

Salisbury University HEIghten Inclusion & Diversity and Intercultural Competence Assessment Report, Fall 2019

This report, authored by SU office of University Analysis, Reporting & Assessment (UARA) staff and reviewed by the University Academic Assessment Committee (UAAC), discusses Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence assessment data collected during fall 2019 GULL Week sessions.

To request more information about the assessment, results, or additional analyses, please contact the Assessment Coordinator, [Dr. Sarah Winger](#).

Executive Summary

Background and Findings

1. Faculty and UARA agreed that the ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competence & Diversity (H-ICD) assessment is aligned with the General Education student learning outcomes, Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence.
2. The H-ICD instrument comprises 74 items with two scaled scores, Analyze & Act as well as Approach. The former has 6 scaled subscores and the latter has 2. The 40 Analyze & Act questions are situational judgments based upon cross-cultural scenarios, with single-selection, multiple choice as well as multiple-selection, multiple choice question types. The 34 Approach Likert-type questions ask test-takers to rate their agreement with culturally-related statements.
3. The results of our administration of the H-ICD instrument supported its validity and reliability.
 - a. H-ICD scores demonstrated validity:
 - i. Content Validity: instrument was designed based upon literature review, review of existing measures, as well as expert review of items
 - ii. Scale Analysis: supported using dimensionality analyses
 - iii. Criterion and Construct Validity: supported by published group differences, for both H-ICD dimensions' scores, particularly based on class level (i.e., freshmen vs. seniors) and students that had traveled to more countries or had more opportunities to learn and interact with people from ethnically diverse backgrounds performed significantly better than those that had traveled to less countries or had less opportunities— also, the Analyze & Act skill-based score on this instrument had moderate positive correlations with the SU students' related measures of SAT Verbal score range categories and SAT Math score range categories
 - b. H-ICD scores in published studies satisfactorily supported reliability for both individual-level reliability and institution-level total score reliability of the scaled scores and scaled subscores
4. A limitation of this administration is that some students (juniors) are underrepresented in this sample compared to other class levels – due to sampling requirements of a concurrent study. Otherwise, generally, the students that completed the H-ICD instrument were fairly representative of the overall and non-test-taker populations at SU.

5. The average SU H-ICD Analyze & Act scaled score (166.6) was above the average of the ETS comparison group (166.3) as well as above the proficiency benchmark (158). Only 14.5% of SU H-ICD test-takers had scores below the 158-level proficiency benchmark. The average SU H-ICD Approach scaled score (118.8) was slightly below the average of the comparison group (119.9). Scaled subscores' results for both dimensions were fairly similar to their respective scales' scores' results. The preliminary comparison group values should be interpreted with caution.
6. There was no significant difference between average H-ICD Analyze & Act or Approach scaled scores of transfer students and SU native, first-time students. See full report for scaled subscore results.
7. As SU and other institutions' students' class level (i.e., freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors) increased, so too did the averages of both of the H-ICD scaled scores ([Table 12](#)). SU students' average H-ICD scaled scores increased significantly by class level; Analyze & Act scaled subscore: freshmen's average score was significantly less than sophomores' and seniors'. Approach scaled subscore: freshmen's average score was significantly less than seniors'. See full report for scaled subscore results.
8. There was a significant difference between both of the average H-ICD scaled scores by SU College/School (i.e., CHHS, Fulton, Henson, Perdue, and Seidel; based on students' primary major); Henson majors' average Analyze & Act scaled score was significantly higher than the average score of students majoring in Perdue; no other college or school comparisons were significantly different for the Analyze & Act or Approach scaled scores. See full report for scaled subscore results.

Suggested Action Items

1. The benchmarks with which SU students' Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence are compared should be evaluated by objective faculty and/or staff with expertise in the discipline or assessment of those student learning outcomes.
2. Perform an area/course mapping of the current SU courses that align with the new Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes.
3. Teaching faculty, General Education Steering Committee, and other relevant parties should consider whether the H-ICD instrument is well aligned with the new (as of November 2018) General Education Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes. If the H-ICD instrument is not aligned, then an alternative assessment that is aligned should be identified.
4. Consider results from the assessment to develop interventions or review and update curriculum to align with areas that need improvement.
5. Relevant stakeholders at SU should request further analyses of the H-ICD data to address additional questions of interest that were not described here.
6. Determine a timeline to re-collect assessment data related to Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes, tentatively set for re-assessing using the H-ICD in fall 2022 and then every 3 years.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background and Findings	1
Suggested Action Items	2
Detailed Inclusion & Diversity and Intercultural Competence Report	4
Instrument	4
ETS HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite	4
H-ICD Instrument	4
Methodology and Sample	5
Results	6
Demographic Comparison of Test-takers vs. Non-test-takers	6
Validity and Reliability of the H-ICD Administration at SU	9
SU Student Scores on the H-ICD	11
H-ICD and SOS Survey Student Responses	15
Discussion	16
References	17
Salisbury University H-ICD Reporting Documentation	18
Appendices	19
Appendix 1. ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competence & Diversity Assessment Sample Questions	20
Appendix 2. Student Opinion Scale (SOS) Survey (Sundre & Thelk 2007)	22
Appendix 3. Additional H-ICD descriptions and results	22
H-ICD Assessment Level Descriptions	22
Analyze & Act Performance Level Descriptions	22
Approach Level Descriptions	22
Additional H-ICD scaled subscore results by demographic groups	23
Appendix 3 - Table 1. Student Admit Type, to SU, Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD	23
Appendix 3 - Table 2. Student Undergraduate Class Level Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD	23
Appendix 3 - Table 3. Student College/School Enrollment Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD	24

Detailed Inclusion & Diversity and Intercultural Competence Report

Instrument

ETS HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite

The ETS HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite comprises “innovative, modular, computer-delivered assessment tool[s that enable] colleges and universities to measure the student learning outcomes that are essential for academic success” ([About the HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite](#) 2022). The HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite instruments align with common general education areas in Higher Education. The instruments are designed and aligned with national frameworks, for the respective instruments. The instrument reporting includes score/subscore benchmark comparisons versus similar institutions. The benchmark comparison values in this report are from the most recently available ETS institutional score reports for the particular HEIghten assessment addressed.

