguistics as a component of the outcome. The concepts of linguistic skills or language learning are not covered under the scope of the GPI (see again Appendix B). Measures should be considered for evaluation of these outcomes to provide the most accurate assessment of this area of the UGA Core Curriculum.

Future Assessment

As previously stated, the GPI results indicate that UGA students possess global perspectives as they complete Area IV of the Core Curriculum that compare well with peers. The GPI results do not, however, indicate the specific contributions of Area IV courses to this perspective, nor do they indicate whether students have experienced growth over time in this area. For these reasons, if UGA wishes to continue using the GPI as a measure of learning in Area IV of the Core Curriculum, a number of changes should be considered so that the instrument can provide more useful information. Changes to consider include:

- Revised administration protocols, such as in-class administration, that will increase sample sizes
- Research designs that better control for other factors that may affect the outcomes measured
- Research designs that measure student growth in these outcomes over time
- Identification and use of additional quantitative and qualitative measures that can triangulate and deepen our understanding of student learning in these areas

In addition, since Area IV learning outcomes currently include linguistic skills and language learning and the GPI items do not address these skills, a full assessment of this area of the Core Curriculum should include additional measures to evaluate these outcomes. Faculty from disciplines such as linguistics, foreign languages, speech communication, and other relevant

¹ Parker, M.C. (2012, September). *Global Perspective Inventory – Assessing Global Perspectives on Campus*. Round Table Discussion hosted at the annual conference of the Southern Association of Institutional Research, Orlando, FL.

fields may be able to provide input regarding appropriate measures for addressing linguistic skill and language proficiency as intended in the Area IV outcomes.

UGA should also consider a separate, focused investigation of the various factors contributing to the development of global perspectives. Such a study could build on collaborations currently under way with the Office of International Education and study abroad directors and could include professionals from the Office of Service Learning and the Division of Student Affairs to provide a deeper understanding of how UGA students develop global perspectives both in and out of the classroom.

In summary, while the GPI results are generally positive for UGA students, they do not provide a comprehensive understanding of student learning in Area IV of the UGA Core Curriculum. The Office of Academic Planning recommends that UGA administration, in collaboration with faculty responsible for core areas of the curriculum, review this report and work together to determine the best plan for assessing the learning outcomes defined for Area IV of the UGA General Education Core Curriculum.

Appendix A:

From UGA *Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 14, General Education Curriculum*
(Effective Fall 2008)

IV. World Languages and Culture, Humanities and the Arts (12 hours)

World Languages, Culture, Literature, and the Arts will be characterized by an understanding and appreciation of the world from different linguistic, cultural, literary, and aesthetic perspectives. Participation in Language Communities, Practicum in Service Learning, and Study Abroad Programs are highly desirable components of the learning process that will enable students to communicate successfully in an increasingly cosmopolitan society, and to engage successfully and competently with a globally connected society.

World Languages and Culture (9 hours)

- Ability to appreciate and respect commonality and diversity among people and cultures
- Ability to better understand one's own culture through the study of world cultures and different critical perspectives
- Ability to contribute to the well-being of a globally connected society
- Ability to apply linguistic skills and cultural knowledge acquired in the classroom to real-life situations
- Ability to understand that learning, especially language learning, is not a finite process, but a life-long commitment
- Ability to appreciate and pursue the common good over self-interest

Appendix B:

UGA Outcomes/GPI Mapping

General Education Outcomes - Area IV.	GPI Scales/Domain Descriptions	GPI Domains	GPI Questions
Ability to better understand one's own culture through the study of world cultures and different critical perspectives.	Degree of complexity of one's view of the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value.	Cognitive - Knowing	When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach. *
			Some people have a culture and others do not. *
			In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine. *
			I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.
			I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.
			I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world. *
			I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me. *
Ability to appreciate and respect commonality and diversity among people and cultures.	Degree of understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on our global society and level of proficiency in more than one language.	Cognitive - Knowledge	I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.
Ability to apply linguistic skills and cultural knowledge acquired in the classroom to real life situations.			I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.
			I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.
			I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.
			I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.
Ability to appreciate and respect commonality and diversity among people and cultures.	Level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from one's own.	Intrapersonal - Affect	I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own. *
			I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.
			I see myself as a global citizen.
			I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view. *
			I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.
			I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.
			I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.
			I constantly need affirmative confirmation about myself from others. *
Ability to contribute to the well-being of a globally connected society.	Level of interdependence and social concern for others.	Interpersonal - Social Responsibility	I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.
Ability to appreciate and pursue the common good over self-interest.			I work for the rights of others.
			I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.
			I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.
			Volunteering is not an important priority in my life. *

Appendix C:

From *Interpretative Guide and Norms for Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* (2012 Edition)

Description of GPI Domains & Scales

Cognitive domain. Cognitive development is centered on one's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know. It includes viewing knowledge and knowing with greater complexity and taking into account multiple cultural perspectives. Reliance on external authorities to have absolute truth gives way to commitment in relativism when making commitments within the context of uncertainty. The two scales are:

- **Knowing.** Degree of complexity of one's views the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value. (7 items)
- **Knowledge.** Degree of understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on our global society and level of proficiency in more than one language. (5 items)

Intrapersonal domain. Intrapersonal development focuses on one becoming more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood. It reflects one's sense of self-direction and purpose in one's life, becoming more self-aware of one's strengths, values, and personal characteristics and sense of self, and viewing one's development in terms of one's self-identity. It incorporates different and often conflicting ideas about who one is living in an increasingly multicultural world. The two scales are:

- **Identity.** Level of awareness of one's unique identity and degree of acceptance of one's ethnic, racial, and gender dimensions of one's identity. (6 items)
- **Affect.** Level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from one's own and degree of emotional confidence when living in complex situations, which reflects an "emotional intelligence" that is important in one's processing encounters with other cultures. (8 items)

Interpersonal domain. Interpersonal development is centered on one's willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others. It includes being able to view others differently; and relating to others in terms of moving from dependency to independence to interdependence, which is considered as the most mature perspective in effectively living in a global society.

- **Social Responsibility.** Level of interdependence and social concern for others. (5 items)
- **Social Interactions.** Degree of engagement with others who are different from oneself and degree of cultural sensitivity in living in pluralistic settings. (7 items)

Community. Perceptions of the character and identity of the campus, supportive community of its members, extent of being encouraged to develop one's strengths and talents. (8 items)

Appendix D:

UGA vs Norm Group - Difference of Means (1 sample t-test)

	One-Sample Statistics				One-Sample Test					
Cognitive Knowing					Test Value = 3.56					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	3.724576	0.5007832	0.0325982	5.049	235	0	0.1645763	Lower	Upper
Cognitive Knowledge					Test Value = 3.63					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	3.697458	0.5879589	0.0382729	1.763	235	0.079	0.0674576	Lower	Upper
Intrapersonal Identity					Test Value = 4.13					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	4.097458	0.5009807	0.0326111	-0.998	235	0.319	-0.0325424	Lower	Upper
Intrapersonal Affect					Test Value = 3.81					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	3.84852	0.441483	0.028738	1.34	235	0.181	0.038517	Lower	Upper
Interpersonal Social Responsibility					Test Value = 3.66					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	3.686441	0.6286649	0.0409226	0.646	235	0.519	0.0264407	Lower	Upper
Interpersonal Social Interaction					Test Value = 3.54					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	236	3.504237	0.5264017	0.0342658	-1.044	235	0.298	-0.0357627	Lower	Upper