

May 2020

## Global Perspectives in the Core: Student Attitudes and Instructor Performance

Scott M. Butler  
*Georgia College*, [scott.butler@gcsu.edu](mailto:scott.butler@gcsu.edu)

Amanda Reinke  
*Kennesaw State University*, [areinke@kennesaw.edu](mailto:areinke@kennesaw.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl>

---

### Recommended Citation

Butler, Scott M. and Reinke, Amanda (2020) "Global Perspectives in the Core: Student Attitudes and Instructor Performance," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 14: No. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2020.140104>

---

# Global Perspectives in the Core: Student Attitudes and Instructor Performance

## Abstract

Global learning and global citizenship education (GCE) continue to be integrated as co-curricular and curricular components in US higher education. Many institutions have linked their mission and values statements to global learning. However, their efforts fail to reflect a single shared understanding or philosophy of global learning or GCE. While scholars continue to discuss and debate the substance of these frameworks, few studies have analyzed perspectives of curricular global learning and GCE requirements. Three hundred fifty-four undergraduate students attending a university in the Southern US completed questionnaires assessing their attitudes towards global learning, international issues, and global citizenship, as well as their attitudes toward the college's required global perspectives curriculum. Results indicate that students feel generally positive towards global learning and issues, believe global learning should be required at this and other institutions, and have high perceptions of faculty performance.

## Keywords

Global learning, global citizenship education, liberal arts, core curriculum

## Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

## Cover Page Footnote

The authors would like to acknowledge the University System of Georgia SOTL fellows program and the Georgia College SOTL fellows program.

# Global Perspectives in the Core: Student Attitudes and Instructor Performance

Scott M. Butler<sup>1</sup> and Amanda Reinke<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Georgia College

<sup>2</sup> Kennesaw State University

Received: 8 August 2019; Accepted: 13 December 2019

## Abstract

Global learning and global citizenship education (GCE) continue to be integrated as co-curricular and curricular components in US higher education. Many institutions have linked their mission and values statements to global learning. However, their efforts fail to reflect a single shared understanding or philosophy of global learning or GCE. While scholars continue to discuss and debate the substance of these frameworks, few studies have analyzed perspectives of curricular global learning and GCE requirements. Three hundred fifty-four undergraduate students attending a university in the Southern US completed questionnaires assessing their attitudes towards global learning, international issues, and global citizenship, as well as their attitudes toward the college's required global perspectives curriculum. Results indicate that students feel generally positive towards global learning and issues, believe global learning should be required at this and other institutions, and have high perceptions of faculty performance.

## INTRODUCTION

In response to critiques that higher education in the US is not preparing students to confront the challenges of a globalized world (Alger, 1974; Council on Learning, 1981; El-Khawas, 1994; Merryfield, 1998; see Teichler, 2004 for discussion), many liberal arts colleges have incorporated global learning and citizenship as curricular and co-curricular components of undergraduate education. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP) encourage institutions to emphasize learning outcomes that are “closely calibrated with the challenges of a complex and volatile world” (AAC&U, 2008, p. 2). They highlight findings indicating that 72% of employers want colleges to place increased emphasis on “global issues” and “cultural values and traditions” (AAC&U, 2008, p. 11). Studies demonstrate that employers want emphases on learning outcomes that encourage an understanding of global contexts and decisions, the role of the US in the world, cultural diversity, and intercultural competency (Hovland & Schneider, 2011).

Administrators and faculty have responded to calls for internationalizing and incorporating global learning and citizenship into curricular and co-curricular experiences for undergraduates by asking how global learning can be articulated as a goal of higher education (see Green & Baer, 2001; Nair & Henning, 2017). As a term, global learning originated in the early 1980s and referred to the development of pedagogical practices that promote critical thinking and problem-solving (Hanvey, 1982; Soedjatmoko & Newland, 1987). Global learning was particularly salient for tackling pervasive issues, such as poverty, conflict, and the ethical debates arising from advances in science and technology (Hanvey, 1982; Doscher & Landorf, 2018). The term was further defined by Hovland (2006) as a way to prepare students for meaningful and active citizenship in a globalized world. Many institutions of higher education have linked their mission and values statements to global learning; however, these efforts fail to be clearly linked to a single and concise definition (Calahan, 2018; Hovland, 2014). Simultaneously “global citizen” remains operationally unclear. The