H-ICD Instrument

The HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity (H-ICD) assessment is one of the five ETS HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite instruments. The H-ICD assessment is an instrument which comprises 74 items across two dimensions, Analyze & Act as well as Approach ([HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment](#) 2022). The 40 items aligned with the Analyze & Act dimension questions are situational judgments related to a range of cross-cultural scenarios and include both single-selection, multiple choice and multiple-selection, multiple choice question types. Specifically, test-takers, “...are asked to indicate the best or most appropriate response or responses with the aim of creating or maintaining positive interactions and relationships in cross-cultural settings.” The Approach dimension comprises 34 Likert-type items that present test-takers with culturally-related “...statements with which they are asked to rate their agreement on a 4-point scale ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree.’” See H-ICD sample items in [Appendix 1](#) and information about the instrument’s alignment with SU’s student learning goals, outcomes, and curricular area mapping in [Table 1](#). Details about the instrument can be found at the [HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment](#) website (2020), the [HEIghten Intercultural Competency and Diversity Test-at-a-Glance](#) document (2022), and the Griffith *et al.* (2016) ETS Research Report, “Assessing Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Existing Research and Future Directions” that explains the operational definitions and assessment considerations for the development of this particular assessment.

As mentioned previously, there are two dimensions measured by the H-ICD, which are described below. The first dimension is aligned with the Analyze & Act scaled score as well as its 6 scaled subscores, related to particular skills: 1) Self-Awareness; 2) Cultural Knowledge Application; 3) Suspending Judgment/Perspective Taking; 4) Social Monitoring; 5) Emotion Regulation; and 6) Behavior Regulation. The former four scaled subscores align with the Analyze aspect of the dimension whereas the latter two scaled subscores align with the Act aspect of the dimension. The second dimension is aligned with the Approach scaled score as well as its 2 scaled subscores, related to particular self-reported attitudes: 1) Positive Cultural Orientation and 2) Cultural Self-Efficacy. Also, although it is not measured as a separate scaled subscore, the idea of Tolerance of Ambiguity is embedded within the H-ICD as a third aspect of the Approach scaled score.

The University Academic Assessment Committee, representing Faculty Senate and multiple departments and programs, and UARA staff agreed that the H-ICD instrument is aligned with the General Education Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes ([Table 1](#)).

Table 1. The SU General Education student learning goal, outcome, and area mapping related to Critical Thinking & Reasoning.

Student Learning Goal	Student Learning Outcome	Area Mapping
Personal, Social, and Cultural Responsibility	Inclusion & Diversity: Students will demonstrate an openness to the pluralistic nature of local, national, and global institutions, societies, and cultures as well as develop characteristics of respect, connection, and involvement among people with different experiences and perspectives.	TBD*
	Intercultural Competence: Students will be able to demonstrate the necessary knowledge, self-awareness, and behaviors to support effective and appropriate interactions in a variety of cultural and linguistic contexts that build and enhance relationships.	TBD*

Note. Revised SU General Education student learning goals and outcomes were approved by Faculty Senate November 20, 2018. Asterisk (*) denotes that, at this time, there has not been an official area mapping of current courses to the revised SU General Education student learning goals and outcomes.

Related to Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence, results from this instrument can: provide a benchmark of student outcomes at SU; inform instructional efficacy and possible interventions; evaluate curricular strengths and weaknesses; and continuously improve student outcomes if we use this instrument for future GULL Week administrations.

Methodology and Sample

Data were collected from volunteer students at SU who self-selected and signed up to participate in various Gaining Understanding as a Lifelong Learner (GULL) Week testing sessions during a week in September, 2019. GULL Week sessions were open to the entire SU undergraduate student population. The assessments were administered in a proctored computer lab setting and lasted approximately one hour, of which ~45 minutes was dedicated to the H-ICD administration and ~15 minutes was dedicated to a different assessment, which included ~5 minutes for a Student Opinion Scale (SOS) Survey ([Appendix 2](#); Sundre & Theik 2007). The SOS Survey estimates the GULL Week participant's perceived importance of the assessment(s) and effort expended by the participant in completing the assessment(s) (i.e., H-ICD).

Some faculty offered incentives (such as extra credit) to participating students, some mentioned GULL Week and encouraged students to participate, and some did not interact with students about GULL Week. The office of University Analysis, Reporting & Assessment (UARA) publicized GULL Week across campus via many avenues. Particularly, competitions between both College/Schools and Greek life groups were set up to improve participation.

In all, n = 3022 undergraduates participated in fall 2019 GULL Week and, of those, n = 725 students (18 years or older) completed the H-ICD with quality data (39.3% and 9.4% of total SU fall 2019 undergraduate enrollment (n = 7686), respectively). The H-ICD cut-off determination for "quality data" for the analyses in this report was based upon the UAAC decision of a student self-report measure of effort, informed by an *ad hoc* UARA analysis of various quality control metrics. Therefore, any student that self-reported less effort was marked as "not quality data" and therefore not included in these analyses. For the H-ICD test, this is based upon the ETS follow-up question "Did you try your best?" and 26 students (3.5% of the total H-ICD test-takers that included both "quality data" and "not quality data") that responded "No" were marked as "not quality data" and were only included as H-ICD non-test-takers for these analyses.

Demographic analyses of the H-ICD non-test-takers (n = 6961; 90.5%), including those who participated without providing quality data, were compared to the test-takers that completed H-ICD with quality data to evaluate the extent to which the sample of test-takers was representative of the entire SU undergraduate population during fall 2019. Further analyses within the test-takers were performed to evaluate the validity and reliability of the instrument administration at SU as well as to determine whether scores on the instrument varied by student characteristic(s), based upon available data in the Student Information System (GullNet). Some data may be missing for some demographic or student data variables for some students, therefore some of these total numbers may be different in the tables and results. However, there is a known limitation in the sampling because, during fall 2019 GULL Week, there was a concurrent study that required a great deal of students from a particular demographic (i.e., juniors), which led to diminished numbers of those represented in this H-ICD test-taker sample. The students with data for both H-ICD and the SOS Survey were analyzed to evaluate student responses on those scales.

Results

Demographic Comparison of Test-takers vs. Non-test-takers

Except for the limitations due to the designs of the targeted students in the previously mentioned concurrent study during fall 2019 GULL Week, the demographics of the students who took the H-ICD were similar to the non-test-takers, based upon z-test results of column comparisons (Tables 2-8; lack of significance annotations). The particular impact of the concurrent study's sampling requirements is noted and evident in [Table 5](#). Otherwise, females ([Table 3](#)), SU native first-time students ([Table 4](#)), as well as students with primary majors in the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS; [Table 6](#)) were disproportionately high in the test-taker group and, in two cases of student success metrics (i.e., High School GPA and SU Cumulative GPA), the test-takers of the H-ICD were significantly more successful than the non-test-takers ([Table 8](#)); although it should be considered that another set of success metrics (i.e., SAT Math and Verbal scores) indicated the two groups were comparable ([Table 7](#)).

