



Embedding Intercultural Experiences in a Criminal Justice Course: Assessing the Impact on Students' Global Perspectives

Daniel E. Hall¹, Theresa Conover², John Forren³ and Eric G. Lambert⁴

¹Department of Justice and Community Studies and Political Science, Miami University, 1601 University Boulevard, Hamilton, OH 45013. E-mail: hallde@MiamiOH.edu

²Department of Justice and Community Studies and Political Science, Miami University, 1601 University Boulevard, Hamilton, OH 45013. E-mail: conoveme@miamioh.edu

³Department of Justice and Community Studies and Political Science, Miami University, 1601 University Boulevard, Hamilton, OH 45013. E-mail: forrenjp@miamioh.edu

⁴School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Dunes Medical / Professional Building, Room 2101, Indiana University Northwest, 3400 Broadway, Gary, Indiana 46408
E-mail: erilambe@iu.edu and elambert55555@gmail.com

To Cite this Article

Daniel E. Hall, Theresa Conover, John Forren & Eric G. Lambert (2025). Embedding Intercultural Experiences in a Criminal Justice Course: Assessing the Impact on Students' Global Perspectives. *Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies*, 3: 2, pp. 105-125. <https://doi.org/10.47509/JCCJS.2025.v03i02.01>

Abstract: As the world becomes more interconnected, there has been a call for college students, regardless of major, to be more globally aware and operate effectively in a diverse world. There has been no published research that has examined how an international comparative criminal justice course affects the global views of students majoring in criminal justice. The current study examined how an international comparative criminal justice class affected the global perspectives and views of students at a U.S. midwestern public university. The Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) was used, which is a widely used measure of students' global and intercultural competency and measures six different areas. A group pre-test and a group post-test design was used across the three semester offerings of the course. Only on one of the six areas in the GPI was there a difference between the pre- and post-test. Students on average had an increase in the area of cognitive knowledge, which deals with awareness of different cultures and their impact on society.

Keywords: Comparative Criminal Justice; Global Views; Global Perspectives Inventory; Criminal Justice Students

Introduction

Reflecting the profound impact of globalization on Americans' day-to-day lives, the nation's educational community from pre-K through graduate school now recognizes the importance in preparing students to work and live in a diverse and interconnected world (National Education Association, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Globalized education proponents argue that globally focused education is needed to equip students, regardless of major, with the transferable skills necessary to compete for jobs and, once on the job, to collaborate effectively with others and communicate across cultural lines (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 2006). Beyond the working world, a global education is also generally thought to broaden students' understanding of the interconnectedness of the world's societies and of their place with that global system (Dyer, 2004). Reimers (2020) noted:

Global education are both practices guided by a set of purposes and approaches intentionally created to provide opportunities for students to develop global competencies, and the theories that explain and inform those practices and their effects. Global competencies encompass the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that help students develop, understand, and function in communities which are increasingly interdependent with other communities around the world, and that provide a foundation for lifelong learning of what they need to participate, at high levels of functioning, in environments in continuous flux because of increasing global change (p. 25).

Globally focused education enhances a student's ability to understand and accept differences among diverse others (Banks & Baker, 2016; Lansford, 2002). It fosters the development of empathy with others and sensitivity about problems facing society (Wood, 1991). At an ethical level, it also encourages the formation of stronger personal commitments to norms of fairness, equality, and social justice and to the taking of "action that will create a humane and just world" (Banks, 2004, p. 291).

To what extent has this globalization of criminal justice education made a difference in how criminal justice students think? Unfortunately, the published literature to date tells us little about this specific question. This study aims to provide at least the beginnings of an answer by assessing the extent to which students' global perspectives are affected by participation in a semester-long comparative criminal justice course that, by design, blends a significant amount of traditional classroom study of global and intercultural content with intercultural experiential learning. The current study examined if taking a comparative criminal justice course would increase global knowledge and views.

Literature and Focus of Current Study

In light of such perceived personal and professional benefits, U.S. colleges and universities have sought to globalize the learning experience for their undergraduate students in at least four different ways. One approach has been to increase the quality and quantity of the study-abroad experiences that post-secondary institutions offer – an effort that has yielded a tripling of the number of U.S. students studying in other countries over the past two decades (Institute of International Education, 2024). Another approach has been to increase student exposure to other cultures and identities by boosting the numbers and diversity of international students who study in the United States. On this front, too, the numbers suggest remarkable progress in recent years; in recent years, U.S. colleges and universities have enrolled almost a million international students (Institute of International Education, 2024). A third method is to expand the range of global co-curricular programs – such as diversity-focused film and speakers’ series, cultural immersion programs, international service-learning trips, and the like – which provide structured opportunities for students to engage, even if briefly, with different cultures, beliefs, and ways of living (Graml & Jackson, 2021). Finally, a wide range of institutions have sought to internationalize or globalize their curricula by purposefully infusing their courses, degree programs and, in some cases, their general education core with significant cross-cultural or transnational content. A leading advocate for such a curriculum-focused approach is the American Council on Education, which urges its member institutions to both incorporate foreign language, regional studies, and global issues courses into their general education requirements, embed globalized courses within each disciplinary major, and the development of international and global majors (American Council on Education, 2023). The Association of American Colleges and Universities takes a similar approach, advocating for the recognition of global knowledge and intercultural competence as essential learning outcomes for all students while offering tools for use in institution-level assessment of student learning in those areas (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007, 2016).

