Journal of Diversity in Higher Education

Expanding the Reach of Intergroup Dialogue: A Quasi-Experimental Study of Two Teaching Methods for Undergraduate Multicultural Courses

Christa K. Schmidt, David R. Earnest, and Joseph R. Miles

Expanding the Reach of Intergroup Dialogue: A Quasi-Experimental Study of Two Teaching Methods for Undergraduate Multicultural Courses

Christa K. Schmidt and David R. Earnest
Towson University

Joseph R. Miles
University of Tennessee, Knoville

Colleges and universities are closely examining their practices for engaging campus constituents in multicultural education. One method that has received increased attention is the use of intergroup dialogue (IGD). Although there is mounting research evidence of the effectiveness of IGD in meeting the goals and objectives of multicultural education, there remains a need to demonstrate its ability to be integrated into an existing curriculum and what specifically it adds to typical methods for teaching about diversity. The current study compared undergraduate diversity-topic courses that were taught with and without an IGD component integrated into the existing curriculum. One hundred twelve undergraduate students enrolled in 1 of 5 courses completed survey measures at the beginning and end of the semester. Results from split-plot ANOVAs demonstrated that students enrolled in courses with IGD showed greater increases over the course of the semester on measures of racial oppression awareness, openness to diversity, and empathic feeling and acting as an ally than students enrolled in courses without the IGD component. Further, main effects demonstrated that students enrolled in both course formats had increased scores on awareness of systems of oppression and privilege as well as anxiety and lack of multicultural self-efficacy over the course of the semester. These findings add to the growing literature on the effectiveness of IGD and extend the generalizability to campuses integrating IGD teaching methods to an existing curriculum.

Keywords: intergroup dialogue, multicultural education, multicultural psychology, pedagogy

The social and political climate on college campuses in the United States has drawn attention to the difficulty our society is experiencing when it comes to processing our differences. Administrators and faculty in higher education are grappling with these growing divides and allocating resources to help mitigate the distress students are experiencing as a result of intergroup tensions. Though experiencing distress can be harmful, open—and sometimes anxiety-provoking—dialogue can also provide opportunity for individual and group growth. For example, many institutions are implementing programs designed to help undergraduate students openly dialogue about their different identities, associated forms of privilege and oppression, and perspectives on current social conflicts. One such model, intergroup dialogue (IGD), was designed and first implemented over 30 years ago (Thompson, Brett, & Behling, 2001; Zúñiga & Nagda, 1993; Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2007) but has received increased attention as a method for addressing current social and political divides across the country (e.g., Gurin, Nagda, & Zúñiga, 2013). As there is mounting evidence of the effectiveness of IGD from the developers of this approach (Gurin et al., 2013), other institutions are looking for ways to incorporate IGD into their multicultural education efforts. The purpose of the current study was to investigate the unique contribution of IGD when included in college courses alongside multicultural course content.

Multicultural Education

Historically, universities have focused student engagement with diversity on structural (e.g., recruiting students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds) and curricular (e.g., courses with multicultural content) levels (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008), with only limited emphasis on the interactional level that allows room for members of the campus community to engage meaningfully across the differences they represent (Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). One lesson from the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision and subsequent racial integration of schools was that exposure to people of different races alone is necessary but not sufficient to promote educational benefits. Students with different racial identities need to be encouraged to learn from one another in meaningful ways (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004) in settings in which there is status equality, the existence of common goals, and intimacy (Zirkel & Cantor, 2004).

There is robust empirical support for this *intergroup contact hypothesis*: Intergroup contact under the conditions of equal status between groups, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities, law, or custom (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998) can lead to positive outcomes for intergroup attitudes and relations (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). In fact, a

Christa K. Schmidt and David R. Earnest, Department of Psychology, Towson University; Joseph R. Miles, Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoville.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christa K. Schmidt, Department of Psychology, Towson University, 8000 York Road, Towson, MD 21252. E-mail: ckschmidt@towson.edu

meta-analysis of intergroup contact research suggests that the power of contact with outgroup members may not only relate to the "liking" of members of that outgroup but may extend to "greater liking" for members of still other outgroups (Pettigrew et al., 2011, p. 275). Accordingly, educational and societal benefits of increased opportunities for meaningful interaction across one social identity group on college campuses may extend beyond to relations with members of other social identity groups.

Many diversity education initiatives on college campuses emphasize cross-cultural education, which encourages students to learn about individuals who have different identities and backgrounds (Gudykunst, 1998). Critical multicultural education, however, advanced the notion that students needed more than appreciation of diversity—they also need knowledge of how systems of power and privilege perpetuate inequality (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007) and the required skills to challenge these systems. Freire (1985) theorized that multicultural education should take a liberation approach, whereby students develop *critical consciousness*, or the ability to recognize systems of oppression and one's role in these systems, and to develop strategies that empower individuals toward social action. Freire asserted that the strategies of liberation education include abilities to (a) listen to the needs and perspectives of others, (b) engage in dialogue to create empathic connection and mutual responsibility, and (c) build on the knowledge gained in dialogue to engage in positive social action. Conceptualizing multicultural education from this framework provides a groundwork for how students move from passive recipients of knowledge about diversity to active change agents in systems of inequality and oppression (Ali & Ancis, 2005).