Table 2. Student Race/Ethnicity Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

Race/Ethnicity	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
African American	97 (13.4%)*	998 (14.3%)*	1095 (14.2%)*
American Indian/ Alaska Native	1 (0.1%)*	58 (0.8%)*	59 (0.8%)*
Asian	35 (4.8%)	255 (3.7%)	290 (3.8%)
Caucasian	514 (70.9%)	4801 (69.0%)	5315 (69.2%)
Hispanic	38 (5.2%)	319 (4.6%)	357 (4.6%)
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	2 (0.3%)	7 (0.1%)	9 (0.1%)
Non-resident Alien	7 (1.0%)	86 (1.2%)	93 (1.2%)
Two or more races	23 (3.2%)	164 (2.4%)	187 (2.4%)
Unknown/ Not specified	8 (1.1%)*	273 (3.9%)*	281 (3.7%)*
Total	725 (100.0%)	6961 (100.0%)	7686 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' proportions are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$.

Table 3. Student Gender Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

Gender (code)	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
Male (1)	218 (30.1%)*	3177 (45.6%)*	3395 (44.2%)*
Female (2)	506 (69.8%)*	3742 (53.8%)*	4248 (55.3%)*
Unknown/ Not specified	1 (0.1%)	42 (0.6%)	43 (0.6%)
Total	725 (100.0%)	6961 (100.0%)	7686 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' proportions are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$.

Table 4. Student Admit Type, to SU, Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

SU Admit Type (code)	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
First-time student (F)	574 (79.4%)*	4582 (68.0%)*	5156 (69.1%)*
Transfer (T + U)	149 (20.6%)*	2153 (32.0%)*	2302 (30.9%)*
Total	723 (100.0%)	6735 (100.0%)	7458 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' proportions are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$. Total

values will not match the aforementioned sample values because some students have missing information in GullNet.

Table 5. Student Undergraduate Class Level Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

Class Level (code)	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
Freshmen (1)	278 (38.3%)*	1672 (24.0%)*	1950 (25.4%)
Sophomores (2)	198 (27.3%)*	1460 (21.0%)*	1658 (21.6%)
Juniors (3)	61 (8.4%)*	1805 (25.9%)*	1866 (24.3%)
Seniors (and +) (4)	172 (23.7%)	1707 (24.5%)	1879 (24.4%)
Unclassified, non-degree undergrads (7)	16 (2.2%)*	317 (4.6%)*	333 (4.3%)
Total	725 (100.0%)	6961 (100.0%)	7686 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' proportions are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$. The disproportionately high number of freshmen and sophomores and low number of juniors is caused by the majority of juniors being included instead in a separate concurrent study during fall 2019 GULL Week.

Table 6. Student College/School Enrollment Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

College/School	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
CHHS	204 (28.1%)*	1486 (21.3%)*	1690 (22.0%)
Fulton	142 (19.6%)*	1949 (28.0%)*	2091 (27.2%)
Henson	121 (16.7%)	1006 (14.5%)	1127 (14.7%)
Perdue	141 (19.4%)	1458 (20.9%)	1599 (20.8%)
Seidel	80 (11.0%)*	563 (8.1%)*	643 (8.4%)
Undeclared	37 (5.1%)*	499 (7.2%)*	536 (7.0%)
Total	725 (100.0%)	6961 (100.0%)	7686 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' proportions are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$.

Table 7. Student SAT Scores Compared between the H-ICD Test-takers, Non-test-takers and All SU Undergraduates

SAT Score Range	SAT Math			SAT Verbal		
	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total	Test-taker	Non-test-taker	Total
< 500	121 (22.0%)	1034 (23.0%)	1155 (22.9%)	110 (20.0%)	1016 (22.6%)	1126 (22.3%)
500-599	295 (53.6%)	2335 (52.0%)	2630 (52.2%)	275 (50.0%)	2221 (49.5%)	2496 (49.5%)
600-699	122 (22.2%)	1021 (22.7%)	1143 (22.7%)	148 (26.9%)	1150 (25.6%)	1298 (25.8%)
700-800	12 (2.2%)	100 (2.2%)	112 (2.2%)	17 (3.1%)	103 (2.3%)	120 (2.4%)
Total	550 (100.0%)	4490 (100.0%)	5040 (100.0%)	550 (100.0%)	4490 (100.0%)	5040 (100.0%)

Notes. Cell values are counts with percentages reported parenthetically. The SAT score ranges were used so that both the student scores on the old and 2016 SAT versions could be included. Total values will not match the aforementioned sample values because students do not always self-report this information.

Table 8. Student GPA Scores Compared between H-ICD Test-takers and Non-test-takers

Success Metric	Test-taker		Non-test-taker	
	n	Avg (SD)	n	Avg (SD)
High School GPA	209	3.71 (.45)**	1960	3.56 (.47)**
SU Cumulative GPA	725	3.13 (.66)**	6817	2.97 (.71)**

Notes. Cell values are sample sizes (n) or averages with standard deviation reported parenthetically. Significant difference of participation categories between test-takers' and non-test-takers' average values are indicated by two asterisks (**), $p \leq .001$. Total values will not match the aforementioned sample values because students do not always self-report this information or because some students have missing information in GullNet.

Validity and Reliability of the H-ICD Administration at SU

The results of our administration of the 74-item H-ICD supported its validity and reliability. Much of the validity of the H-ICD was described in ETS-related publications (Griffith *et al.* 2016, Liu *et al.* 2018, Swiggett 2019). Content validity was supported via the steps of literature review, review of existing measures, as well as expert review of items (Griffith *et al.* 2016, Swiggett 2019). This latter step also included defining performance-level descriptors for all levels of both H-ICD scaled scores (see Appendix 3 – [H-ICD Assessment Level Descriptions](#)) as well as a standard-setting method to identify students' proficiency for the Analyze & Act scaled score (Table 9; Swiggett 2019). Furthermore, scale analysis was supported using dimensionality analyses (Liu *et al.* 2018). Similarly, both individual-level reliability (Cronbach's alpha; α) and institution-level total score reliability satisfactorily supported the reliability of the scaled scores and scaled subscores (Liu *et al.* 2018).