In delivering a globalized educational experience, colleges and universities have generally sought to provide both content mastery (e.g., knowledge of global problems, different cultures, geography, history, etc.) and heightened levels of intercultural competence to students. To be interculturally competent, scholars have suggested a person must possess the knowledge and skills needed to move among different cultures successfully. Howell (1982), for example, has emphasized the importance of empathy, holistic, and analytical thinking in the development of competence in intercultural communication. He has posited that individuals progress through five

stages of development: unconscious incompetence, conscious incompetence, conscious competence, unconscious competence, and ultimately, unconscious super-competence (Howell, 1982).

In the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), Bennett (1993) posited that learners move through three ethnocentric stages (denial, defense, minimization), followed by three ethnorelativistic stages (acceptance, adaptation, integration) of development (Bennett, 1993). In the denial stage, Bennett (1993) suggests, the learner ignores cultural differences, isolating the differences when possible. In the second stage, one's own culture is defended through the denigration and subordination of other cultures. Some learners in this stage may also experience "reversal," or the elevation of foreign cultures above their own, as a form of defense. Yet either way, cultural differences in this stage are seen as competing, morally binary models. In the third stage, then, cultural differences are minimized. Overarching similarities in humanity are emphasized to the point of ignoring or subordinating cultural differences. Learners transition from minimization of differences to recognizing and accepting differences in the fourth stage, which is Bennett's (1993, 2011) first ethnorelativistic stage. In the fifth stage, adaptation, the learner possesses a more sophisticated understanding of culture, exhibits empathy for people of different cultures, and has developed the intercultural communication skills and worldview that enable the learner to consciously shift into, and act appropriately, in another cultural frame. Finally, a learner has reached full integration when the individual is not defined by a single culture and it is possible to navigate and manipulate multiple cultural frames. A person at this stage possesses a sustained commitment to learning about new cultures and people who are different (Bennett, 2011).

Research indicate that some globally focused educational efforts do affect the thinking and views of college students in general. Scholars have found that simply infusing limited coverage of global subjects within existing content courses does not *ipso facto* produce significant student gains. Neither does simple exposure to study-abroad experience when that exposure lacks significant examination of and reflection on cultural difference (Feng, 2016; Spenader & Retka, 2015). At the same time, well-structured global experiences can indeed produce significant changes in students' attitudes, perceptions, and adaptability to new environments. For instance, scholars have found that well-structured study-abroad experiences may produce higher levels of interest in other cultures for college students in general (Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Ryan & Twibell, 2000), heightened perceptions of self-efficacy (Cubillos & Ilvento, 2012), empathy for others (Ryan & Twibell, 2000), awareness of one's own national and

personal identities (Dolby 2004), creativity in problem-solving (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009), interest in international careers (Norris & Gillespie 2008; Orahood et al., 2004), and improve teacher understanding of the complexity of intercultural communications and learning (Barrow, 2023). Meaningful on-campus interactions with international students likewise have been correlated with increased understanding of cultural differences (Peterson, Briggs, Dreasher, Horner, & Nelson, 1999), improved ability to reflect upon one's own culture (Yefanova et al., 2015), higher levels of tolerance for difference (Jourdini, 2012) and better preparation for future work in diverse workplaces (Arkoudis et al., 2012). Similarly, student attendance at co-curricular campus activities sponsored by non-dominant cultural groups has been positively associated with heightened appreciation of difference and greater levels of comfort with cross-cultural interaction (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). In the same vein, scholars have found that courses containing “materials/readings on race and ethnicity issues” and “opportunities for intensive dialogue among students with different backgrounds and beliefs” are correlated with greater acceptance of multiple perspectives, higher levels of intercultural knowledge and stronger preferences for cross-cultural interaction and action aimed at social change (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011, p. 38). There, however, has been little research in this area concerning students majoring in criminal justice.

Research Focus

Several of the attributes and attitudes associated with intercultural competence – including appreciation of diversity, empathy, creativity in decision-making and comfort with cross-cultural interaction – are among the characteristics that scholars and practitioners in criminal justice often identify as being especially desirable for those seeking careers in the field of criminal justice (Birzer, 2008). Scholars have called for an increase in comparative policy analysis with an eye toward improving the U.S. criminal justice system (Corda & Hester, 2021). It is, thus, hardly a surprise that criminal justice educators over the past two decades have moved in various ways to internationalize or globalize their courses and degree programs (Adler, 1996). Leading the charge in this regard is the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, which now includes “comparative criminal justice” among the various curricular content areas recommended for baccalaureate programs in criminal justice (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, 2024, p. 3).