term is used variously to refer to intercultural competence, sensitivity, world citizenship, and global learning, depending upon the researcher or author (Braskamp, 2008; Lewin, 2009; Sperandio, Grudzinski-Hall, & Stewart-Gambino, 2010). Administrators and faculty are left to ask: How should we define global learning? How can we assess global learning and diversity education? How can we operationalize global learning as part of a cohesive institutional strategy to reach all enrolled undergraduates?

Both global learning and global citizenship education (GCE) emerged as the principal frameworks for theorizing and assessing global perspectives and learning among undergraduates (Charles, Longerbean, & Miller, 2013). For example, global learning is enshrined in Liberal Education and America's Promise's (LEAP) essential learning outcomes (Hovland & Schneider, 2011) and associated VALUE rubrics. GCE is supported by pedagogical practices and institutional policies and structures that engage students in global social, environmental, political, or economic issues. Research examining GCE as a framework and a tool for creating, implementing, and assessing global learning has proliferated (Charles et al., 2013; Cortés, 1998; Mikander, 2016; Myers, 2016; Olson, Evans, & Shoenberg, 2007). GCE emphasizes the individual's existence as part of a broader community and humanity as a whole and examines “political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global” (UNESCO, 2015, p. 14). GCE aims to equip young people with the skills, attitudes, knowledge, and values to go beyond thinking about solutions (CUE, 2017). Instead, it encourages tackling pressing problems, such as climate change or conflict, and to be positioned for sustainable actions (CUE, 2017).

According to the American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, US higher education institutions are generally optimistic about their efforts to globalize and internationalize curriculum, particularly through in-house models (e.g., curricular and co-curricular changes; CIGE, 2017). However, only half of those institutions that responded to the CIGE survey indicated curricular changes focused on global learning and internationalization (2017, p. 18). Instead, many insti-

tutions rely on co-curricular changes (e.g., international festivals or events; meeting place for students interested in international topics). These often fail to sustain learning or student interest (2017, p. 20), or rely upon external efforts (e.g., study abroad; international partnerships), which are often expensive for the student and therefore exclusionary (2017, p. 38). Furthermore, there are diverse types of GCE programs to promote engaged citizenship and awareness of globalization. However, there is little consensus regarding theories, philosophies, purposes, and practices to best achieve these goals (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012; Myers, 2016; Sperandio et al., 2010). Universities launching global learning programs may be using GCE terminology as convenient monikers to gain support for diverse methods which may or may not be substantiated in their success by data-driven studies (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Young, 2004) and may or may not reflect desired GCE outcomes.

There have been numerous scholarly discussions and debates about the potential benefits of GCE and global learning. Many institutions have made strides in integrating these as curricular and co-curricular campus opportunities. However, there are still relatively few studies that assess student perspectives of these efforts. The purpose of this study is to quantitatively assess student perceptions of efforts to integrate global citizenship and learning educational goals as a mandatory curricular core component.

## METHOD

### Procedures

A public liberal arts university in the South with an enrollment of 6,000 undergraduates met calls for increasing global learning and knowledge of global issues by institutionalizing global learning in their core via a mandatory Second Year (GC2Y) or “Global Perspectives” course. GC2Y emerged as the second part of a two-part curricular series and advances critical thinking, writing skills, and global perspectives. GC2Y seeks to fulfill many of the goals espoused by GCE, the LEAP initiative, and the outcomes specified in the Association of American Colleges and Universities Global Learning VALUE Rubric (AAC&U 2014). Global learning is defined by AAC&U as “a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies...and their implications for people’s lives and the earth’s sustainability” (2014). As a result of global learning, students should:

1. become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences,
2. seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and
3. address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably (AAC&U, 2014).