Intergroup Dialogue

Pioneered by multicultural educators at the University of Michigan in the late 1980s, IGD aligns with the tenets of dialogic, critical multicultural education (Freire, 1985). Building on Freire's (1985) conceptualizations and drawing from the literature in communication studies, IGD uses *a critical-dialogic* model, whereby the analysis of power imbalance and the need for social action (critical) are engaged through relationship-building communication processes that engage the individual in self-awareness while also appreciating differences among individuals (dialogic; Gurin-Sands, Gurin, Nagda, & Osuna, 2012). The critical-dialogic model emphasizes change on both individual and system levels through sustained communication over an extended period; raising consciousness of individual, cultural, and institutional beliefs and behaviors; and building connections across differences (Sorensen, Nagda, Gurin, & Maxwell, 2009). IGD brings meaningful engagement across identity differences under the conditions outlined by intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954) that maximize potential benefits of diversity in education. Specifically, IGD is a semistructured and facilitated group intervention that teaches individuals how to discuss differences in identity and perspective while also making space to address both historical and current conflicts (Zúñiga et al., 2002). In this model, students meet over several weeks in small groups, with balanced representation across the identities that relate to the topic of the dialogue (e.g., people of color and White people; lesbian, gay, and bisexual people and heterosexual people; women and men; transgender people and cisgender people). Participants discuss challenging topics and learn from one another as they consider their own identities and perspectives. These characteristics of IGD differ from typical didactic courses that teach diversity-related content as well as from singular presentations that expose students to new information in a multicultural context, without providing opportunities for meaningful engagement with one another across groups.

In their review of the research literature on the effectiveness of IGD, Dessel and Rogge (2008) found that IGD programs have been included in academic, community, and international settings, with great variability in their implementation. Even so, they concluded that studies across these varied settings highlight a wide range of positive outcomes associated with participation in IGD. Research on the Program on Intergroup Relations at the University of Michigan, which has served as a model of IGD for college campuses across the country, highlights some of these positive outcomes (University of Michigan, 2018). For example, Gurin et al. (2004) conducted a longitudinal field study comparing students who took a dialogue course with a control group of nonparticipants during their first year of undergraduate study and again in their senior year. They found that students who participated in the course with a dialogue component during their first semester expressed greater democratic sentiments and civic participation during their senior year than nonparticipants. Similarly, Gurin et al. (2013) reported on a multiyear, multiuniversity (including the University of Michigan) experimental study that compared outcomes for students who participated in IGD with those in a control group of traditional lecture-based social science classes on race and gender. They found significant pre–post increases in cognitive outcomes (e.g., considering multiple perspectives), affective outcomes (e.g., positivity in interactions with others), understanding of the structural nature of inequality, intergroup empathy, and intergroup collaboration outcomes in those who participated in IGD but not among participants in the control classes. Krings, Austic, Gutierrez, and Dirksen (2015) also found that students enrolled in courses with a dialogue component demonstrated increases in political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism at the completion of the course, whereas students in a lecture-based course on social justice issues saw positive change in political participation and multicultural activism only.

Although these studies demonstrated promising results for IGD as a mechanism of effective multicultural education, critics have raised issues with the implementation and reach of such programs. For instance, the effects of IGD appear to be different for those holding privileged and oppressed identities, and some have raised the question of IGD's ability to influence institutional policy or curriculum (Dessel & Rogge, 2008). Further, some scholars have also criticized IGD mechanisms as either too liberal in the focus on peer-facilitated, relational pedagogy or too conservative with a limited scope of influencing social policy or university curriculum (Nagda, Gurin, Sorenson, Gurin-Sands, & Osuna, 2009). Still, IGD represents an empirically supported way of engaging students in critical multicultural education, and universities are looking to implement similar programs for students. A concern in the research to date is that much of the evidence comes from the courses in the well-established and well-funded program at the University of Michigan. In this program, students can enroll in for-credit, stand-alone IGD courses that center on experiential learning through dialogue (University of Michigan, 2018). Given its effectiveness, educators at more institutions may wish to implement IGD as a component of their multicultural education curricula, but

they may not have the resources necessary to develop a full-scale IGD program offering stand-alone courses. Thus, when considering how institutions might implement the methods of IGD into an existing curriculum, as well as some of the criticisms of the IGD model, additional research is necessary to examine alternative approaches.

One study that examined IGD methods implemented into an existing undergraduate course was Muller and Miles's (2017) investigation of the effects of IGD in a course on multicultural psychology. Their multicultural psychology course met twice weekly and used traditional lecture/discussion methodologies to cover diversity-related content during the first half of the semester. During the second half of the semester, the class met once per week in this same format and once in IGD groups. When examining potential changes in students taking this course, the authors found that students reported less color-blind racial attitudes (on individual and institutional levels; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000) and greater empathic perspective-taking from pre- to postdialogue. These findings were in line with the objectives of IGD to raise awareness of systems of power and oppression and enhance relations across identity differences. Additionally, this research presented a model for how to incorporate IGD into an existing course in psychology to enhance student engagement with course content. Muller and Miles did not, however, have a comparison group with which they could compare student outcomes. Therefore, a next logical step in this line of inquiry would be to compare such a course using IGD to a more traditional course that focuses on diversity-related content without the IGD component.