The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences also mandates that all accredited degree programs in criminal justice provide students with a “systematic examination of the issues of diversity” either through specific courses devoted to the topic or through the

integration of diversity themes throughout program offerings (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, 2024, p. 9). It is more common for undergraduate-level criminal justice programs to offer explicitly globalized courses, commonly titled “comparative criminal justice” or the like – and to also incorporate comparative or globalized content into courses that focus predominantly on domestic criminal justice issues and practices. There is a question if and how including a globalization course taken in a criminal justice program affects how criminal justice students’ global perspective and views.

A salient research question is what type of college learning experiences are most impactful for students majoring in criminal justice in terms of developing level of intercultural competence. Unfortunately, the published literature to date tells us little about this specific question. This study aims to provide at least the beginnings of an answer by assessing the extent to which students’ global perspectives and views are affected by participation in a semester-long comparative criminal justice course that, by design, blends a significant amount of traditional classroom study of global and intercultural content with intercultural experiential learning.

Methods

A Description of the Course and Its Global Components

The current study examined the attitudinal impact on students of participation in an upper-division (400 level) comparative criminal justice systems course offered at a medium-sized liberal arts public university in the midwestern United States. For criminal justice majors, the course was a required course that served to contextualize the U.S. criminal justice system and to familiarize upper-level students in the field with the ways in which various societies have confronted selected problems of criminal justice policy and process over time. While students not majoring in criminal justice (e.g., minor in criminal justice) could take the class, the vast majority (93%) of the class during the study timeframe were criminal justice majors.

To advance students’ learning about criminal justice in particular, the course provides extensive coverage of (a) the major legal traditions (common, civil, Islamic, socialist, and traditional/transitional) and adjudicatory models (inquisitorial and adversarial) found within human societies today; (b) the major competing models of/approaches to policing, adjudication, and corrections across the globe; (c) the comparative analysis of crime; (d) the competing approaches to constitutionalism and the rule of law in various societies; and (e) the application of competing theories of law and justice to traditional or customary systems of justice found in the world. To advance these learning goals, the course relied on readings, discussions, and case

study analysis – all aimed at getting students to grapple with a range of contemporary problems that transcend national borders such as human trafficking, comparative police use of force, the treatment of rape victims, and the definition and prosecution of crimes against humanity. The course was taught from an interdisciplinary perspective. Beyond law and criminal justice, students were exposed to relevant anthropological, historical, philosophical, and political science scholarship from a global perspective.

At the same time, the broader global perspective elements of the studied course aimed beyond the confines of criminal justice itself to foster higher levels of intercultural competence, tolerance, understanding of cultural diversity, and the ability to interact with others across cultural lines. Pursuing these broader learning goals, the course included at least three intentionally global elements. The course opened with a perspectives module that introduced students to the comparative study of societies and the concepts of ethnocentrism and cultural relativism and it also included exercises aimed at prompting students to examine their own particular cultural and social biases. This module was completed during the first full week of class. Students also explored these topics in readings and interactive online exercises. Additionally, the course also required students to attend at least one out-of-class international or intercultural event of their own choosing. For this course component, students were expected to participate in an event that involved significant exposure to non-U.S. cultures and non-dominant points of view. The students then record their reactions and lessons learned from the event in 300 to 500 words.

In addition, the course also included significant opportunities for first-person interactions with diverse people who enriched the content learning and who engaged the students in discussions about non-dominant histories, cultures, religions, and ways of life. For example, the class met via live videoconference with a law school class in China to discuss differences in the two countries' legal systems, societal views about law and justice, and differences in due process between the two nations. Further, the course included a field trip to a local mosque, where the class attended a Jumu'ah (Friday prayer service) and a discussion of Islam, Sharia, and Islamic traditions with a resident scholar/member. For the research project, students were actively encouraged to cultivate relationships with foreign-born peers as a means of supporting and brainstorming project ideas.

Sample

A convenience sample design was used where the students in three separate course offerings were asked to be part of the proposed study by taking a pre-test at the start

of the class and a post-test at the end of the class. The course offerings were one in the fall semester, one in the spring semester, and the third in the following fall semester. The three courses were taught by the same instructor using the same lesson plans. Participation was voluntary. Students who participated by taking the pre-test and the post-test did so anonymously. Of the 99 students who enrolled in the three courses (36 in the first course, 25 in the second course, and 38 in the third course), 93 participated in the current study. About 51% of the participants indicated being male, and 49% as being female. Approximately 94% indicated that they were U.S. citizens, and 6% indicated being a citizen of a nation other than the U.S. In terms of race/ethnicity, 91% marked White non-Hispanic, 4% Hispanic, 2% African American, 1% Asian/Pacific Islands, and 1% other or did not answer the question. In terms of class rank, 1% selected freshman, 8% sophomore, 29% junior, and 62% senior. In terms of major, 93% selected criminal justice, and 8% other. The mean age in years was 24.7, with a standard deviation of 7.72, ranging from 18 to 51.