The Global Perspectives course requirement is a curricular effort to integrate global learning and GCE as a cohesive, sustained, and mandatory component of every undergraduate student’s experience. GC2Y targets sophomores and provides intensive engagement with global perspectives, multiple intellectual approaches to a particular topic or theme, learning beyond the classroom (LBTC) opportunities, and writing skills. GC2Y’s outcomes, including intensive writing, engagement with diversity, global learning, and reflects high-impact practices identified by the AAC&U (AACU, 2018b). These courses are also an innovative way to fulfill the university’s mission by providing opportunities

to engage students outside the classroom and emphasizing global issues and topics to prepare students for success in a diverse world. The goal of Global Perspectives is to develop strong written communication skills, analytical thinking skills, a broad understanding of global issues, and an appreciation of diversity. GC2Y simultaneously fulfills the liberal arts mission and continued interest in facilitating undergraduate global learning by meeting two learning outcomes: (1) Students will be able to explain multiple intellectual approaches that clarify or respond to problems, topics, themes, and/or issues; and (2) Students will be able to evaluate diverse responses of peoples, cultures, societies, and groups to historic and/or contemporary global issues, themes, or topics.

Faculty propose their own course topic but must attempt to achieve those institutionally-defined student learning outcomes which also include a writing intensive component of the course. Furthermore, in addition to three contact hours in the traditional classroom, Global Perspectives courses include a fourth contact hour and a LBTC requirement. Faculty decisions regarding the topic, LBTC, and use of the fourth hour result in diverse student experiences in the classroom depending on the course in which they chose to enroll. Prospective GC2Y course instructors submit an application that includes their proposed course syllabus, to the campus curriculum committee. The committee reviews their application and determines whether the proposed course will meet the institutionally defined outcomes and goals. There is no additional training for faculty teaching a GC2Y course, and there was no training specific to teaching GC2Y, GCE, or global learning available to instructors at this university during the time of our study.

### Participants

Three hundred fifty-four undergraduate students completed questionnaires assessing their attitudes towards global learning, international issues, global citizenship, and the college’s required Global Perspectives curriculum. Among these, 229 (64.7%) had completed or were currently enrolled in, their GC2Y course requirement. These students completed additional items regarding their experience with the GC2Y program including the following measures: factors that influenced the selection of their course, pedagogic strategies used in the course, assessment techniques used by the instructor, and overall instructor performance. The majority of the participants self-identified as women (74.3%) and Caucasian (84.0%). The mean age was 20.4 ( $SD = 1.9$ ) and nearly half (46.3%) were sophomores. More than half of participants (54.0%) had completed one or more additional classes with a global theme and 6.2% had participated in a study abroad program. Additional participant demographics can be found in Table 1.

### Recruitment

Participants were recruited during the fall 2016, spring 2017, and summer 2017 semesters from 12 classes. An email was sent by the investigators to each of the GC2Y course instructors and three agreed to allow data collection during normal class time. The instructor for these courses held appointments in different academic units including health sciences, humanities, and physical sciences. Nine additional health sciences courses were selected for recruitment including two upper division courses with global content, two additional upper division courses, and five lower division classes required by select health sciences programs. Students who were recruited from the nine additional classes were asked

to reflect upon any previous experiences with their core requirement Global Perspectives course. Questionnaires were completed via pen and paper and results were later coded and analyzed using SPSS software. The average response rate among all classes was 83.1% and the mean number of participants per course was 29.5. Prior to completion of the questionnaire, each participant read and signed a consent form. Completion of the questionnaire required approximately 15 minutes and some instructors provided extra credit for participation. The campus IRB approved all procedures prior to data collection.