Current Study Purpose

Building on the research by Muller and Miles (2017) and Gurin et al. (2013), the current study sought to compare college courses that cover diversity-related content using traditional and IGD teaching methods. Although critical multicultural education theory (e.g., Adams et al., 2007) asserts the importance of learning about systems of oppression, including one's personal participation in, and experience with, such systems, and the benefit of dialogic pedagogy (Freire, 1985), many college courses on diversity rely on the unidirectional presentation of didactic content without requiring students to examine their own or others' personal engagement with the content. Additionally, traditionally taught courses on diversity-related topics generally do not meet the optimal conditions for best outcomes of intergroup contact, including equal status between groups, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities (Allport, 1954). As demonstrated by previous research (Dessel & Rogge, 2008; Gurin et al., 2013; Muller & Miles, 2017), IGD presents an opportunity to extend learning beyond the passive receipt of information to a more active, engaged, and personal understanding of content related to diversity. Therefore, we set out to answer the question of whether IGD adds to students' understanding of multicultural content beyond participation in a traditional diversity-related didactic course. We hypothesized that existing courses that teach diversity-related content, when paired with IGD methods, would enhance students' critical consciousness, empathic perspective-taking, awareness of oppressive systems, and openness to learning about diversity-related content more than that of traditionally taught didactic courses covering similar content. These outcomes are consistent

with the critical-dialogic model of multicultural education that emphasizes developing one's critical consciousness and awareness of power imbalance in one's own and others' lives through engaged communication that encourages empathy and understanding (Gurin-Sands et al., 2012). Such an examination of teaching diversity in higher education is necessary as we navigate the challenges and capitalize on the growth of our diverse campuses.

Method

Participants

The current study took place at a mid-Atlantic university near Baltimore, Maryland, where the student body is 60% female and the racial composition is 57.3% White, 19.7% African American or Black, 7.1% Latino or Hispanic, and 5.6% Asian American, with smaller representation among other racial groups. In response to a student protest that came on the heels of the death of Freddie Grey in police custody, along with incidences of bias and hate that were occurring on the campus, administrators at the university agreed to enhance efforts to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion on campus. What followed was a partnering between academic and student affairs to train faculty and staff in IGD facilitation, develop courses in which IGD could be a component of the curriculum, and facilitate dialogues on conflict-laden topics among small groups of university students with different identities and perspectives.

One hundred twelve undergraduate students (of a total of 178) enrolled in one of five courses that addressed topics of diversity and multicultural education participated in this study. Across the entire sample, the mean age was 21.4 years ($SD = 4.37$), with approximately 95% of individuals being between 18 and 25 years of age. In this sample, 82% of students had at least a 3.0 or higher grade point average (GPA) and 15% had engaged in a study-abroad opportunity. The demographic profile of students in the courses with and without IGD were equivalent (see Table 1). Cisgender women were overrepresented in the sample, and this was reflective of the courses examined in the study having more cisgender women students than those who identify as men, transgender women, or nonbinary. Specifically, the courses were in the psychology and education departments, and according to the university's institutional research office, 85% of the majors in these departments during the time of data collection identified as cisgender women. Socioeconomic status (SES) was measured by asking students to self-identify their SES (i.e., working class, middle class, upper-middle class, upper class) and thus indicates the student's perception of their status rather than an objective measure.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from five courses through e-mails initiated by their course instructors, with interested individuals being directed to contact a research assistant for an identification code and access to the online survey. Four of the courses (two sections each of Multicultural Psychology and Teaching and Learning in a Diverse Society; $n = 55$) included an IGD component for 8 weeks of the semester, and the fifth course, Cross-Cultural Psychology, used traditional methods of instruction

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Complete sample		IGD		Cross-cultural	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Gender						
Women	101	90	49	89	52	91
Men	10	9	5	9	5	9
Transgender	1	1	1	2		
Race/ethnicity						
African American/Black	18	16	10	18	8	14
European American/White	65	58	33	60	32	56
Asian American	10	9	2	4	8	14
Hispanic/Latino/a American	9	8	5	9	4	7
Biracial	6	5	4	7	2	4
Native American						
International	1	1			1	2
Other	3	3	1	2	2	3
Academic status						
Freshman	3	3	3	5		
Sophomore	19	17	14	26	5	9
Junior	36	32	17	31	19	33
Senior	54	48	21	38	33	58
Socioeconomic status						
Working class	12	11	8	14	4	7
Middle class	71	63	34	62	37	65
Upper middle class	27	24	12	22	15	26
Upper class	2	2	1	2	1	2

Note. N = 112; IGD, n = 55; Cross-cultural, n = 57; IGD = intergroup dialogue.

throughout the entire semester (i.e., lecture/discussion; *n* = 57). All courses had a primary objective of educating students on topics related to human diversity and students self-selected into the courses. The IGD courses were taught by four different instructors across two semesters (one White female tenured faculty, one Black female tenure-track faculty, one White female adjunct faculty, and one Black male adjunct faculty) and the Cross-Cultural Psychology course was taught by the same instructor across two semesters (biracial female tenure-track faculty). Further, the IGD courses included two faculty or staff facilitators for every IGD group in the course. These facilitators were separate from the course instructors and were involved only in facilitating the dialogue component.

Cross-cultural psychology. Cross-Cultural Psychology, an upper-level course in the psychology department and satisfying a major requirement, was taught using traditional teaching methods, including lecture and discussion that focused on cross-cultural diversity education. This course covered topics including the effects of culture on social, cognitive, and emotional development; socialization; motivation; and relationships across different cultures—and examined research methodology from a cultural lens. Emphasis was placed (in the syllabus and discussion at the outset of class) on respectful engagement across different student perspectives with the acknowledgment that topics in the course were likely to be interpreted differently by people with differing identities. Students met for class for 75-min twice a week. Across these classes, 60% of students chose to participate in the research study. In this sample (*n* = 57), the mean age was 22.02 years with approximately 93% of individuals being between 18 and 25 years

of age. Further, 72% of students had at least a 3.0 or higher GPA and 14% had engaged in a study-abroad opportunity.