Measures

The Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) was used, and this is a widely used measure of students' global and intercultural competency (Braskamp et al., 2014). The GPI is aimed at measuring "how a student thinks, views herself as a person with a cultural heritage, and relates to others from other cultures, backgrounds and values" (Iowa State University, 2024, p. 1). The questions used in the current study are presented in the appendix. The GPI questions were grouped in the six GPI scales of: (a) cognitive knowing scale; (b) cognitive knowledge scale; (c) interpersonal identity scale; (d) intrapersonal affect scale; (e) interpersonal social responsibility scale; (f) interpersonal social interaction scale (Braskamp et al., 2014; Iowa State University, 2024). The questions were answered using a five-category Likert (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree) response option. The responses to the questions were summed together to form an index for cognitive knowing. The resulting sum was divided by the number of questions to standardize the measure. The questions found in the appendix were administered twice, once as a pre-test at the start of the course and the second time at the end of the course.

The cognitive knowing scale "reflects cultural development theory and assesses recognizing the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 8). This scale consisted of seven questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach's alpha for the items was .60, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach's alpha of .66.

The cognitive knowledge scale “reflects intercultural communication theory and assesses ones understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on society (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 8). This scale consisted of five questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the items was .82, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .77.

The intrapersonal identity scale “reflects cultural development theory and assesses being aware of and accepting one’s identity and sense of purpose (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 9). This scale consisted of six questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the items was .76, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .74.

The intrapersonal affect scale “reflects intercultural communication theory and assesses respecting and accepting cultural differences and being emotional aware (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 9). This scale consisted of five questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the items was .72, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .73.

The interpersonal social responsibility scale “reflects cultural development theory and assesses being interdependent and having social concern for others (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 10). This scale consisted of five questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the items was .66, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .73.

The interpersonal social interaction scale “reflects intercultural communication theory and assesses engaging with others who are different and being culturally sensitive (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017, p. 10). This scale consisted of five questions (see appendix), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the items was .63, which is similar to that reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .70.

The Cronbach alpha values were above the cut-off rule of thumb of .60 (Gronlund, 1981) and are in line with reported by Braskamp et al. (2014), who created the GPI.

Analytical Plan

To measure changes in global perspective views, a pre/post-type research design using two-way ANOVA was employed. The two-way ANOVA was used because the sizes of the two sampled groups were not equal (Blalock, 1979), and it was not possible to match cases from the pre-test to the post-test. A total of 93 pre-tests were completed,

and a total of 75 post-tests were completed. The two-way ANOVA was then calculated for each of the six scales using the pre-test/post-test (main effect) and semester (main moderating effect) factors, in addition to the interaction between the two terms (pre-test/post-test*semester).¹

Results

The pre-test mean and the post-test mean is presented for the six indexes in Table 1. There appeared to be an increase from the pre-test mean to the post-test mean for the cognitive knowing index, the cognitive knowledge index, and the intrapersonal identity index. There appears to be a slight increase from the pre-test mean to the post-test mean for the interpersonal social responsibility index. There was no visible increase from the pre-test mean to the post-test mean for either the intrapersonal affect index or the interpersonal social interaction index.

Table 1: Pre-Test and Post Test Means for Indexes

<i>Index</i>	<i>Pre-Test Mean</i>	<i>Post-Test Mean</i>
Cognitive Knowing	3.44	3.54
Cognitive Knowledge	3.36	3.72
Intrapersonal Identity	4.04	4.12
Intrapersonal Affect	3.95	3.94
Interpersonal Social Responsibility	3.64	3.66
Interpersonal Social Interaction	2.77	2.71

- Two factors were utilized to calculate the GPI group mean scores. The first main factor (pre-test/post-test) is a dichotomous variable used to indicate the point in time when the survey was taken; either at the start of the semester and was coded zero (pre-test), or at the end of the semester and was coded 1 (post-test). The hypothesized relationship between the factors and the dependent variables indicate that students will be in more agreement with the positive attributes of the GPI after they have completed the course. Again, this is done by comparing the before and after mean scores of the GPI with a moderating factor for the semester. Since data collected over three semesters are included in the study with the same instructors, there could have been subtle variations in the classes, possibly creating a moderating effect. In order to control for the possible effect, a second factor is used – semester of the offering of the course. The measure for semester when the course was offered was a nominal level variable and was coded to reflect the particular semester the course was offered (1 = first course offering; 2 = second course offering, and 3 = semester 1, 2 = semester 2, and 3 = semester 3). In addition, interaction effects between the main factors are examined (pre/post * semester).