*Table 1. Participant Demographics*

Variable	n	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	263	74.3
Male	90	25.4
Transgender	1	.3
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Caucasian	297	84.0
Black/African American	26	7.3
Hispanic/Latino	17	4.8
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	5	1.4
Asian	3	.8
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	.6
Other	4	1.1
<b>Academic Status</b>		
Freshmen	13	3.7
Sophomore	164	46.3
Junior	120	33.9
Senior	57	16.1
<b>Academic Major</b>		
Health sciences	282	79.7
Physical sciences	25	7.0
Humanities/social sciences	24	6.8
Business	18	5.1
Education	5	1.4
<b>Completed/enrolled in core global issues course</b>		
Yes	229	64.7
No	125	35.3
<b>Additional previous global issues course</b>		
Yes	191	54.0
No	161	46.0
<b>Previous study abroad</b>		
Yes	22	6.2
No	332	93.8

**Measures**

A newly developed instrument was created to assess student attitudes and outcomes of the Global Perspectives courses. Initial concepts for the questionnaire items were guided by a rubric and course objectives for all Global Perspectives courses provided by the campus director of assessment with input from faculty. Additional items were added that assessed instructor performance, student attitudes, and participant demographics. The final version of the questionnaire included 57 items over the following topics: attitudes towards global issues (9 items), previous enrollment in global issues courses (4 items), rationale for selecting their Global Perspectives course (9 items), pedagogic strategies used in class (11 items), assessment strategies used by the instructor (8 items), description of the LBTC requirement (1 item), instructor performance (10 items), and student demographics (5 items). The 19 items assessing student attitudes and instructor performance were measured on a five point Likert scale (1= *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*).

To assess validity and reliability among Likert-based items a series of tests were conducted including principal component analysis with a Varimax rotation for construct validity and Cronbach alpha for internal consistency. The results revealed two constructs: student attitudes toward global issues, and faculty performance when teaching global issues. Criteria for the model

included Eigen values of  $\geq 1$ , community scores of  $\geq .4$ , and loading scores of  $\geq .7$ . The two constructs accounted for 66.8% of the variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was .928 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant,  $p < .001$ . The Cronbach alpha for the first construct was .90 and .95 for the second.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each item and measures of central tendency were computed for the two constructs. Mean comparisons were conducted using a one way ANOVA test and bivariate correlational assessments were computed using Pearson Product Moment tests. A composite score was computed for each of the student attitudes toward global issues and faculty performance constructs by summing the values of individual items.

**RESULTS**

**Student attitudes global issues**

The vast majority of participants (83.4%) believe GC2Y courses should be taught at all colleges and universities and 87.6% believe they should be taught at their institution. In addition, nearly three quarters (71.7%) reported that a university-wide policy should require taking at least one course. More than 80.0% reported that teaching about global issues helps students understand their place in the world and that they are interested in becoming a better global citizen. Nearly all, (95.2%) believe learning about global perspectives helps students understand social issues broadly in other cultures. There was no significant difference in mean global learning attitudes among participants who completed a GC2Y course when compared to those who have not,  $F(1, 352) = 2.35$ ,  $p = .126$ . In addition, there was no difference in mean attitudes across academic major,  $F(4, 349) = 2.114$ ,  $p = .079$ . Each of the nine items on the global issues and learning construct were significantly correlated,  $p < .001$ . Additional information regarding student attitudes towards global issues and learning can be found in Tables 2 and 3.

*Table 2. Student Attitudes Towards Global Issues and Learning*

Variable	M(SD)	Mdn	Mo
1. Learning about global issues helps students understand ethical issues more broadly in other cultures	4.3(.7)	4.0	4.0
2. Learning about global issues helps students understand social issues more broadly in other cultures	4.3(.6)	4.0	4.0
3. Learning about global issues helps students understand the importance of diversity	4.2(.8)	4.0	4.0
4. Global issues classes should be taught at all colleges and universities	4.1(.9)	4.0	4.0
5. Teaching about global issues helps students understand their place in the world	4.1(.8)	4.0	4.0
6. Global issues classes should be taught at our school	4.1(.8)	4.0	4.0
7. I am interested in becoming a better global citizen	4.1(.8)	4.0	4.0
8. Understanding global issues will make students more marketable/desirable in the workforce after graduation	4.0(.9)	4.0	4.0
9. All students at my school should be required to take at least one global issues class	3.8(1.0)	4.0	4.0

Note: Items were measured on a 5 point Likert scale where higher scores indicate stronger attitudes.