Multicultural psychology and teaching and learning in a diverse society. Multicultural Psychology was an upper-level elective course taught once in the Honors College and once for psychology majors, while Teaching and Learning in a Diverse Society was a 200-level course and major requirement in the College of Education. These courses used a combination of traditional and IGD teaching methods. Specifically, in these courses, students met for 8 weeks for regular instruction (lecture and discussion) and then, in the final 8 weeks of the semester, half of the course time was devoted to IGD, whereas the other half continued the traditional presentation of content in the full class. For the IGD component, students met in small groups of nine to 11 students with two trained IGD facilitators, who were faculty or staff at the university. All facilitators had participated in a 2-day training in IGD facilitation prior to the groups beginning, and then met for weekly consultation with administrators of the IGD program throughout the duration of the groups. Groups were determined based on students' responses to a brief survey asking about various aspects of identity (e.g., race, gender, sex, SES, sexual orientation) prior to the start of the semester. The IGD group topics included one group each on race, sexual orientation, religion, gender, appearance and size, and a final group called "emergent themes." For the groups on race, sexual orientation, religion, and gender, each was comprised of approximately equal numbers of students who identified with a marginalized (e.g., people of color in the race group) or privileged (e.g., White in the race group) identity as well as one facilitator representing each identity. For the appearance and size and emergent themes groups (both included all female-identified students, and most identified as White, heterosexual, and middle class), identity differences were not apparent before the groups began, so the topic of the discussion "emerged" from the group members' different perspectives based on their individually defined identities. The activities of all the groups encouraged students to examine the intersections of their identities as they discussed their personal experiences. Across these classes, 67% of students chose to participate in the research study. The IGD sample (*n* = 55) mean age was 20.76 years, with approximately 96% of individuals being between 18 and 25 years of age. In this sample, 93% of students had at least a 3.0 or higher GPA and only 16% had engaged in a study-abroad opportunity.

Participation in this study was not a course requirement, though all course instructors offered extra credit as incentive for participation. Participants completed an online survey at two time points: within the first 3 weeks of the semester (prior to IGD groups beginning) and during the last week of the semester (when all course content and IGD groups were complete). Between Time 1 and Time 2, attrition resulted in the loss of 29 students across the five courses. Participants accessed the online survey via an e-mail from the research assistant at the designated time point. Participants used a confidential identification code given to them by the research assistant on each survey to connect their responses at each time point. Neither course instructors, IGD facilitators, nor faculty researchers had access to student identification codes or survey responses.

Measures

Openness to diversity/challenge. The Openness to Diversity/Challenge Scale (ODCS; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996) assesses both an individual's openness to diversity (i.e., cultural, racial, and value types) and their perceived enjoyment when challenged intellectually. This eight-item measure was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), with higher scores reflecting greater openness to diversity and challenges to one's belief systems. Sample items include "I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and values are different from my own" and "The courses I enjoy most are those that make me think about things from a different perspective." A mean score was calculated across all items to determine an individual's general openness. Internal consistency scores for the original scale were .83 and .84 for pre- and postintervention (Pascarella et al., 1996). In the current study, internal consistency was .90 and .93 for pre- and postintervention.

Awareness of privilege and oppression. The Awareness of Privilege and Oppression Scale (APOS-2; McClellan, 2014) is a 40-item self-report inventory measuring one's overall awareness of societal privilege and oppression in terms of race, sex, class, and sexual orientation. Participants were asked to respond to items including "Individuals whose parents went to college are more likely to go to college than an individual whose parents did not go to college" and "People of Color experience high levels of stress because of the discrimination they face" on a 6-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). An overall total scale score can be calculated, as well as total scores on four subscales, which include awareness of heterosexism (10 items), sexism (nine items), classism (10 items), and racism (11 items). Higher scores are consistent with greater awareness of privilege and oppression. In the current study, internal consistency on the preintervention assessment was .90 for the overall scale, .84 for heterosexism, .63 for sexism, .75 for classism, .87 for racism; and .93 for the overall scale, .89 for heterosexism, .78 for sexism, .79 for classism, and .88 for racism on the postintervention.

Everyday multicultural competencies. The Everyday Multicultural Competencies Scale (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014) is a 48-item scale that assesses multicultural competencies acquired in higher education settings. Respondents report their agreement with statements spread across six factors and related subscales including Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (10 items), Resentment and Cultural Dominance (10 items), Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (seven items), Empathic Perspective-Taking (five items), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (eight items), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (eight items). Sample items include "I believe the United States is enhanced by other countries," "I often find myself fearful of people of other races," and "I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society." In the current study, internal consistency for each subscale was .88 for Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, .87 for Resentment and Cultural Dominance, .68 for Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, .70 for Empathic Perspective-Taking, .89 for Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and .79 for Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally on the pretest. For the posttest, internal consistency scores were .90 for Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, .91 for Resentment and Cultural Dominance, .77 for Anxiety and

Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, .64 for Empathic Perspective-Taking, .90 for Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and .82 for Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally.