In order to determine whether the differences between the pre-test means and the post-test means were statistically significant, a two-way ANOVA test was utilized. In addition to including the pre-test and post-test means, the semester of the course was also included as a variable. Levene's test statistic for unequal variances was also examined for all factors. The statistics for Global Perspectives measures indicate that the null hypothesis of homogeneity of error variances is to be assumed. Across all the subscales, no interaction effects were found between the main factors (pre-test/post-test and semester). The results are presented in Table 2. There was no statically significant difference between the pre-test mean and the post-test for the cognitive knowing index,

Table 2: Two-Way ANOVA Results

	SS	df	MS	F	Partial η^2
<i>Cognitive Knowing Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	.411	1	.411	1.684	.011
Semester	1.068	2	.534	2.186	.027
Interaction	.068	2	.034	.140	.002
<i>Cognitive Knowledge Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	4.963	1	4.963	12.646**	.074
Semester	1.408	2	.704	1.793	.022
Interaction	1.280	2	.640	1.631	.020
<i>Intrapersonal Identity Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	.269	1	.269	1.023	.006
Semester	.463	2	.231	.880	.011
Interaction	.229	2	.115	.436	.005
<i>Intrapersonal Affect Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	.005	1	.005	.016	.000
Semester	1.773	2	.887	3.125*	.038
Interaction	.065	2	.033	.115	.001
<i>Intrapersonal Social Responsibility Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	.011	1	.011	.037	.000
Semester	.948	2	.474	1.557	.019
Interaction	.834	2	.417	1.370	.017
<i>Intrapersonal Social Interaction Index</i>					
Pre v. Post	.133	1	.133	.186	.001
Semester	6.958	2	3.479	4.887**	.058
Interaction	.876	2	.438	.615	.008

Note: SS stands for sum of the squares, df for degrees of freedom, MS for mean squares, F for F value, and Partial η^2 for partial Eta squared, a measure of effect size.

* $p \leq .01$ ** $\leq .01$

intrapersonal identity index, the intrapersonal affect scale, the intrapersonal social responsibility index, and the intrapersonal social interaction index. For the cognitive knowledge index, there was a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test means. For the cognitive knowledge index, there was an increase from before to after the completion of the course. The partial eta square value indicates that the pre-test/post-test factor explains just over seven percent of the observed variation from the pre-test to the post-test score for cognitive knowledge measure. The semester the course was offered was a significant variable for the intrapersonal affect index (explaining about 4% of the variance) and for the interpersonal social interaction index (explaining about 6% of the variance).

Discussion and Conclusion

No published research was located that explored the impact on global knowledge and views of criminal justice students, so the current study was undertaken. The current study examined whether global views and knowledge would change after the completion of a comparative criminal justice course using data from a public U.S. midwestern university based on the GPI, a well-regarded and previously used measure. The results were mixed. Only for one of the six indexes was there a significant increase from the pre-test to the post-test. There was an increase for the cognitive knowledge index after completion of the comparative justice course. There, however, were no significant changes for the cognitive knowing index, the intrapersonal identity index, the intrapersonal affect index, the intrapersonal social responsibility index, or the intrapersonal social interaction index.

It makes sense that there would be an increase of cognitive knowledge from a global perspective after completing a comparative criminal justice course. A major focus of a comparative criminal justice course is to cover crime in different nations and how different cultures respond to crime. Another major focus of a comparative criminal justice course is to provide information about crime and criminal justice systems across different cultures and nations, as well as differences and similarities between nations in this area. The current findings indicate that students who completed the comparative criminal justice course felt that they had a greater knowledge and understanding of conflict, such as crime, in the world and how responses to conflict differ across cultures and nations.

On the other hand, completion of the course did not appear to have a significant area on the other five areas measured by the GPI. Specifically, there was no statistical significance for the GPI areas of cognitive knowing, intrapersonal identity, intrapersonal

affect, interpersonal social responsibility, and interpersonal social interaction. The cognitive knowing focuses on how people know and not what they know, which is covered in the area of cognitive knowledge (Merrill et al., 2012; Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). It could be that the course provided knowledge to the participating students. It could be that the course was not long enough to change feeling that knowledge is complex and to take into multiple cultural contexts. For example, even if the experiences in the course led students to make some new friends (i.e., question “Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background”), it is unlikely to change drastically over any one semester period. More time may be needed for greater change. Further, the course activities also may not been complex and more personally intensive to change this aspect of global views. The current study measured attitudinal change only over a 14-week semester period. Research on student development and learning suggests that significant change in student attitudes and beliefs often take place over a longer timeframe (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Kegan, 1994).