Table 9. Level descriptions and score/subscore interpretations for the H-ICD (HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Analyze & Act and Approach Level Descriptions 2018; ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Sample Institutional Score Report 2016; HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite Scores 2022)

SCORE/Subscore Name	SU Level	ETS Level	Score/Subscore Range	Test-takers at this level...
ANALYZE & ACT scaled score	Proficient	Advanced	175 – 180	...are highly aware of/able to identify the 10 descriptions of interactions among culturally different others*
		Proficient	158 – 174	...are moderately aware of/able to identify the 10 descriptions of interactions among culturally different others*
	Need Improvement	Developing	150 – 157	...are not very aware of/able to identify the 10 descriptions of interactions among culturally different others*
Self-Awareness scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
Cultural Knowledge Application scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
Suspending Judgment/ Perspective Taking scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
Social Monitoring scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
Emotion Regulation scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
Behavior Regulation scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	1 – 10	Varies
APPROACH scaled score	High	High	132 – 150‡	...view themselves as very capable of the 4 descriptions*
	Neutral	Neutral	105 – 131‡	...view themselves as moderately capable of the 4 descriptions*
	Low	Low	90 – 104‡	...view themselves as not very capable of the 4 descriptions*
Positive Cultural Orientation scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	9 – 15	Varies
Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscore	n/a	n/a	9 – 15	Varies

Notes. Although the H-ICD documentation describes the Advanced and Proficient proficiency levels for the Analyze & Act dimension, SU will only evaluate whether students are proficient or not and the “SU Proficiency Level” information details that difference. Asterisk (*) denotes that the 10 descriptions of interactions among culturally different others for the three ETS proficiency levels for Analyze & Act or the 4 descriptions of self-reported reactions to hypothetical situations regarding the three ETS levels for Approach are identical (HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Analyze & Act and Approach Level Descriptions 2018; see [Appendix 3](#)). ‡ denotes that the original value ranges provided for the three ETS levels for Approach (HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Analyze & Act and Approach Level Descriptions 2018) have since been updated to the values shown here – based upon values provided in other documents (ETS HEIghten

Intercultural Competency & Diversity Sample Institutional Score Report 2016; HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite Guide to Score Interpretation 2020).

Criterion and construct validity were supported based upon scaled score differences, for both the Analyze & Act as well as the Approach dimensions of the H-ICD, between freshmen and seniors at higher education institutions, where seniors scored significantly higher than freshmen on average (Liu *et al.* 2018). Also, both of the H-ICD scaled scores were supported as significantly linked to related self-reported variables, such as the number of countries traveled to and whether they had opportunities to learn and interact with people from ethnically diverse backgrounds. Those students that had traveled to more countries or had more opportunities to learn and interact with people from ethnically diverse backgrounds performed significantly better on the H-ICD scaled scores than those that had traveled to less countries or had less opportunities, respectively (Liu *et al.* 2018). Based on the SU student scores in fall 2019, criterion and construct validity were supported; students' Analyze & Act scaled score on this instrument had a moderate positive correlation with the SU students' related measure of SAT Verbal score range categories, $r = .483$ ($p < .001$) and a moderate positive correlation with the SU students' related measure of SAT Math score range categories, $r = .348$ ($p < .001$). Similarly, the students' proficiency binary score on this instrument had a small positive correlation with the SU students' related measure of SAT Verbal score range categories, $r = .272$ ($p < .001$) and a small positive correlation with the SU students' related measure of SAT Math score range categories, $r = .201$ ($p < .001$). The students' Approach scaled score was not correlated with SAT/ACT Scores. This is not unexpected as the Approach scaled score does not refer to any cognitive ability or skill but to self-reported attitudes aligned with ideas such as "positive cultural orientation," "cross-cultural self-efficacy" (Table 9) as well as "tolerance of ambiguity." The SAT score range categories were from 1 - 4 where: 1 = < 500; 2 = 500-599; 3 = 600-699; and 4 = 700-800). Correlation coefficients $\geq .1$ but less than $.3$ are evidence of small effect sizes and $\geq .3$ but less than $.5$ are evidence of medium effect sizes (Field 2013).

SU Student Scores on the H-ICD

On average, the SU students who participated ($n = 725$) had an average Analyze & Act scaled score of 166.6 ($SD = 7.4$) with a range of 150 to 180 as well as an average Approach scaled score of 118.8 ($SD = 9.7$) with a range of 90 to 150 on the H-ICD instrument (Table 10). In all but two of the Analyze & Act-aligned scaled subscores, Self-Awareness as well as Suspending Judgment/Perspective Taking, the SU students' average scores are higher than or equal to the comparison group's average scores. Whereas, both Approach-aligned scaled subscores are marginally less than the comparison group's average scores.

However, it should be noted that the ETS comparison group data, which comprises 1,691 undergraduate students, should only be considered as a preliminary comparison since this is a limited sample of students who took the H-ICD between August-October 2017. Although that sample represents undergraduate students from a wide range of Higher Education institutions, it is not a large enough sample to be considered representative of all students in Higher Education. However, as ETS re-evaluates the H-ICD benchmark values after broader sampling of students, then those numbers can be used in future SU H-ICD reports, if applicable. The possible Analyze & Act scaled score range is 150 – 180 and its respective 6 scaled subscores' ranges are 1 – 10, whereas the possible Approach scaled score range is 90 – 150 and its respective 2 scaled subscores' ranges are 9 – 15 (Table 9).

The SU average Analyze & Act scaled score of 166.6 is marginally greater than that of the comparison group, 166.3 ($SD = 8.6$). More importantly, not only do the H-ICD Analyze & Act scaled score proficiency

levels (85.5%; [Table 10](#)) indicate that the majority of SU students are proficient in those skills, but the SU average Analyze & Act scaled score of 166.6 is also well above the H-ICD benchmark cut-off for proficiency (158). However, 14.5% of the H-ICD test-takers (n = 105) have Analyze & Act scaled scores of less than 158 and therefore need improvement. The SU average Approach scaled score of 118.8 is marginally lower than the comparison group, 119.9 (SD = 10.0) – although both are within the “Neutral” category.

Table 10. SU (white columns) and ETS Comparison Group (gray columns) Students’ Levels on the Scaled Scores/Subscores of the H-ICD

SCORE/ subscore	ETS Comparison Group (n = 1,691)			SU Fall 2019 (n = 725)		
	Avg (SD) SU Level	Percent of Students		Avg (SD) SU Level	Percent of Students	
		Proficient	Need Improvement		Proficient	Need Improvement
ANALYZE & ACT	166.3 (8.6) <i>Proficient</i>	81%	19%	166.6 (7.4) <i>Proficient</i>	85.5%	14.5%
<i>Self-Awareness</i>	5.7 (2.5)	n/a	n/a	5.6 (2.4)	n/a	n/a
<i>Cultural Knowledge Application</i>	5.7 (2.5)	n/a	n/a	5.8 (2.3)	n/a	n/a
<i>Suspending Judgment/ Perspective Taking</i>	5.6 (2.5)	n/a	n/a	5.5 (2.4)	n/a	n/a
<i>Social Monitoring</i>	5.6 (2.6)	n/a	n/a	5.7 (2.4)	n/a	n/a
<i>Emotion Regulation</i>	5.6 (2.5)	n/a	n/a	5.6 (2.3)	n/a	n/a
<i>Behavior Regulation</i>	5.5 (2.6)	n/a	n/a	5.8 (2.4)	n/a	n/a
APPROACH	119.9 (10.0) <i>Neutral</i>	n/a	n/a	118.8 (9.7) <i>Neutral</i>	n/a	n/a
<i>Positive Cultural Orientation</i>	12.0 (1.0)	n/a	n/a	11.9 (1.0)	n/a	n/a
<i>Cultural Self-Efficacy</i>	12.0 (1.0)	n/a	n/a	11.9 (1.0)	n/a	n/a

Note. The ETS comparison group data (gray) is based on the HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite Guide to Score Interpretation (2020). SU proficiency levels for the Analyze & Act scaled score are: Proficient = students with scores ranging from 158 – 180; Need Improvement = students with scores ranging from 150 – 157; whereas SU levels for the Approach scaled score are equivalent to the ETS levels (see [Table 9](#) for more details). **Highlighted** values denote where the SU fall 2019 scaled score or scaled subscore averages were less than those of the ETS comparison group.