**Table 3. Correlates of Global Issues and Learning Variables.**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Item 1	1.00	.73	.68	.58	.60	.64	.45	.50	.51
Item 2	.73	1.00	.61	.54	.57	.61	.51	.42	.49
Item 3	.68	.61	1.00	.57	.55	.61	.45	.55	.51
Item 4	.58	.54	.57	1.00	.55	.88	.50	.51	.63
Item 5	.60	.57	.55	.55	1.00	.60	.49	.47	.53
Item 6	.64	.61	.61	.88	.60	1.00	.51	.53	.64
Item 7	.45	.51	.45	.50	.49	.51	1.00	.52	.51
Item 8	.50	.42	.55	.51	.47	.53	.52	1.00	.53
Item 9	.51	.49	.51	.63	.53	.64	.51	.53	1.00

Note: For descriptions of each item see Table 2.  
Note: Each correlation is significant at  $p < .001$ .

### Selection of global issues course

Participants reported that a wide variety of factors influenced the selection of their GC2Y course. The most prevalent response was the day and time of the class (60.7%), followed by interest in the title of the course (58.1%). Other common responses included: this was the only course that was available (38.0%), recommendation by a friend/peer (27.9%) and preference for the instructor (24.0%). Less than 15% reported their selection was based upon an advisor recommendation, that the course was related to their academic major, that the LBTC experience sounded preferable, or that a faculty member recommended it.

### Pedagogic Strategy and Instructor Assessment Techniques

Nearly all instructors (96.5%) used in-person lecture as a pedagogic strategy and more than three quarters held discussions during class (86.5%), screened films/documentaries (84.7%), and required student presentations (77.3%). More than half (52.4%) required students to attend events or volunteer either on campus or in the community and 25.7% required students to engage in volunteerism. The least prevalent pedagogic strategy was lecture delivered online (3.1%). The most common LBTC requirement included watching films (58.1%) followed by attending events on campus/in the community (36.2%) and volunteering on campus/in the community (15.7%). The least common requirement included completing a research paper/project (8.7%). Some instructors required students to participate in multiple outside the class events (e.g., attending events and volunteering on campus or in the community).

The most common assessment techniques used by instructors included student presentations (80.3%), examinations (71.2%), and research presentations (66.4%) while the least prevalent method was discussions in class (18.0%). Additional information regarding instructor pedagogic strategies, outside the class requirements, and assessment techniques can be found in Table 4.

### Student Assessment of Instructors

More than two-thirds of participants (67.3%) rated their instructor as outstanding while 56.3% rated the course as outstanding. In addition, the majority reported that the course stressed the importance of global issues (78.1%), that it was clear how global issues fit into the class (76.0%), and that global themes were introduced during class time (73.3%). More than three-quarters reported the course resulted in a better understanding of different peoples, groups, and cultures (79.5%) and 77.7% reported the course introduced them to cultural diversity. Nearly two-thirds (65.0%) reported the course enabled them to think critically about global issues and 45.4% believed they have a greater responsibility for solving international issues.

Each of the 10 items on the faculty performance construct were significantly correlated,  $p < .001$ . A strong relationship was

observed among the items rating the instructor as outstanding and rating the course as outstanding,  $r(228) = .83, p < .001$ . The composite score for the faculty performance construct was significantly correlated to the student attitudes toward global issues construct,  $r(228) = .39, p < .001$ . A summary of results regarding student assessment of instructors can be found in Tables 5 and 6.

**Table 4. Pedagogic strategies and assessment techniques used by global issues instructors.**

Variable	N	%
<b>Pedagogic strategy</b>		
Lecture in-person	220	96.5
Discussions in-class	198	86.5
Films/documentaries	194	84.7
Student presentations	177	77.3
Attending events on campus/in community	120	52.4
Guest lectures	69	30.1
Volunteering on campus/in community	59	25.7
Lecture online	7	3.1
<b>Outside the class experience</b>		
Film screenings	133	58.1
Attend events on campus/in community	83	36.2
Volunteer on campus/in community	36	15.7
Research paper/project	20	8.7
Unknown/left blank	17	7.4
<b>Assessment technique</b>		
Student presentations	184	80.3
Examinations	163	71.2
Research papers	152	66.4
Reaction papers	130	56.8
Book reports	85	37.1
Discussions in-class	41	18.0