Results

Means and standard deviations for all variables are included in Table 2. We conducted split-plot ANOVAs for all scales to assess the impact of (a) courses with diversity-centered content that included an IGD experience within the course, and (b) a traditionally taught course with diversity-centered content without the IGD experience, on student multicultural competency and openness to diversity. Specifically, we evaluated the change in scores on all measures from early semester (pre) to end of semester (post) for students enrolled in diversity courses with IGD and a comparison Cross-Cultural Psychology course. Split-plot ANOVAs with time (pre–post scale scores) and condition (IGD and Cross-Cultural) indicated statistically significant interaction effects (see Table 3). For all analyses, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was not significant, indicating equivalence of groups.

As shown in Table 3, statistically significant main effects for time (pre and post) were observed for the APOS-2 and ECCS. Specifically, scores increased over time (pre–post) for both the IGD and Cross-Cultural courses for the APOS-2 total score as well as the APOS-2 subscales for awareness of heterosexism, classism, and racism. Scores also increased over the course of the semester for the subscales of the ECCS, including Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, and Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege. These findings indicated that students in diversity-topic courses with and without IGD saw similar increases in scores on these variables.

Main effects for course (IGD or Cross-Cultural) were also observed for the APOS-2 total score and Racism subscale, and the ECCS Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale (see Table 3). These effects reveal a statistically significant difference between students in the IGD and Cross-Cultural courses with the students in IGD courses reporting higher scores on awareness of race-related privilege and oppression.

Finally, as shown in Table 3, statistically significant Time × Course interactions were observed for the ODCS, the APOS-2 Racism subscale, and the ECCS Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale. These statistically significant interaction effects indicated that students enrolled in the courses with IGD demonstrated greater increases in scores on measures of openness to diversity, awareness of privilege and oppression pertaining to race, and empathic feelings for individuals with marginalized identities than students enrolled in the traditionally taught diversity topic course over the course of the semester. Statistically significant effects were not observed for other scales or subscales.

Discussion

With the increasing attention placed on divisiveness on college campuses and in society as a whole, universities are searching for ways to engage their students in productive dialogue that leads to greater understanding, a broader sense of perspective, and enhanced critical thinking. The goal of this study was to examine the effectiveness of courses covering diversity-related content using an IGD component relative to a more traditionally taught course.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Scale Scores

Scale	n	Pre		Post		t	df
		M	SD	M	SD		
Openness to Diversity							
Total score							
IGD	52	4.19	.67	4.50	.73	3.63***	51
Cross-cultural	53	4.25	.68	4.15	.84	.93	52
Awareness of Privilege and Oppression							
Total score							
IGD	49	180.3	24.45	192.00	25.81	3.87***	48
Cross-cultural	50	172	24.63	177.4	25.88	2.48*	49
Heterosexism							
IGD	52	45.04	8.30	48.69	8.09	3.41***	51
Cross-cultural	54	42.54	9.50	45.11	9.54	2.67**	53
Sexism							
IGD	54	44.04	5.45	44.11	7.43	.08	53
Cross-cultural	55	44.04	5.72	44.31	6.31	.43	54
Classism							
IGD	54	40.93	7.21	44.54	6.77	5.35***	53
Cross-cultural	53	39.62	6.87	42.74	7.13	4.32***	52
Racism							
IGD	52	47.81	9.45	51.63	8.81	3.62***	51
Cross-cultural	57	45.82	9.47	46.07	10.36	.36	56
Everyday Cultural Competency Scale							
Cultural Openness							
IGD	50	51.42	7.28	52.26	7.42	1.21	49
Cross-cultural	52	49.90	6.56	50.44	7.37	.56	51
Resentment							
IGD	50	24.00	9.78	23.1	11.37	−.66	49
Cross-cultural	50	24.98	8.69	25.70	9.92	.80	49
Anxiety							
IGD	48	13.81	4.61	15.00	6.65	1.22	47
Cross-cultural	53	14.45	5.10	15.75	6.28	1.78	52
Empathetic Perspective							
IGD	50	18.34	4.55	18.46	4.44	.20	49
Cross-cultural	54	19.30	4.34	19.93	4.63	.69	53
Awareness							
IGD	50	38.96	6.81	40.78	6.73	2.22*	49
Cross-cultural	53	36.81	8.06	37.34	8.14	.66	52
Empathic Feeling							
IGD	49	37.20	5.44	38.76	5.97	2.01*	48
Cross-cultural	54	37.04	5.59	36.61	6.32	.69	53

Note. $N = 112$; IGD, $n = 55$; Cross-cultural, $n = 57$. Pre = Pretest; Post = Posttest; df = degrees of freedom; IGD = intergroup dialogue.
* $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.   *** $p < .001$.