On average, SU native, first-time students had similar H-ICD scaled scores as compared to transfer students ([Table 11](#)). The difference in the Analyze & Act scaled score, .6, was not significant $t(721) = .951, p > .05$. The difference in the Approach scaled score, -1.5, was not significant $t(721) = -1.675, p > .05$. Similarly, for most of the scaled subscores, SU native, first-time students had similar scores as compared to transfer students ([Appendix 3 - Table 1](#)). However, for the Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscore, the difference, -.2, was significant $t(721) = -2.207, p < .05$, where SU native, first-time students had lower scores as compared to transfer students.

Table 11. Student Admit Type, to SU, Average Scaled Scores on the H-ICD

SU Admit Type (code)	n	Analyze & Act				Approach	
		Scaled Score		Percent of Students		Score	SD
		Score	SD	Proficient	Need Improvement		
First-time student (F)	574	166.7	7.5	85.5%	14.5%	118.5	9.7
Transfer (T + U)	149	166.1	7.2	85.2%	14.8%	120.0	9.6

Based on previous findings discussed regarding H-ICD criterion and construct validity (Liu *et al.* 2018), as students' class level (e.g., freshman, senior) increased, so too did the average Analyze & Act and Approach scaled scores on the instrument. The same trend was supported for this SU administration of the H-ICD Analyze & Act and Approach scaled scores as well as for seven of the eight scaled subscores. Specifically, at SU, sophomores, juniors, and/or seniors scored greater than freshmen on the H-ICD Analyze & Act and Approach scaled scores (Table 12) as well as the Self-Awareness, Cultural Knowledge Application, Social Monitoring, Emotion Regulation, Behavior Regulation, Positive Cultural Orientation, and Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscores (Appendix 3 - Table 2). However, there were no significant differences between class level groups' averages for the Suspending Judgment/Perspective Taking scaled subscore, although there was a trend of increasing score with increasing class level (Appendix 3 - Table 2).

For the Analyze & Act scaled score, the effect of difference in average scores between groups, although significant, was small based on effect size value interpretation ($F(3, 705) = 5.3, p < .01, r = .15$). Post hoc comparisons, via the Tukey HSD test, were used to identify which class levels' average scores were significantly different (Table 12). Tests revealed significant pairwise differences between the Analyze & Act scaled scores of freshmen as compared to sophomores' ($p < .05$) and seniors' ($p < .01$).

For the Approach scaled score, the effect of difference in average scores between groups, although significant, was also small based on effect size value interpretation ($F(3, 705) = 4.9, p < .01, r = .14$). Tukey HSD tests also revealed significant pairwise differences (Table 12) between the Approach scaled scores of freshmen compared to seniors' ($p < .01$).

Similarly, there were significant differences in the H-ICD scaled subscores based on class level, but the effect of differences in average scores between groups was small based on effect size value interpretation [Self-Awareness scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 4.7, p < .01, r = .14$); Cultural Knowledge Application scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 4.3, p < .01, r = .13$); Social Monitoring scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 3.1, p < .05, r = .11$); Emotion Regulation scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 2.9, p < .05, r = .11$); Behavior Regulation scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 3.2, p < .05, r = .12$); Positive Cultural Orientation scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 3.6, p < .05, r = .12$); Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscore: ($F(3, 705) = 5.3, p < .01, r = .15$)] Post hoc comparisons, via the Tukey HSD test revealed significant pairwise differences (Appendix 3 - Table 2) between the average Self-Awareness scaled subscores of sophomores and seniors, which were significantly higher, as compared to the average score of freshmen ($p < .05$ and $p < .01$, respectively). They also revealed the significant pairwise differences between the average Cultural Knowledge Application, Social Monitoring, Emotion Regulation, and Positive Cultural Orientation scaled subscores of seniors, which were significantly higher, as compared to the average scaled subscores of freshmen ($p < .01, p < .05, p < .05, p < .05$, respectively). They also revealed the significant pairwise difference between the average Behavior Regulation scaled subscore of sophomores, which was significantly higher, as compared to the average scaled subscore of freshmen ($p < .05$). Also, there were significant pairwise differences between the average Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscores of juniors

and seniors, which were significantly higher, as compared to the average scaled subscore of freshmen ($p < .05$ and $p < .01$, respectively). No other class level comparisons for the average scaled subscores were significantly different ([Appendix 3 - Table 2](#)).

Table 12. Student Undergraduate Class Level Average Scaled Scores on the H-ICD

Class Level (code)	n	Analyze & Act				Approach	
		Scaled Score		Percent of Students		Score	SD
		Score	SD	Proficient	Need Improvement		
Freshmen (1)	278	165.2 ^{a*}	7.3	83.1%	16.9%	117.1 ^{a*}	9.2
Sophomores (2)	198	167.0 ^{ab*}	7.3	85.9%	14.1%	119.2 ^{ab}	9.7
Juniors (3)	61	167.3 ^{ab}	7.9	86.9%	13.1%	120.2 ^b	8.8
Seniors (and +) (4)	172	167.9 ^{a*}	7.3	88.4%	11.6%	120.3 ^{b*}	10.5
Unclassified, non-degree undergrads (7)	16	167.6 ^{n/a}	7.8	87.5%	12.5%	121.8 ^{n/a}	7.4

Notes. Subset groups' average scores are indicated by group letters ^{a, b} or ^{n/a}. The latter is because there were fewer than 30 students in the unclassified, non-degree undergraduates group; therefore, those students were removed prior to the ANOVA analysis. Results from sample sizes fewer than 30 should be interpreted with caution. Where a class level differs significantly compared to another class level is indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$.

