

Spring 4-26-2022

Intergroup Dialogue: Affecting Real Change

Lauryn Hulett
lhulett@bgsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/honorsprojects>

 Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Communication Commons](#), [Community-Based Learning Commons](#), [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Hulett, Lauryn, "Intergroup Dialogue: Affecting Real Change" (2022). *Honors Projects*. 808.
<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/honorsprojects/808>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

IMPLICATIONS OF INTERGROUP DIALOGUE: AFFECTING REAL CHANGE

LAURYN HULETT

HONORS PROJECT

**Submitted to the Honors College
at Bowling Green State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for graduation with
UNIVERSITY HONORS**

DATE

27 April 2022

Dr. Jessica Birch, Department of Women's Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Advisor

Professor Amy Rybak, Department of English, Advisor

Introduction

In recent years, higher education institutions are often looking for ways in which they are able to increase inclusion within their campus culture. Some universities across the nation claim to have a commitment to diversity, yet current curriculum standards often lack tangible outcomes that reflect this philosophy. For example, as a part of BGSU's mission, one diversity objective held is the intention to create public good through "our people and community". (Forward. BGSU strategic plan, 2021) Within this objective is initiative number nine of BGSU that states "we will create the culture that we aspire to be by intentionally educating all members of our community regarding diversity, inclusion and democracy. This will allow us to recruit, retain and support a diverse community of students, faculty and staff so that all belong." (Forward. BGSU strategic plan, 2021). While this is an objective and initiative of BGSU, their curriculum may not reflect this philosophy. When obtaining an undergraduate degree at BGSU, only one course related to Cultural Diversity in the United States is required (BG Perspective [general education curriculum]). While having this course requirement provides benefits, Intergroup Dialogue is a course that may provide more inclusive outcomes (Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices, 2007).

To provide context, Intergroup Dialogue, or IGD, is a class that aims to increase self, or student-awareness among a range of topics such as sexuality, race, gender, and religion. Intergroup Dialogue is a course that I was enrolled in during my second year at BGSU within the Honors College. After having a transformative experience, I decided to initiate the re-creation of the course, and co-facilitated a version of Intergroup Dialogue during Fall 2021. This class may focus on one topic such as race, or may discuss multiple identities; either way, the pedagogy of the course remains consistent among applications of Intergroup Dialogue. Several studies have

confirmed positive outcomes from Intergroup Dialogue courses, but it is not always accessible or appealing for all students to participate in. In reference to accessibility of the course, Intergroup Dialogue requires at least one facilitator who has gone through trainings and is competent in IGD overall. Additionally, IGD requires a specific number of opposing identities in order for the course to be effective, which may be difficult to recruit in terms of a college course. The pedagogy of Intergroup Dialogue includes four stages: creating meaning, examining identities, difficult conversations, and building alliances. (Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices, 2007).

From the facilitation of the course, along with personal experience, I began to question the several pieces of Intergroup Dialogue that contribute to measurable change. Which in turn led me to my research questions:

- What pedagogical aspects of intergroup dialogue are most productive in affecting behavioral change in participants' ability to recognize and empathize with the experiences of people whose identities they do not share?
- In what ways does Intergroup Dialogue contribute to a more inclusive environment among higher education institutions?
- To what extent can Intergroup Dialogue pedagogy and philosophies be adapted to be used across all fields and disciplines, not just specifically about race, gender, sexuality, religion?

Ultimately, the goal of many higher education institutions is to create an environment in which diversity and inclusion are valued. For example, BGSU's statement on Diversity and Belonging is as follows:

Bowling Green State University values diversity as essential to improving the human condition. Diversity and inclusion immeasurably enrich all that we do to engage, understand, and respect individuals.

While there are a multitude of ways to address this, I hypothesize that adding Intergroup Dialogue pedagogy and philosophies into multiple courses and fields across campus would allow students to not only empathize with people whose experiences differ from their own, but also be able to practice constructively working through conflict, and eventually become better agents of social justice and change. The goal of this project is to provide a comprehensive discussion of best practices for incorporating Intergroup Dialogue into a variety of curricula and disciplines, based upon a review and analysis of the existing literature.

Literature Review

Before discussing the best practices of Intergroup Dialogue, I must first explain the specific pieces of pedagogy that contribute to behavioral and perspective change. Intergroup Dialogue consists of four steps or stages; stage one being group beginnings, stage two is exploring differences and commonalities of experience, moving to stage three would be exploring and discussing hot topics, and finally, action planning and alliance building. Each of these stages intend to contribute to sustained learning as well as the development of trust among participants (Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices, 2007).