Intrapersonal identity and intrapersonal affect deal with a person becoming more aware of global differences and perspectives and using this information into reshaping their self-identity in a multicultural world (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Merrill et al., 2012; Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). Bennett and Bennett (2004) indicated that “the development of general intercultural sensitivity is paralleled to a large extent by identity development” (p. 158). Merrill et al. (2012) indicated that those high on these areas are able to explain how their personal values are different from others and feel that they are developing a meaningful life philosophy.” It appears that a single semester criminal justice class may not be sufficiently intense or long enough to result in major intrapersonal changes for college aged students. Most of the students in the current study are young and have not had multiple life experiences that may be necessary for major intrapersonal changes. In addition, the course did not involve intensive activities that may be experienced in other life interactions, such as studying abroad for a year. It may be that these types of experiences are needed for significant changes in intrapersonal identity and intrapersonal affect (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005).

A change in interpersonal social responsibility was expected after completing the course. This area deals with having a concern for others who are different from your own culture (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). King and Baxter Magolda (2005) that this area “involves the ability to interact effectively and interdependently with diverse others” (p. 579). Interpersonal social interaction was expected from the completion of the course. Interpersonal social interaction deals with the willingness

to interact with culturally different individuals and to do so (Braskamp et al., 2014; Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). Given the emphasis on domestic and international student interactions in the course, an increase in the interpersonal scores was expected. There, however, was no significant difference for either the interpersonal social responsibility or the interpersonal social interaction scale from the completion of the selected class. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity may provide an answer for the current findings (Bennett, 2011). Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity is a theory of how people experience and evaluate cultures different from their own (Bennett, 2011). Bennett (2011) proposed that there is continuum of how people respond and evaluate different cultures ranging from denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. At the denial end of the continuum is ethnocentrism and at the integration end of the continuum is ethnorelativism (Bennett, 2011). In the selected course for the current study, the intercultural interactions and activities may have had the effect of pushing some students "backward" or kept them at the denial/defensive points of development (Bennett, 1993, 2011). Further, if true, this effect may be accentuated by the inclusion of Islamic content during a period increasing intolerance of Islam in the United States. This suggestion is consistent with the course instructor's observation that student resistance to Islamic content increased during the time period of this investigation. Further research on this explanation, and, if confirmed, whether students subsequently progressed into ethnorelativism stages is needed (Bennett, 2011).

While the current findings did not show a change in five areas of the GPI, it does not mean the course is not important nor had any effect on students. The course introduced criminal justice students to the idea that there are differences between nations and cultures in defining crime and in dealing with criminal offenders. In addition, the current results showed that there was increase in cognitive knowledge and views, an important educational outcome. The current findings point that influencing criminal justice student views is a complex matter and likely will involve multiple courses and interactions.

While more of a control than an explanatory variable, semester was significant in the ANOVA tests for Intrapersonal Affect Index and Intrapersonal Social Interaction Index. As previously noted, intrapersonal identity and intrapersonal affect deal with a person becoming more aware of global differences and perspectives and using this information into reshaping their self-identity in a multicultural world (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Merrill et al., 2012; Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). Likely, the composition of the class for a particular semester plays a role in influencing

these two areas. It may be that there were more diverse students in some semesters than there was for the class in other semesters, and this may have influenced the change for these two areas. It may also be possible that in some semester there are students who have greater propensity for change for Intrapersonal Affect Index and Intrapersonal Social Interaction Index. Future research should explore if the type of student in a comparative criminal justice class influences changes in views of the students.

Limitations

As with many studies, the current study had limitations. It was a single study at one U.S. midwestern public university. Additional studies are needed at other universities. It could be that the current results would vary in new studies and/or across different U.S. universities. Universities tend to attract students with different experiences and attitudes, with some institutions more so than other institutions. In addition, research involving students in other nations is needed since the impact of a comparative criminal justice class could differ in its effects on the six areas of the GPI. Replication by future studies is critical. As noted by Lindsay and Ehrenberg (1993), “replication is little discussed in the statistical literature nor practiced widely by statistically minded researchers. It is needed not merely to validate one’s findings, but more importantly, to establish the increasing range of radically different conditions under which the findings hold, and the predictable exceptions” (p. 217).

Another limitation was a lack of a control or comparison group. As this was an exploratory study to determine whether an international comparative course changed the global and criminal justice knowledge and views, it was decided to use the before and after design for a single course. Future studies may wish to include a comparison course which does not focus on interactional issues and experiences so as to compare how the international comparative criminal justice class affects students.

A related limitation is that the current study used group pre-test and group post-test design. This was done in order to provide participating students with anonymity since knowing that pre-test responses would be compared with post-test responses, some students may have altered their responses feeling that they were being tested on what they should have learned from the course. Future research should test if using a matched pre-test and post-test design changes the results. Fewer post-tests is because students dropped out, it is possible students who scored low on the pretest were the ones who dropped the class as they may have been less receptive to the material. It is clear that more research on how a comparative criminal justice class affects the attitudes, experiences, and views of criminal justice students is needed.