Student performance by SU College or School for each of the H-CCE scaled scores are detailed in [Table 13](#) and scaled subscores in [Appendix 3 - Table 3](#). There was a significant difference in both of the H-ICD scaled scores based on enrollment in College or School at SU, but the effect of difference in average scores between groups was small based on effect size value interpretation [Analyze & Act: $F(5, 719) = 3.2$, $p < .01$, $r = .15$]; Approach: $F(5, 719) = 2.4$, $p < .05$, $r = .13$]. Post hoc comparisons, via the Tukey HSD test, were used to identify which College or Schools' average scores were significantly different. Tukey HSD tests revealed significant pairwise differences ([Table 13](#)) between the average Analyze & Act scaled scores of students from Henson, which was significantly higher, as compared to the average score of students from Perdue ($p < .01$). For the Approach scaled score, Tukey HSD tests revealed no significant pairwise differences ([Table 13](#)) between the average scores of students; the average scores of students do not significantly differ by enrollment in College or School at SU ($p > .05$).

Similarly, there were significant differences in four of the eight H-ICD scaled subscores based on enrollment in College or School at SU, based on students' primary major, but the effect of differences in average scores between groups was small based on effect size value interpretation [Emotion Regulation scaled subscore: $F(5, 226.107) = 2.7$, $p < .05$, $r = .14$]; Behavior Regulation scaled subscore: $F(5, 719) = 3.0$, $p < .05$, $r = .14$]; Positive Cultural Orientation scaled subscore: $F(5, 219.433) = 3.1$, $p < .05$, $r = .15$]; Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscore: $F(5, 719) = 2.2$, $p < .05$, $r = .12$]. Post hoc comparisons, via the Tukey HSD test revealed significant pairwise differences ([Appendix 3 - Table 3](#)) between the average Emotion Regulation and Behavior Regulation scaled subscores of students from Henson, which were significantly higher, as compared to the average scaled subscores of students from Perdue ($p < .01$). They also revealed the significant pairwise differences between the average Positive Cultural Orientation scaled subscore of students from Fulton, which was significantly higher, as compared to the average

scaled subscore of students from Perdue ($p < .01$). For the Cultural Self-Efficacy scaled subscore, Tukey HSD tests revealed no significant pairwise differences ([Appendix 3 - Table 3](#)) between the average scores of students; the average scores of students do not significantly differ by enrollment in College or School at SU ($p > .05$). No other College or School enrollment comparisons for the average scaled subscores were significantly different ([Appendix 3 - Table 3](#)).

Table 13. Student College/School Enrollment Average Scaled Scores on the H-ICD

College/School	n	Analyze & Act				Approach	
		Scaled Score		Percent of Students		Score	SD
		Score	SD	Proficient	Need Improvement		
CHHS	204	166.5 ^{ab}	7.1	86.8%	13.2%	119.1 ^{ab}	9.0
Fulton	142	167.1 ^{ab}	7.7	87.3%	12.7%	120.7 ^b	10.5
Henson	121	168.3 ^{b*}	7.1	89.3%	10.7%	119.0 ^{ab}	10.0
Perdue	141	164.8 ^{a*}	7.9	76.6%	23.4%	117.7 ^{ab}	9.7
Seidel	80	166.8 ^{ab}	6.9	88.8%	11.3%	117.8 ^{ab}	9.2
Undeclared	37	165.7 ^{ab}	7.6	86.5%	13.5%	115.8 ^a	9.1

Notes. Subset groups' average scores are indicated by group letters ^a and ^b, where the group ^a category differs significantly compared to group ^b category is indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .01$.

Although not presented here, student performance by primary major is available [upon request](#) to programs or Departments when at least 30 students in that major participated in this instrument's administration. These data can be used for informal review and improvement efforts, or for more formal program review and improvement efforts such as Academic Program Review required reporting related to assessment of program student learning outcomes aligned with this instrument, when applicable.

H-ICD and SOS Survey Student Responses

The H-ICD test-takers also took the SOS Survey ($n = 706$; [Table 14](#); [Appendix 2](#)). We were able to evaluate the reliability of both subscales within the SOS Survey. The *Importance* subscale, which addresses the extent to which the student thought it was important to do well on the H-ICD, demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .759$). Similarly, the *Effort* subscale, which addresses the extent to which the student fully engaged in effortful behavior on the H-ICD, demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .806$). The validity of the instrument is discussed in the SOS Survey Manual (Sundre & Thelk 2007). The 10 items, five in each subscale, are measured in a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. There are four items that are negatively worded, and their scores were reverse coded prior to analysis.

In general, students selected "Agree" in their responses for the *Importance* and *Effort* subscales. For *Importance*, this indicates that students thought that their scores on the H-ICD instrument would affect them somewhat in either a positive or negative way. For *Effort*, it indicates that students put in a moderate effort towards completing the H-ICD instrument. The two subscales had a moderate positive correlation with one another, $r = .398$ ($p < .001$; medium effect size). The *Importance* subscale was also minimally positively correlated with both H-ICD scaled scores [Analyze & Act, $r = .234$ ($p < .001$, small effect size); Approach, $r = .253$ ($p < .001$; small effect size)]. The *Effort* subscale had a moderate positive correlation with the H-ICD Analyze & Act scaled score ($r = .439$; $p < .001$, medium effect size) and had a small positive correlation with the H-ICD Approach scaled score ($r = .216$; $p < .001$, small effect size). These correlations with both of the H-ICD scaled scores seem to indicate that the students who self-

reported that the H-ICD was an important test and exerted more effort on performance on the test also scored higher than those who did not self-report the high importance of the test or exerting as much effort on the test, respectively, although the effect sizes are small to medium.

Table 14. Student Opinion Scale (SOS) Survey subscales' administrative results for the students who also participated in the H-ICD instrument administration

SOS Subscale	Number of Items	Reliability (α)	n	Average Score (out of 25)	SD
Importance	5	.759	706	16.6	3.8
Effort	5	.806	706	20.4	3.1

Discussion

Based on the results presented here it seems that there is room for improvement in the Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes at SU. Several action items are suggested below towards this end.

1. To determine whether our students are meeting SU expectations for Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence, the benchmarks with which SU students' Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence are compared should be evaluated by objective faculty and/or staff with expertise in the discipline or assessment of those student learning outcomes. For example, what percentage of students do we expect to be proficient?
2. Perform an area/course mapping of the current SU courses that align with the new Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence General Education student learning outcomes.
3. Based on discussions and decisions related to Action Items #1-2, relevant parties such as faculty teaching courses aligned with this student learning outcome and the General Education Steering Committee should consider whether the H-ICD instrument is aligned well with the new (as of November 2018) SU General Education Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes. If it is not aligned, then an alternative assessment that is aligned should be identified.
4. Relevant stakeholders at SU should consider the results from the H-ICD assessment to develop interventions or review and update curricula to align with areas that need improvement. In particular, and possibly in conjunction with Action Item #2, these data can be re-evaluated to help identify courses that students with high H-ICD scaled scores/subscores have completed at SU to investigate potentially successful Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence-related interventions on campus. Successful projects at other institutions may be considered to guide instructional interventions at SU.
5. Relevant stakeholders at SU should request further analyses of the H-ICD data to address additional questions of interest that were not described here (e.g., potential analyses for courses or programs).
6. Based on discussions and decisions related to Action Items #1-5, a timeline for re-assessment of the SU General Education Inclusion & Diversity as well as Intercultural Competence student learning outcomes should be finalized. At this time, the H-ICD is planned to be re-assessed in fall 2023 and every three years after. This will allow an analysis of whether there is change in student learning outcomes based upon either a change in assessment or instructional or curricular interventions.