These four stages all work together to create an environment in which dialogue is supported. This use of dialogue is very intentional, as there should not be “debate”, but rather a discussion with the intent to find solutions. This course typically consists of individuals that have a range of identities and experiences depending on what the course focus is. For example, if an Intergroup Dialogue course were to focus on race, the course would consist of equal amounts of

representation of Black and white students. In addition to this, the class size is between 10 and 15 students; this is also intentional, as a small number of students may result in less conversation and limited viewpoints of specific identities. Too large of a class may present challenges for building trust among a group with many individuals. Too large of a class may also allow some students to dismiss themselves from dialogue (Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices, 2007).

The first major theme that emerged throughout literature was a positive effect in cognitive outcomes: specifically, awareness. A few higher-education IGD programs that measured students had an increase of self-awareness of social identities after students concluded the course. For example, Aldana et. al, (2012) measured awareness of racism through pre and posttests of the course and found that each student had an increased awareness of racism by the time the course concluded. Through this study, it was evident that upon participating in an IGD course, an increase in social awareness is probable. Another example of this increased awareness was found through a study done by Craig et. al, (2012), which was an IGD course that focused specifically on race. Authors in this study reported that all white participants, were able to confront many harmful individual forms of racism, and with that, many were also able to gain the confidence to advocate for social justice (Craig, et. al, 2012). Not only did IGD contribute to awareness, but in some cases it also generated confidence for those to advocate for social justice.

The next theme that emerged throughout Intergroup Dialogue research was the idea that not only are the benefits internal, but there are also tangible skills that students improved upon, such as active listening and conflict management. In the study, "From awareness to action: College students' skill development in intergroup dialogue" (2015), researchers allowed nine universities across the United States to implement Intergroup Dialogue as a means to measure

outcomes. What authors found was a development and/or improvement in the skill of active listening, as well as increased opportunities for students to constructively work through conflict.

Regardless of profession, these are two skills that are valued among the work place.

Additionally, a study done by Nagda et. al, (2007), focused on the individual, situational and group outcomes. One of the individual outcomes found was the development of active listening skills. This was measured through a means of self-reporting, as students in this study reported they improved listening skills compared to before they participated in the course.

The current research on IGD in higher education consists of a few themes: measurable positive outcomes such as increased social awareness, increase in listening skills, and conflict resolution. While the outcomes are beneficial, more often than not, the IGD courses studied have varying content, course-lengths, and even amount of participants. For example, the study done by Thakral, et. al, (2016), consisted of a 14-week, semester-long course of Intergroup Dialogue, while other studies such as Selvanathan et. al, (2019) adapted an online 4 week version. Not to mention the Intergroup Dialogue courses may focus on a range of topics; one application of IGD focused only on race, while another study focused only on sexuality (Craig et. al, 2012 and Dessel et. al, 2013). This makes it difficult to quantify which components of Intergroup Dialogue contribute directly to positive outcomes. Ultimately, the goal of this project is to establish which components are most effective in behavioral change, and to what extent they can they be used by higher education institutions to increase inclusion among their campus.

Methodology, Data Collection

While current Intergroup Dialogue literature states the multitude of positive outcomes that align with the course, there are many other aspects that may differ. As discussed, the timelines and content-focus may differ depending on each application, making it difficult to

quantify what components of IGD contribute directly to these positive outcomes. This idea relates back to the first research question which relates to pedagogy and philosophies of IGD. Upon further research, I will determine best practices for higher education institutions to implement.

The system in which this research was conducted is through a systematic literature review of the body of knowledge on Intergroup Dialogue. A systematic literature review was conducted as it allows scholars to see the particular strengths and weaknesses within a given discipline, and evaluate the current practices (Fink, 2014). In this selection of resources, the criteria included recent data, a specific age range, and a requirement of any relation to concepts used in Intergroup Dialogue. I chose data that was published within the last 20 years as this will likely yield current or recent effective practices. Additionally, the subjects in data chosen are within the age range of 17 years old to 24 years of age, as this includes and requires a focus on young adults in college. The articles chosen each have a relevance to one of Intergroup Dialogue's components: the four stages, interpersonal relations in small group settings, dialogue as a means of social justice, IGD as a means of inclusion in higher education, etc.

Additionally, this research looked at many disciplines. The current research draws from disciplines such as curriculum and pedagogy studies; social justice education; diversity, equity, and inclusion; psychology; and social work, as well as some sexuality studies. Social justice movements and genuine social change are deeply intersectional, and in turn, the research drawn upon must also include many disciplines (Dessel, 2011). One of the goals of this project was to determine best practices across the curriculum for increasing inclusion, and traditional disciplinary work of strictly one field such as pedagogy or equity studies alone would not have been sufficient to characterize all of the parts of this project.