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100% because participants could check all that apply

**Table 5. Instructor performance**

Variable	M(SD)	Mdn	Mo
1.As a result of this class, I have a better understanding of different peoples, groups, cultures, and societies	4.0(1.0)	4.0	4.0
2.The instructor introduced stimulating themes about global issues and topics throughout the semester	3.9(1.1)	4.0	4.0
3.The instructor demonstrated the importance of global issues and themes throughout the semester	3.9(1.0)	4.0	4.0
4.It was clear how global issue topics fit into the course	3.9(1.1)	4.0	4.0
5.The course introduced me to cultural diversity as it relates to global issues	3.8(1.0)	4.0	4.0
6.Overall, I would rate this instructor as outstanding	3.7(.1.2)	4.0	4.0
7.The course increased my ability to think critically about global issues	3.7(.8)	4.0	4.0
8.Overall, I would rate this course as outstanding	3.4(1.2)	4.0	4.0
9.As a result of the course, I can analyze and evaluate cross-cultural connections among various groups globally	3.5(1.1)	4.0	4.0
10.As a result of the course, I feel a greater responsibility for solving international issues and problems	3.2(1.2)	3.0	4.0

Note: Items were measured on a 5 point Likert scale where higher scores indicate stronger attitudes.

**Table 6. Correlates of Instructor Performance Variables**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Item 1	1.00	.68	.58	.63	.71	.60	.77	.57	.72	.59
Item 2	.68	1.00	.81	.79	.72	.70	.76	.67	.67	.62
Item 3	.58	.81	1.00	.77	.64	.65	.66	.63	.60	.61
Item 4	.63	.79	.77	1.00	.64	.67	.67	.65	.64	.61
Item 5	.71	.72	.64	.64	1.00	.59	.72	.57	.70	.64
Item 6	.60	.70	.65	.67	.59	1.00	.62	.83	.62	.56
Item 7	.66	.76	.66	.67	.72	.62	1.00	.63	.65	.73
Item 8	.57	.67	.63	.65	.57	.83	.63	1.00	.63	.62
Item 9	.72	.67	.60	.64	.70	.62	.65	.63	1.00	.69
Item 10	.59	.62	.61	.61	.64	.56	.73	.62	.69	1.00

Note: For descriptions of each item see Table 5.  
Note: Each correlation is significant at  $p < .001$ .

## DISCUSSION

The present study is one of few empirical investigations to assess a university-wide initiative focused upon GCE outcomes. Although the curricular framework for the GC2Y program is unique to a single institution, the application of GCE as a curricular requirement is evident from this case study. Findings from 354 student research participants reveal that attitudes towards global learning and issues as part of the curriculum are very high. Notably, statistically significant moderate correlations were observed among each of the nine items assessing student attitudes towards global issues and learning. In addition, more than three-quarters of students believe that global issues courses should be taught at this and other institutions. This suggests that students believe curricular GCE initiatives may be of critical importance to liberal arts institutions as well as colleges and universities with other primary foci or mission statements. In addition, results provide unique insights into student opinions regarding which factors influenced how they selected their course, their perception of how their instructor performed, as well as pedagogic/assessment techniques used by their instructor. These factors can be useful for outside faculty and administrators who are planning to initiate similar programs to the GC2Y program.

According to the AAC&U (2014), global learning should inform students about the world and the myriad ways in which their actions have reactions on the local and global scales, equip them to tackle pressing global issues, and train students to be “attentive to diversity.” The vast majority of our research participants believe that teaching about global issues helps them understand their place in the world and grows an interest in becoming a better global citizen. Furthermore, nearly all of our participants believe that global perspectives engagement helps them understand social issues in other cultures. These attitudes are positively associated with studies among potential employers. Studies demonstrate employer interest in graduates that understand global contexts, diversity, and intercultural competency (Hovland & Schneider, 2011), as well as a general interest in emphasizing global issues during the undergraduate experience (AAC&U 2008, p. 11).