References

- About the HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite. 2022. <https://territorium.com/about-the-assessments/> Accessed February 2022.
- ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Sample Institutional Score Report. 2016. https://www.ets.org/s/heighten/pdf/heighten_sample_icd_institution_aggregate_report.pdf Accessed November 2020.
- Field, A. P. 2013. *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 267.
- Griffith, R. L., Wolfeld, L., Armon, B. K., Rios, J., & Liu, O. L. 2016. Assessing Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Existing Research and Future Directions. *ETS Research Report Series, 2016(2)*, 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12112>
- HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment. 2022. <https://territorium.com/intercultural-competency-diversity/> Accessed February 2022.
- HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Analyze & Act and Approach Level Descriptions. 2018. <https://territorium.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ICD-Performance-Level-Descriptions.pdf> Accessed February 2022.
- HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Sample Questions. 2017. <https://territorium.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ICD-Sample-Questions.pdf> Accessed February 2022.
- HEIghten Intercultural Competency and Diversity Test-at-a-Glance. 2017. <https://territorium.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ICD-Test-at-a-Glance.pdf> Accessed February 2022.
- HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite Guide to Score Interpretation. 2020. ETS.
- HEIghten Outcomes Assessment Suite Scores. 2022. <https://territorium.com/scores/> Accessed February 2022.
- Liu, O. L., Roohr, K. C., & Rios, J. A. 2018. Assessing Civic and Intercultural Competency in Higher Education: The ETS HEIghten[®] Approach. *ETS Research Report Series, 2018(1)*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12212>
- Swiggett, W. D. 2019. Providing Threshold Score Recommendations for the Second Phase of Assessments for the HEIghten[®] Outcomes Assessment Suite: A Standard-Setting Study. *ETS Research Memorandum*, 45. <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RM-19-06.pdf>
- Sundre, D. L., & Thelk, A. D. 2007. [“The Student Opinion Scale \(SOS\): A Measure of Examinee Motivation: Test Manual.”](#) James Madison University, The Center for Assessment & Research Studies.

Salisbury University H-ICD Reporting Documentation

The following related reporting documentation can be found at the [General Education Outcome Assessment Report website](#):

1. Fall 2017 Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Field Test – ETS-provided Institutional Score Report
2. Fall 2019 Inclusion & Diversity and Intercultural Competence ONESHEET

Appendices

[Appendix 1](#). ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competence & Diversity Assessment Sample Questions

[Appendix 2](#). Student Opinion Scale (SOS) Survey (Sundre & Theik 2007)

[Appendix 3](#). Additional H-ICD descriptions and results

Appendix 1. ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competence & Diversity Assessment Sample Questions

Note: These following sample items and answer key are for reference only and are originally from the [HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Sample Questions](#) document (2017). They provide examples of question types, skills measured, contexts covered, and the difficulty of the questions.

Part 1

Directions: Please respond to the following statements by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions.

1. I like to work on projects where the outcome is not predictable.
(A) Strongly disagree
(B) Disagree
(C) Agree
(D) Strongly agree
2. The way a person behaves in a social situation is largely based on who they are and NOT on the culture in which they were raised.
(A) Strongly disagree
(B) Disagree
(C) Agree
(D) Strongly agree

Part 2

Directions: You will read some questions about situations requiring a decision or opinion. After each question, you will see four or more answer choices. Select the answer choice that **best** answers the question. For **some** questions, you will be asked to select **more than one** answer choice.

3. A group of students from another country is going to visit your university, and each student will be placed with a local family during the stay.

Select the options for the blanks that, taken together, would produce the best direction for encouraging a positive cultural exchange.

The university should take care to _____ in order to make sure that _____.

Blank 1	Blank 2
(A) introduce each student to their homestay family in advance	(A) the family does not have to adjust their lifestyle in any way
(B) arrange an appropriate meal plan for each student	(B) the family has some information about the student's background
(C) provide transportation to and from the university	(C) the family includes the student in housekeeping chores

Questions 4 — 5 refer to the information below.

Zak grew up in a country where senior members of the community are accustomed to helping with the financial concerns of younger people who ask for assistance. When Zak arrives in a new country on a student visa, he finds it difficult to manage the many expenses that are not covered by his scholarship. He meets with his advisor and, after exchanging greetings and asking about the advisor's family, Zak politely asks for a sum of money that will help him through the next two months. His advisor is surprised and flustered at what seems to him to be an inappropriate request.

4. What response by Zak's advisor best reflects the ability to control emotion in the face of a possible cross-cultural misunderstanding?

- (A) "So let's get this straight, Zak. You're asking me to give you a personal loan!?"
- (B) "Sorry, Zak. I'm not in a position to just hand out large amounts of cash."
- (C) "Well, Zak. That's a very unusual request for a student to make to an advisor here."
- (D) "No, Zak. I can't give you money. You should have made arrangements for this before you came here."

5. What behavior on Zak's part **best** demonstrates his ability to respond appropriately to the difference in cultural norms suggested by his advisor's response?

- (A) Zak apologizes for any misunderstanding and adds that he appreciates the advisor's guidance as to local customs that might differ from his own.
- (B) Zak asks for ideas about what actions would be appropriate in this country, and adds that he will do his best to repay any loan the advisor can make.
- (C) Zak thanks the advisor for his time and explains that he will try to ask someone else at the school to give him the money.
- (D) Zak laughs and tells the advisor he is sure that other students from his country make similar requests as they adjust to living in this country.

Answer Key:

1. There is no right or wrong answer.
2. There is no right or wrong answer.
3. A, B
4. C
5. A

Appendix 2. Student Opinion Scale (SOS) Survey (Sundre & Thelk 2007)

Item	Item Text	Subscale
1	Doing well on these tests was important to me.	Importance
2	I engaged in good effort throughout these tests.	Effort
3*	I am not curious about how I did on these tests.	Importance
4*	I am not concerned about the scores I receive on these tests.	Importance
5	These were important tests to me.	Importance
6	I gave my best effort on these tests.	Effort
7*	While taking these tests, I could have worked harder on them.	Effort
8	I would like to know how well I did on these tests.	Importance
9*	I did not give these tests my full attention while completing them.	Effort
10	While taking these tests, I was able to persist to completion of the tasks.	Effort

Notes. Asterisk (*) denotes items that are reversed prior to scoring.