Our hypothesis that courses with an IGD component would demonstrate greater increases than a traditionally taught diversity course in critical consciousness, empathic perspective-taking, awareness of oppressive systems, and openness to learning about diversity-related content was partially supported. Specifically, students in the course with IGD showed greater increases in racial oppression awareness, openness to diversity, and empathic feeling and acting as an ally. These findings extend the reach of previous studies (e.g., Gurin et al., 2004; Krings et al., 2015; Muller & Miles, 2017) by demonstrating the effectiveness of IGD within an established curricular course compared with traditional didactic teaching methods. Further, a criticism of the literature on IGD has been that the implementation of such programs varies considerably, making replication and comparison difficult (Dessel & Rogge, 2008). With the current study, we extended the IGD methods described by Muller and Miles (2017) to

demonstrate that courses using an IGD component were more effective at increasing students' openness to diversity, awareness of racial privilege and oppression, and empathic feelings toward people with oppressed identities than multicultural education courses without the IGD component. Additionally, IGD was implemented in different courses with similar, but not the same, content, boosting the external validity of the findings. Finally, all IGD faculty and staff facilitators in this study participated in a 2-day training and followed the same procedures during their dialogue (i.e., weekly consultation meetings with IGD coordinator, weekly cofacilitator meetings) to ensure the appropriate application of the critical-dialogic model. Such training and consultation reduced the threat of inconsistent facilitation approaches across groups and provided a mechanism to prepare faculty and staff to engage students in this empirically supported approach to multicultural education.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Main Effect and Interaction Results

Scale	F	df	η^2	p
ODCS				
Total score				
Time	2.56	1,103	.02	.11
IGD	1.38		.01	.24
Time × IGD	9.18		.08	<.01
APAOS				
Total score				
Time	21.18	1,97	.18	<.001
IGD	5.92		.06	<.05
Time × IGD	2.76		.03	.10
Heterosexism				
Time	18.75	1,104	.15	<.001
IGD	3.75		.04	.06
Time × IGD	.56		.01	.45
Sexism				
Time	.09	1,107	.001	.76
IGD	.01		0	.93
Time × IGD	.03		.00	.86
Classism				
Time	46.38	1,105	.31	<.001
IGD	1.52		.01	.22
Time × IGD	.25		.002	.62
Racism				
Time	10.77	1,107	.09	<.01
IGD	4.79		.04	<.05
Time × IGD	8.33		.07	<.01
ECCS				
Cultural openness and desire to learn				
Time	1.32	1,100	.01	.25
IGD	1.68		.02	.20
Time × IGD	.06		.001	.80
Resentment and cultural dominance				
Time	.01	1,98	.00	.91
IGD	.98		.01	.32
Time × IGD	.98		.01	.33
Anxiety and lack of multicultural self-efficacy				
Time	4.28	1,99	.04	<.05
IGD	.52		.01	.47
Time × IGD	.01		.000	.92
Empathic perspective taking				
Time	.01	1,102	.001	.75
IGD	.82		.01	.37
Time × IGD	.38		.004	.54
Awareness of contemporary racism and privilege				
Time	4.21	1,101	.04	<.05
IGD	4.22		.04	<.05
Time × IGD	1.27		.01	.26
Empathic feeling and acting as an ally				
Time	1.32	1,101	.01	.25
IGD	1.22		.01	.27
Time × IGD	4.07		.04	<.05

Note. df = degrees of freedom; ODCS = Openness to Diversity and Challenges Scale; IGD = intergroup dialogue; APAOS = Awareness of Privilege and Oppression Scale; ECCS = Everyday Cultural Competency Scale.

The results of the current study align with the theories of critical multicultural education and intergroup contact. The IGD approach teaches strategies for listening and dialoguing to create greater empathy and understanding of different perspectives, consistent with the goals of critical multicultural education theory (Freire, 1985). The results of the current study demonstrate that diversity-related courses, with and without IGD, were effective in increasing awareness of systems of oppression and privilege, particularly when it pertains to race, sexual orientation, and class. Further, over the course of the semester, students in all courses demonstrated increased scores on measures related to awareness of racism and privilege and the anxiety that often comes from such awareness. Thus, the component of multicultural education that pertains to raising awareness of systems of oppression appears to be effectively addressed using both traditional methods of teaching and IGD. However, the courses that included the IGD component also

increased students' empathic engagement across identity differences and the desire to act as an ally. IGD provides the necessary conditions for optimal intergroup contact by requiring balanced status between identity groups that are the focus of the dialogue, the common goal of greater intergroup understanding, teaching strategies for intergroup cooperation, and creating an institutional context that supports such dialogue. Thus, courses that fall under the umbrella of multicultural education and incorporate IGD may be more likely to fully realize the goals of this approach as outlined by Freire (1985), as IGD helps provide the optimal conditions for intergroup contact (Allport, 1954).

Although IGD has been a model for student engagement with diversity for decades and is gaining popularity at institutions of higher education, most programs described in the literature represent cocurricular activities in which students engage outside the classroom. Muller and Miles (2017) presented a model for incorporating IGD into a typical college course that covered content related to human diversity. By replicating their study method for incorporating IGD into a diversity topic course, we were able to replicate their findings of enhancing awareness of racial oppression and privilege and empathic perspective-taking and extend them to demonstrate the enhanced effect of IGD over a traditional college course covering diversity content. The current study also uncovered a main effect of course type on student awareness of racism and racial privilege. Specifically, students who enrolled in the courses with the IGD component demonstrated higher scores throughout the semester on this construct than students who enrolled in the traditionally taught course. Muller and Miles speculated that students who selected their course may have had greater awareness of racial oppression than other students who did not choose such a course, and the findings of the current study confirmed that suspicion. Students in the current sample who were higher on awareness of the systems of oppression and privilege may have been more apt to take a course that involved the IGD component when registering for classes.