Participants reported a variety of contextual factors influenced the selection of their GC2Y course. These include preferences for the course topic or instructor as well as pragmatic concerns, such as the day and time of the class and not having any other available course options. These findings are potentially useful to faculty and administrators who develop and plan the availability of courses. Although students had positive attitudes towards global learning, they did encounter problems in the variety of course topics from which to choose and the availability of courses; this is an important consideration if institutions are considering incorporating GCE as a mandatory curricular component. Students report that their instructors used a multitude of pedagogic techniques. While nearly all utilize lecture in their classroom, more than half also use discussions, screen films, require student presentations, and mandate that students to attend events either on campus or in the community. Many instructors require students to attend film screenings or attending events on campus or in the community as part of their LBTC experience. In addition, more than one quarter require students to volunteer on campus or in the community. These findings are reflective of the LBTC program requirement. Overall, results indicate the GC2Y program contributes to the university’s liberal arts mission in

various ways, including student participation in community-based engaged learning.

Previous pedagogic assessments of GCE initiatives have faced significant barriers, including the lack of available tools which have been psychometrically evaluated. The creation of a newly developed instrument represents one useful contribution of the present study. Overall, the large sample size allowed for sufficient psychometric analysis and results indicated the questionnaire was high in both validity and reliability. Findings suggest the instrument can be used for further research assessing student attitudes as well as studies that assess pedagogic strategies and instructor performance.

Future research is needed to assess student attitudes towards global learning as well as campus-wide curricular GCE initiatives. Additional large-scale studies are needed to evaluate student opinions about curricular GCE requirements at other colleges and universities with diverse demographic characteristics and institutional goals. The creation of additional valid and reliable instruments will provide helpful resources for assessing essential learning outcomes and curricular goals. Furthermore, assessments that analyze faculty and administrative perspectives of GCE programs would provide a useful perspective in the overall efficiency and efficacy of initiatives.

## Limitations

The present study has limitations to consider. Results are based upon self-reported attitudes and perceptions of instructor performance. Given the purpose and aims of the study, surveying the students was the most feasible method of collecting data and enabled the procurement of a sufficient sample size. The sample recruitment method may place limitations on the generalizability of findings. For example, data were obtained from students on a single occasion at the end of the semester. This method does not allow for a pre and post assessment of student attitudes and makes it difficult to ascertain if changes were the direct result of the GC2Y courses. However, given that it required less class time on part of the instructors, it may have resulted in a higher number of courses and students for recruitment. In addition, women and those enrolled in health science degree programs are overrepresented. The sample was recruited from 12 courses, nine of which were classes housed in the health sciences academic division. These courses were chosen for feasibility. Additionally, only one of the 44 (2.3%) total GC2Y course offerings are housed within the health sciences division. Giving students enrolled in health science courses an opportunity to reflect upon their past experiences with GC2Y courses proved beneficial. Ultimately, this recruitment strategy resulted in participants who had enrolled in 39 different Global Perspectives courses. Overall, while the recruitment method places limitations of the academic expertise of the participants, it allowed for a higher degree of representation among the GC2Y courses. In addition, it is notable that the mean sum of student attitudes were not statically different across academic majors. This suggests that the inclusion of a higher proportion of health science students did not bias the sample. Lastly, while each of the courses assessed are focused upon global issues, there was a high degree of variability in the content and objectives of each class. This made the creation of the single instrument which accurately reflects student attitudes and instructor performance difficult. Nonetheless, the newly created instrument exhibited a

high degree of both validity and reliability and results reflect a high degree of consistency across items.

## CONCLUSION

GC2Y as a curricular component of the core matches the university's Mission Statement, which strives to "develop the intellectual, professional, and civic skills and dispositions that enable graduates to thrive in an information-intensive and diverse global society" while enriching "the lives of students and their local and global communities." The institution responded to the calls for integrating global learning and GCE into the undergraduate experience by including "diverse global society" and "local and global communities" in the mission, and operationalized it by instituting GC2Y courses as part of the mandatory sophomore-level core curriculum.