Appendix 3. Additional H-ICD descriptions and results

H-ICD Assessment Level Descriptions

As is indicated by the ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment Analyze & Act and Approach Level Descriptions (2018), the descriptions for the Analyze & Act (n = 10) and Approach (n = 4) dimensions of the H-ICD are identical across the three respective categories (proficiency or group, respectively) and are listed below. The difference between the proficiency or group is determined by the statement preceding the descriptions (e.g., very capable, moderately capable, or not very capable) for the Approach dimension’s level descriptions.

Analyze & Act Performance Level Descriptions

1. the impact of their own culture, values, preferences, and previous experiences on their cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses
2. how certain behaviors or actions may be interpreted by other people
3. how nonverbal behaviors or cues may signal certain feelings, thoughts, or intentions
4. others' responses to their own actions and signals
5. others' physical, verbal, and non-verbal behaviors and cues during a social interaction
6. others’ potential viewpoints
7. how preconceived judgments and stereotyped thinking can interfere with information processing
8. how to use declarative cultural knowledge to enhance interactions (with culturally different others)
9. the importance of monitoring and revising personal behavior to engage in culturally appropriate behavior and to avoid culturally inappropriate behavior
10. the importance of monitoring and revising emotions in an automatic or controlled manner

Approach Level Descriptions

1. adapting to and navigating cross-cultural environments
2. communicating with and understanding the intentions and viewpoints of culturally different others
3. facing/dealing with ambiguous circumstances or situations that do not have clear outcomes
4. responding to cross-cultural interactions in a positive way

Additional H-ICD scaled subscore results by demographic groups

Appendix 3 - Table 1. Student Admit Type, to SU, Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD

Scale	Scaled Subscore	SU Admit Type (code); sample size			
		First-time student (F); n = 574		Transfer (T + U); n = 149	
		Score	SD	Score	SD
Analyze & Act	Self-Awareness	5.6	2.4	5.6	2.4
	Cultural Knowledge Application	5.8	2.3	5.6	2.4
	Suspending Judgment/ Perspective Taking	5.6	2.3	5.3	2.4
	Social Monitoring	5.7	2.4	5.4	2.3
	Emotion Regulation	5.7	2.3	5.5	2.3
	Behavior Regulation	5.8	2.4	5.8	2.3
Approach	Positive Cultural Orientation	11.9	1.0	11.9	0.9
	Cultural Self-Efficacy	11.9*	1.0	12.1*	1.0

Notes. Where the admit type differs significantly in scores are indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$.

Appendix 3 - Table 2. Student Undergraduate Class Level Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD

Scale	Scaled Subscore	Class Level (code); sample size									
		Freshmen (1); n = 278		Sophomores (2); n = 198		Juniors (3); n = 61		Seniors (and +) (4); n = 172		Unclassified, non-degree undergrads (7); n = 16	
		Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD
Analyze & Act	Self-Awareness	5.2 ^{a**}	2.4	5.8 ^{ab*}	2.2	5.8 ^{ab}	2.4	5.9 ^{b**}	2.3	5.8 ^{n/a}	2.6
	Cultural Knowledge Application	5.4 ^{**}	2.4	5.9	2.3	6.1	2.5	6.2 ^{**}	2.1	6.0 ^{n/a}	2.8
	Suspending Judgment/ Perspective Taking	5.3	2.3	5.6	2.3	5.7	2.6	5.8	2.5	5.7 ^{n/a}	2.4
	Social Monitoring	5.4 [*]	2.4	5.6	2.4	5.7	2.1	6.1 [*]	2.3	5.4 ^{n/a}	2.4
	Emotion Regulation	5.4 [*]	2.3	5.7	2.2	5.6	2.5	6.0 [*]	2.3	6.1 ^{n/a}	2.2
	Behavior Regulation	5.4 [*]	2.4	6.0 [*]	2.3	6.1	2.4	6.0	2.3	6.1 ^{n/a}	2.3
	Approach	Positive Cultural Orientation	11.7 [*]	0.9	12.0	1.0	12.0	1.0	12.0 [*]	1.0	12.2 ^{n/a}
Cultural Self-Efficacy		11.7 ^{a**}	1.0	11.9 ^{ab}	1.0	12.1 ^{b*}	0.9	12.1 ^{b*}	1.1	12.3 ^{n/a}	0.8

Notes. Subset groups' average scores are indicated by group letters ^{a, b} or ^{n/a}. The latter is because there were fewer than 30 students in the unclassified, non-degree undergraduates group; therefore, those students were removed prior to the ANOVA analysis. Results from sample sizes fewer than 30 should be interpreted with caution. Where a class level differs significantly compared to another is indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .05$, or two (**), $p \leq .01$.

Appendix 3 - Table 3. Student College/School Enrollment Average Scaled Subscores on the H-ICD

Scale	Scaled Subscore	College/School; sample size											
		CHHS; n = 204		Fulton; n = 142		Henson; n = 121		Perdue; n = 141		Seidel; n = 80		Undeclared; n = 37	
		Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD	Score	SD
Analyze & Act	Self-Awareness	5.6	2.2	5.8	2.4	5.9	2.3	5.1	2.5	5.6	2.4	5.4	2.3
	Cultural Knowledge Application	5.8	2.3	6.0	2.3	6.2	2.2	5.5	2.2	5.6	2.5	5.3	2.6
	Suspending Judgment/ Perspective Taking	5.4	2.3	5.6	2.4	5.9	2.3	5.2	2.4	5.6	2.3	5.4	2.4
	Social Monitoring	5.7	2.4	5.7	2.4	6.1	2.2	5.4	2.5	5.7	2.2	5.2	2.5
	Emotion Regulation	5.6	2.3	5.8	2.4	6.0*	2.1	5.1*	2.4	5.8	2.3	5.5	1.9
	Behavior Regulation	5.8 ^{ab}	2.3	5.8 ^{ab}	2.4	6.3 ^{b*}	2.2	5.2 ^{a*}	2.5	5.9 ^{ab}	2.2	5.8 ^{ab}	2.2
Approach	Positive Cultural Orientation	11.9 ^a _b	0.8	12.1 ^b *	1.0	11.9 ^a _b	1.1	11.7 ^a *	1.0	11.8 ^a _b	0.9	11.7 ^{ab}	1.0
	Cultural Self-Efficacy	12.0	1.0	12.1	1.1	11.9	1.0	11.8	1.0	11.8	0.9	11.6	1.0

Notes. Subset groups' average scores are indicated by group letters ^a or ^b. Where a College/School differs significantly compared to another is indicated by an asterisk (*), $p \leq .01$.