The finding that students in the current study who took both types of courses increased in both awareness of privilege and oppression *and* anxiety and lack of multicultural self-efficacy is notable. The anxiety, fear, guilt, and shame that often comes from discussions of race-related content in the college classroom has been described in the literature for some time (e.g., Tatum, 1992; Tummala-Narra, 2009) and may also be true for content that addresses other identity differences (e.g., gender, sexual orientation, religion). Paralleling this literature, others have demonstrated that multicultural programming that encourages intergroup contact and connection has a small but positive effect on intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and acceptance of diversity (Simmons, Wittig, & Grant, 2010). Thus, these parallel processes of anxiety coupled with growth are evident in the results of the current study. As the campus context for this study represents a diverse student population, and the students in both classes mirrored one another in terms of racial and social class composition, both types of classes set the tone for intergroup contact while digesting diversity-relevant content. Although students in both types of courses benefitted from participation in multicultural education, the students with the IGD component appeared to have additional benefits that may have stemmed from the closer intergroup contact and the focus on persisting in cross-group discussion even when it provoked anxiety, tension, or guilt.

Limitations

Despite the strengths of this study, one must consider the findings in light of the limitations. The current study examined multiple courses over several semesters, each with different course instructors and related, but different, course content. Thus, we cannot rule out the possibility that the different course content or instructor characteristics contributed to the differences found between groups. Additionally, other course-related variables could have contributed to the results, including class size, the differences between upper- and lower-division courses, and/or the racial, age, and gender composition of the students in the courses, among other possibilities. Further, the IGD groups represented a range of topics of discussion, including race, sexual orientation, gender, and religion, and different facilitators led each dialogue group. These aspects of the study led to greater generalizability of the findings, though at the expense of certainty that participation in IGD was the cause of the effects discovered. Similarly, the student who chooses to enroll in a course with an IGD component may be different in important ways from a student who does not choose such a course. Students who chose the IGD course rated higher on measures of awareness of privilege and oppression at the outset of the semester. However, students in both types of courses increased over the course of the semester in both awareness of oppressive systems and feelings of anxiety as such awareness increases. Taking these findings together, one possibility is that students who chose to enroll in IGD courses are different on some other construct, such as courage, extraversion, or confidence in communication skills, which was unaccounted for in this study. Although we did not measure all of these possibilities, we noted that cisgender women were overrepresented in the courses that we included in the study, leading to a skewed sample in terms of gender. Given the characteristics of the sample, we may assert most specifically that participation in IGD furthers some goals of multicultural education for cisgender women who demonstrate some awareness of privilege and oppression. Further, the absence of a third group of students who were not participating in any type of course under the umbrella of multicultural education leaves open the possibility that there could be additional differences between students who pursue such courses and those who do not. Lastly, students in the current study participated at the beginning and end of the semester. We did not examine more lasting effects of participation in courses with IGD, which would be an important empirical endeavor.

Courses that use an IGD approach are resource-intensive. Each course that utilized IGD in the current study had one course instructor and two IGD facilitators for every 10 students enrolled in the course. Thus, administrative and faculty support for adding IGD components to courses under the umbrella of multicultural education may limit the reach of such courses. The sample size of the current study reflects this challenge. Given the small sample size of the current study, we were unable to examine potential within-group differences for students who participated in the IGD experience. Previous research has indicated that students with privileged and marginalized identities may have different experiences with and outcomes related to IGD (e.g., Miles & Kivlighan, 2012; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004). This is an important area of future inquiry, as quality multicultural education should ensure that students of different identities are receiving benefits that are equivalent, if not the same. Dedicated resources are necessary to

support IGD efforts on college campuses, and coordinated efforts across institutions may help to uncover differential benefits of IGD for different students.

Implications for Practice and Research

IGD programs have typically been developed as cocurricular efforts, often being offered through specific diversity or multicultural offices within the framework of student affairs. Meanwhile, academic curriculum in various disciplines attempts to address diversity-related content within college courses. The current line of research provides a framework for bringing these separate spaces for multicultural education into partnership. LePeau (2015) advocated for academic and student affairs divisions to partner around issues of diversity and inclusion in particular, as they represent difficult challenges that affect multiple aspects of campus climate. In a grounded theory analysis of such partnerships, LePeau found that universities characterized by blurred or nonexistent lines between student and academic affairs' professionals were able to address such challenges best when collaborating on an institutional commitment to inclusion and equity. She included one suggestion to develop coteaching opportunities between academic and student affairs professionals, which was a characteristic of one of the courses using IGD in the current study. Thus, as IGD and similar dialogue-based programs have been cropping up around the country in cocurricular programs led by student affairs professionals, the integration of such programs into the academic curriculum stands to benefit from partnership between academic and student affairs.

In addition to the potential benefits of IGD for students, the current study provided a mechanism to train faculty and staff in the critical-dialogic model. Previous research has demonstrated that faculty who devote core aspects of their jobs to multicultural issues, and faculty who have experienced discrimination and oppression themselves based on race, gender, or sexual orientation, report higher levels of multicultural competence (Pope & Mueller, 2005). However, all faculty will be required to navigate challenging conversations, political and societal events, and different perspectives on course content within their classrooms. In the IGD facilitator training, faculty and staff learned specific strategies and tools for engaging students and one another in the difficult conversations that we often avoid, to the detriment of all. Devoting university resources to training faculty in the critical-dialogic model of IGD has strong potential for advancing university goals of creating inclusive campuses.