Conclusion

The global economy is growing and changing the world. As the world becomes more globally connected, there has been increased calls for enhancing the global attitudes, knowledge, and views of college students. No published research which examined how an international comparative criminal justice course affects the global views of students majoring in criminal justice could be found. The current exploratory study examined how an international comparative criminal justice course affected the global perspectives and views of U.S. college students at a U.S. midwestern public university. The GPI was used, a widely used measure of students' global and intercultural competency and measures six different areas of cognitive knowing scale, cognitive knowledge scale, intrapersonal identity scale, intrapersonal affect scale, interpersonal social responsibility scale.

A group pre-test and a group post-test design was used across three semester offerings of the course. Only on one of the six areas in the GPI was there a difference between the pre- and post-test among the participating criminal justice students. On average there was an increase in the area of cognitive knowledge from the start of class to the end of the class. The cognitive knowledge area deals with awareness of different cultures and their impact on society. This supports the conclusion that both global content was learned and the combination of intercultural and global experiences were successful in the development of global perspectives at least in terms of cognitive knowledge. Conversely, there was no statistically significant difference from the start of the class to the end of the class for the GPI areas of cognitive knowing, intrapersonal identity, intrapersonal affect, interpersonal social responsibility, or interpersonal social interaction.

Crime occurs across the planet, but the responses to crime differ between cultures and nations. In addition, the U.S. is comprised of people and groups from a myriad of cultures and nations. More research on how to enhance the global attitudes and knowledge of students majoring in criminal justice is needed. Globally focused criminal justice courses broaden the experiences and knowledge of students majoring in criminal justice. While the findings of the current study were not as strong as hoped, this does not mean that research in this area should stop. Future studies should explore how to enhance the global attitudes, experiences, and knowledge of criminal justice students. It is hoped at the least that the current study will spark continued interest and research in this area.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the reviewers, the editor, and editorial members for reviewing this paper. Their comments and suggestions improved the paper. The authors also thank Janet Lambert for proofreading this paper.

Note

1. For the research project, students were encouraged to cultivate relationships with foreign-born peers as a means of supporting and brainstorming project ideas. In addition, the instructor incorporated in the class opportunities for meaningful cross-cultural discussion and interaction, such as having foreign-born speakers in the class. In addition, the class included structured domestic student-to-foreign student interactions in what was styled as the Global Buddies Program. The Global Buddies Program had international students participate in four class meetings and in two outside class cultural experience meetings. The international students participated and received credit through one of their required English language classes. For the three comparative criminal justice classes that were part of the current study, the ratio of ratio of international students to domestic students grew to approximately 1:1. The international and domestic students formed class groups and were involved in both classroom learning activities, such as an ice breaker presentation at the start of the class, collaboration on a cultural comparison of their choice during the class, and collaboration on a comparison of a justice subject of their choice during the class. These assigned culminated in collaboratively produced short papers and presentations. In addition, the students participated in out-of-class social experiences, such as dining at a restaurants that served authentic Chinese food. In many instances, students reported developing friendships with international students. From class evaluations, many students reported not only greater intercultural interactions but deeper than they expected. Further, students were divided into groups that had both domestic and foreign students to conduct research, to prepare a paper, and to present on a comparative justice subject of each group's choice.

Appendix

Global Perspectives Inventory Indexes

The following questions from the GPI make up each of the subscales:

Cognitive Knowing Scale

I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me*

I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world*

Some people have a culture and others do not*

In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine*

When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach*

I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems

I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me

Cognitive Knowledge Scale

- I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures
- I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially
- I am informed of current issues that impact international relations
- I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective
- I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture

Intrapersonal Identity Scale

- I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others
- I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me
- I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles
- I know who I am as a person
- I have a definite purpose in my life
- I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life

Intrapersonal Affect Scale

- I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions
- I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own lifestyle
- I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences
- I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.
- I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives

Interpersonal Social Responsibility Scale

- I think of my life in terms of giving back to society
- I consciously behave in terms of making a difference
- Volunteering is not an important priority in my life*
- I put the needs of others above my own personal wants
- I work for the rights of others

Interpersonal Social Interaction Scale

- Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background* *reverse coded

References

- Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. (2024). *Quality standards for college/university criminal justice/criminology baccalaureate degree programs*, as amended October 1, 2022. Retrieved July 19, from https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.acjs.org/resource/resmgr/assessment/baccalaureate_degree_standar.pdf

