



CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY
B A K E R S F I E L D

That said, some of the P/3 . ,74, students had taken social psychology and some had taken personality psychology, but likely not both. Thus, we excluded P/3 . ,74, students from analyses regarding the course they had not taken. Only (of the ,74, students had taken personality psychology and we compared them to the P/3 . 2424 students on personality psychology knowledge (5 questions). The P/3 . 2424 students demonstrated more knowledge ($M = 4.7, SD = 1.4$) than the P/3 . ,74, students ($M = 4.2, SD = 1.4$), albeit not at a statistically significant level, ($t(1) = 4.7, p < .001, d = .4$). In addition, of the P/3 . ,74, students took social psychology and they scored about equal ($M = 2.51, SD = 1.5$) to the P/3 . 2424 students ($M = 2.55, SD = 1.4$), ($t(54) = .5, p = .62, d = .01$).

On a brief note, P/3 . ,74, students scored slightly higher ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.54$) than P/3 . 2424 students ($M = 2.6, SD = 1.5$) on the methods questions alone, albeit not at a statistically significant level, ($t(1) = 1.15, p = .25, d = .02$).

Summary of Assessment Results

Main Findings

Although advanced students (P/3 . ,74,) outperformed lower-division students (P/3 . 2424) overall and on methods questions, the P/3 . 2424 students outperformed advanced students on specific content knowledge in social and personality psychology.

Recommendations for Program Improvement

1. , %

The faculty will discuss potential changes at a future meeting.

Courses should be conducted to capture content that is covered in all iterations of these courses and to ensure accurate representation of material taught in the program. In addition, instead of