Future research should examine the potential long-range implications of participation in IGD as part of an academic course. Longitudinal studies of individuals who participate in IGD, both as students and facilitators, can illuminate how IGD may transform an individual's attitudes and behaviors over time. IGD is a primary example of an activity that promotes interactional diversity, blending diversity-related course content with conversations across difference, which has been linked to positive developments in critical thinking skills over time (Pascarella et al., 2014). Intergroup attitudes are enhanced in cross-group friendships, as these relationships provide a context for positive contact, sharing of personal information, and increased trust, which extends to other outgroup members as demonstrated by a meta-analysis of the effects of cross-group friendships on intergroup attitudes (Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011). A future study might examine the effect of IGD on cross-group friendships outside of the classroom (i.e., in the residence halls, extracurricular involvement) as well as potential behavioral changes (e.g., democratic participation, involvement in social and political efforts to reduce inequity). Further, IGD programs that involve faculty are needed to determine potential benefits for the campus community if faculty are trained in a critical-dialogic model. Although the current study focused on student participants of IGD, the faculty and staff who facilitated the dialogues anecdotally reported seeing a difference in the ways they approached their own classrooms outside of the IGD experience. The possibility that faculty facilitating or participating in IGD has a "contagion effect" on other courses, scholarship, and service responsibilities is worthy of investigation.

References

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203940822

Ali, S. R., & Ancis, J. R. (2005). Multicultural education and critical pedagogy approaches. In C. Z. Enns & A. L. Sinacore (Eds.), *Teaching and social justice: Integrating multicultural and feminist theories in the classroom* (pp. 69–84). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10929-004

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15,* 332–351. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1088868311411103

Dessel, A., & Rogge, M. E. (2008). Evaluation of intergroup dialogue: A review of the empirical literature. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 26,* 199–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/crq.230

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-17771-4

Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Applying anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory to intercultural adjustment training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22,* 227–250. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00005-4

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 17–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00097.x

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). *Dialogue across difference: Practice, theory, and research on intergroup dialogue*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gurin-Sands, C., Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Osuna, S. (2012). Fostering a commitment to social action: How talking, thinking, and feeling make a difference in Intergroup Dialogue. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 45,* 60–79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2012.643699

Hurtado, S., Griffin, K. A., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1,* 204–221. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014009

Krings, A., Austic, E. A., Gutierrez, L. M., & Dirksen, K. E. (2015). The comparative impacts of social justice educational methods on political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 48,* 403–417. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1057087

LePeau, L. (2015). A grounded theory of academic affairs and student affairs partnerships for diversity and inclusion aims. *Review of Higher*

Education: Journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 39, 97–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2015.0044

Mallinckrodt, B., Miles, J. R., Bhaskar, T., Chery, N., Choi, G., & Sung, M. R. (2014). Developing a comprehensive scale to assess college multicultural programming. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 61,* 133–145. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035214

McClellan, M. J. (2014). *Awareness of Privilege and Oppression Scale-2: Construction and initial validation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Theses and Dissertations–Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology (22).

Miles, J. R., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2012). Perceptions of group climate by social identity group in intergroup dialogue. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 16,* 189–205. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028634

Muller, J. T., & Miles, J. R. (2017). Intergroup dialogue in undergraduate multicultural psychology education: Group climate development and outcomes. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 10,* 52–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040042

Nagda, B. A., Gurin, P., Sorenson, N., Gurin-Sands, C., & Osuna, S. M. (2009). From separate corners to dialogue and action. *Race and Social Problems, 1,* 45–55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12552-009-9002-6

Nagda, B. A., Kim, C. W., & Truelove, Y. (2004). Learning about difference, learning with others, learning to transgress. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 195–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00106.x

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 59–70. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67,* 174–195. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2943979

Pascarella, E. T., Martin, G. L., Hanson, J. M., Trolian, T. L., Gillig, B., & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 55,* 86–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2014.0009

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 65–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 751–783. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 271–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

Pope, R. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2005). Faculty and curriculum: Examining multicultural competence and inclusion. *Journal of College Student Development, 46,* 679–688. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0065

Simmons, S. J., Wittig, M. A., & Grant, S. K. (2010). A mutual acculturation model of multicultural campus climate and acceptance of diversity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16,* 468–475. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020237

Sorensen, N., Nagda, B. A., Gurin, P., & Maxwell, K. E. (2009). Taking a "hands on" approach to diversity in higher education: A critical-dialogic model for effective intergroup interaction. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 9,* 3–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2009.01193.x

Tatum, B. D. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review, 62,* 1–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.62.1.146k5v980r703023

Thompson, M. C., Brett, T. G., & Behling, C. (2001). Educating for social justice: The Program on Intergroup Relations, Conflict, and Community at the University of Michigan. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace* (pp. 99–114). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tummala-Narra, P. (2009). Teaching on diversity: The mutual influence of students and instructors. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 26,* 322–334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016444

University of Michigan. (2018). *About the Program on Intergroup Relations*. Retrieved from https://igr.umich.edu/about

Zirkel, S., & Cantor, N. (2004). 50 years after Brown v. Board of Education: The promise and challenge of multicultural education. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00096.x

Zúñiga, X., & Nagda, B. (1993). Dialogue groups: An innovative approach to multicultural learning. In D. Schoem, L. Frankel, X. Zúñiga, & E. A. Lewis (Eds.), *Multicultural teaching in the university* (pp. 232–248). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., Chesler, M., & Cytron-Walker, A. (2007). Intergroup dialogue in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 32,* 1–128.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., & Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35,* 7–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713845248