Although there have been numerous debates about global learning and GCE in the abstract, this study is one of a few that have analyzed student perceptions of global learning and GCE where it has been integrated into the curriculum. Despite the limitations of this study, the findings demonstrate overall positive attitudes among students towards global learning as part of the mandatory core curriculum. Even though many students cited their interest in a given GC2Y course because of the time of day, students had positive attitudes towards faculty performance. The overwhelmingly positive results of this study indicate that global learning in the core is received well by students. Results suggest the success of the GC2Y program as innovative strategy for meeting circular goals focused upon GCE. The program serves as a role model for other institutions which are planning to implement similar initiatives.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the University System of Georgia SOTL fellows program and the Georgia College SOTL fellows program.

## REFERENCES

- Alger, C. F. (1974). *Your Community in the World; the World in Your Community*. Columbus, OH: Mershon Center at Ohio State University.
- Andrzejewski, J. & Alessio, J. (1999). Education for global citizenship and social responsibility. *Progressive Perspectives*, 1(2), 2-17.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2008). *College learning for the new global century*. Washington, DC: AAC&U.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2014). *Global learning VALUE rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/VALUE/GlobalLearning.pdf>.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2018a). *Essential learning outcomes*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes>.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2018b). *High-impact pedagogies*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/resources/high-impact-practices>.
- Braskamp, L. A. (2008). Developing global citizens. *Journal of College and Character*, X (1) 1-5.
- Calahan, C. (2018). A six-year journey of global learning faculty and student development. *Peer Review*, 20(11), 8-12.
- Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement. (2017). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2017 Edition*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Center for Universal Education. (2017). *Measuring global citizenship education: A collection of practices and tools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Charles, H., Longerbean, S., & Miller, A. E. (2013). Putting old tensions to rest: Integrating multicultural education and global learning to advance student development. *Journal of College & Character*, 14(1), 47-57.
- Cortés, C. E. (1998). "Global Education and Multicultural Education: Toward a 21<sup>st</sup>-century Intersection." In *Intersections: A Professional Development Project in Multicultural and Global Education*. L. Swartz, L. Warner, and D.L. Grossman, eds. Washington, DC: NASPA-Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education
- Council on Learning. (1981). *Task force statement on education and the world view*. New Rochelle, NY: Council on Learning.
- Doscher, S. & Landorf, H. (2018). Universal global learning, inclusive excellence, and higher education's greater purposes. *Peer Review* 20(11), 4-7.
- El-Khawas, E. (1994). Toward a global university: Status and outlook in the United States. *Higher Education Management*, 6(1), 90-98.
- Fanghanel, J. & Cousin, G. (2012). 'Worldly' pedagogy: A way of conceptualising teaching towards global citizenship. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17(1), 39-50.
- Green, M. & Baer, M. (2001). Global learning in a new age. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Global-Learning-in-a-New-Age/19868>.
- Hanvey, R.G. (1982). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into Practice*, 21(3), 162-167.
- Hovland, K. (2014). *Global learning: Defining, designing, demonstrating*. NAFSA and Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Hovland, K. & Schneider, C. G. (2011). Deepening the connections: Liberal education and global learning in college. *About Campus* 16(5), 2-8.



- Hovland, K. (2006). *Shared futures: Global learning and liberal education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lewin, R. (Ed.). (2009). *Handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Mikander, P. (2016). Globalization as continuing colonialism: Critical global citizenship education in an unequal world. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 15(2), 70-79.
- Myers, J. P. (2016). Charting a democratic course for global citizenship education: Research directions and current challenges. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(55), 1-16.
- Nair, I. & Henning, M. (2017). *Models of global learning*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- Olson, C. L., Evans, R., & Shoenberg, R. F. (2007). *At home in the world: Bridging the gap between internationalization and multicultural education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Soedjatmoko & Newland, K. (1987). The United Nations University: A New Kind of University. *The Washington Quarterly*, 10(3), 215-224.
- Sperandio, J., Grudzinski-Hall, M., & Stewart-Gambino, H. (2010). Developing an undergraduate global citizenship program: Challenges of definition and assessment. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 12-22.
- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(1), 5-26.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Young, B. (2004, September 3). Global Citizens Unite. *The Times Educational Supplement Section, Opinions*, p. 23.