- Adler, F. (1996). A note on teaching “international.” *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 7(2), 223–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511259600096071>.
- American Council on Education. (2023). *Comprehensive internationalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>.
- Arkoudis, S., Watty, K., Baik, C., Yu, X., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., Lang, J., Pearce, A. (2012). Finding common ground: enhancing interaction between domestic and international students in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.719156>.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2007). *College learning for the new global century*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2016). *Essential global learning*. Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- Banks, C. & Baker, J. (2016). *Comparative, international, and global justice*. Sage Publications.
- Banks, J. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *Educational Forum*, 68(4), 289-298.
- Barrow, E. (2023). Defining intercultural competence: How four pre-service teachers developed a more complex understanding of ICC. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 7(1), 1-17.
- Baxter Magolda, M. (2008) Three elements of self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 269-284.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R.M. Paige (ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience (2nd edition)*, (pp. 21-71). Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (2011) *A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity*. The Intercultural Development Research Institute. Retrieved from http://www.idrinstitute.org/allegati/IDRI_t_Pubblicazioni/47/FILE_Documento_Bennett_DMIS_12pp_quotes_rev_2011.pdf
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training (3rd ed.)* (pp. 147-165). Sage Publications.
- Birzer, M. (2008). What makes a good police officer? Phenomenological reflections from the African-American community. *Police Practice and Research*, 9(3), 199-212.
- Blalock, H. M. (1979). Dilemmas and strategies of theory construction. *Contemporary issues in theory and research: A Metasociological Perspective*. Greenwood Press.
- Braskamp, L.A., Braskamp, D.C. and M.E. Engberg. (2014). *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics*. Global Perspective Institute, Inc.

- Braskamp, L., & Engberg, M. (2011). How colleges can influence the development of a global perspective. *Liberal Education*, 97(3-4), 34-39.
- Carlson, J., & Widaman, K. (1988). The effects of study abroad during college on attitudes toward other cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Research*, 12(1), 1-17.
- Corda, A., & Hester, R. (2021). Leaving the shining city on a hill: A plea for rediscovering comparative criminal justice policy in the United States. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 31(2), 203-223.
- Cubillos, J., & Ilvento, T. (2012). The impact of study abroad on students' self-efficacy perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(4), 494-511.
- Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(2), 150-173.
- Dyer, J. (2004). *Preparing students for a world which is global in its outlook and influences: The rhetoric, reality and response*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved at <http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2004/dye04765.pdf>
- Feng, J. (2016). Improving intercultural competence in the classroom: A reflective developmental model. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 27(1), 4-22.
- Graml, G., & Jackson, R. O. (2021). It starts with a journey: Global learning as holistic, interdisciplinary curricular and co-curricular framework at a liberal arts college. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 21(5), 186-195.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1981). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. Macmillian.
- Howell, W. (1982). *The empathic communicator*. Wadsworth.
- Institute of International Education. (2024). Outlook 2030 brief: The U.S. and international education. Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/IIE_Outlook-2030_March-2024-1.pdf
- Iowa State University. (2024) *About the GPI*. Retrieved from <http://www.gpi.hs.iastate.edu>
- Jourdini, M. (2012). *The impact of international students on American students and faculty at an Appalachian university*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://encompass.eku.edu>.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Harvard University Press.
- King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 571-592.
- Lansford, J. (2002). Educating American students for life in a global society. *Education Reform*, 4(2), 1-4.
- Lindsay, R., & Ehrenberg, A. (1993). The design of replicated studies. *The American Statistician*, 47(3), 217-228.

- Maddux, W., & Galinsky, A. (2009). Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1047-1061.
- Merrill, K. C., Braskamp, D. C., & Braskamp, L. A. (2012). Assessing individuals' global perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(2), 356-360.
- National Education Association (2010). *Preparing 21st century students for a global society: An educator's guide to the 'four Cs.'* Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/A-Guide-to-Four-Cs.pdf>
- Norris, E., & Gillespie, J. (2008). How study abroad shapes global careers: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(3), 382-397.
- Orahood, T., Kruze, L., & Pearson, D. (2004). The impact of study abroad on business students' career goals. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10(1), 117-130.
- Peter D. Hart Research Associates. (2006). *How should colleges prepare students to succeed in today's global economy?* Retrieved from <https://committees.uwsp.edu/gedpolrev/Shared%20Documents/Documents/AACU%20Global%20Education.pdf>
- Peterson, D. M., Briggs, P., Dreasher, L., Horner, D. D., & Nelson, T. (1999). Contributions of international students and programs to campus diversity. *New Directions for Student Services*, 86(Summer), 67-77.
- Research Institute for Studies in Education (2017). *Global Perspective Inventory: Theoretical foundations and scale descriptions*. Iowa State University.
- Reimers, F.M. (2020). *Educating students to improve the world*. Springer.
- Ryan, M., & Twibell, R. (2000). Concerns, values, stress, coping, health and educational outcomes of college students who studied abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(4), 409-435.
- Spenader, A., & Retka, P. (2015). The role of pedagogical variables in intercultural development: A study of faculty-led programs. *Frontiers: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, XXV(Spring), 20-36.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Succeeding globally through international education and engagement*. U.S. Department of Education.
- Wood, R. (1991). Toward cultural empathy: A framework for global education. *Educational Record*, 72(4), 10-13.
- Yefanova, D., Baird, L., & Montgomery, M. (2015). *Study of the educational impact of international students in campus internationalization at the University of Minnesota: Phase one—Focus groups and interviews over-arching report on phase one findings*. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/University-of-Minnesota-Educational-Impact-of-Intl-Students.pdf>