This review of data was evaluated by what they did; breaking down each article and evaluating their goals, the time and length of the course, the assessment methods, and the key findings reported. Finally, the data allowed for characterization of challenges and strengths. Evaluating the data by these terms enables us to create a comprehensive review on the specific components of Intergroup Dialogue that produce environments of inclusion, and in turn may be able to be utilized by higher education institutions.

In order to keep data organized for comparison purposes, I created a rubric table that lays the foundational or key aspects of each article discussed [See Appendix A]. Eleven articles fit the criteria with recency, age, and IGD connection requirements. Some studies were a comprehensive review of multi-universities, some just one instance or one application of Intergroup Dialogue. The emphasis for this project was the success of each application and what they attribute such success to.

Results

[See Appendix A for reference]

After reviewing each study, some connections and conclusions emerged. Overall, the conclusions can be characterized by six main findings: lack of clear goals, a need for effective assessment measurements, voluntary participation, inconsistent class material, differences in group size, as well facilitation structure. Each of these findings will be discussed in depth. The first finding was that there was a lack of clear goals amongst all articles. The overall goal of IGD is to increase civic action, amongst increasing student awareness and promoting engagement. Yet, the studies examined differed beyond this. For example, in Krings et. al (2015) study, their goals were to measure political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism and the differences between an IGD course, and three other social science courses.

Another study done by Garcia, et. al (2019) on oppression pedagogy claimed their goals were to heighten awareness, gain understanding of class culture, and to measure success of experiential learning. These are vastly different goals, while both using IGD pedagogy to get to their goals. A lack of concrete, measurable goals can lead to unclear learning outcomes and can contribute to unorganized methods (Eber & Parker, 2007). The need for measurable clear goals is further explained by a known phenomenon called Bloom's Taxonomy. Bloom's Taxonomy is a hierarchical model of learning objectives that relates to complexity and specificity. There are six stepping blocks to Bloom's taxonomy: beginning with remembering, then understanding, applying, analyzing, and then at the highest domain is evaluation and creation. In nearly all of the goals studied, the goals were only obtaining or aiming for these first and foundational concepts such as remembering and understanding. This is potentially problematic because in order for any genuine social change to exist, students need to be able to not only apply the concepts but evaluate them and create new paths to success. Intergroup Dialogue goals as they stand do not provide sufficient goals that would allow students to go beyond understanding social inequities.

In addition to lack of clear goals, assessment methods varied amongst all articles reviewed. For example, Alimo et. al, (2002) utilized phone interviews after their course concluded. Other scholars like Thakral et. al (2016) in their first-year experience, utilized pre and posttests, while some vaguely mention "self-reported experienced" (Garcia et. al, 2019). Ten out of eleven studies used some method of self-reporting: whether it was a pre and post survey, phone interviews, final projects, or final essays. The one study outside of the ten, gained their data and insights from facilitator-reported evidence in comparison to student evidence (Clark, 2005) Even though most used a self-report method, the data are difficult to compare if they are

not assessed by the same measures and or outcomes. If there were a consistent method of assessment, results would be comparable and would allow insight as to what student's experiences truly are.

Another key finding that emerged amongst ten out of eleven studies was this idea that all participants chose to be a part of this course. The one study outside of the other ten, required their student participants in the course as they were all first semester first-year students (Thakral et. al, 2016). All other studies contained voluntary participation. According to Corsino and Fuller (2021), voluntary participation may yield better in-class participation, but does not directly translate into changing campus climate. Voluntary participation may yield bias in the way that the students signing up for these courses may already have experience or at least interest in talking about these topics. If the goal is to increase inclusion across campus, all identities, experiences, and perspectives must be included (Gwai-Chore, 2021). When all students within an institution are participating in effective dialogue, the curriculum of IGD gains exposure not only within the classroom but would likely generalize to conversations outside of the classroom (Raphael, 2021). If dialogue is not applied campus-wide, these conversations are only held in spaces of those who want to talk about them, which is counterintuitive to the goal of inclusion.

In terms of class material, each intergroup dialogue implementation used the four stages. What differed amongst the articles were the chosen readings and course materials. By just analyzing and sifting through the studies, I was unable to identify what was used in class to elicit discussion, which in turn made it difficult to draw conclusions on pedagogy. Pedagogy and class materials *may* matter, but I was unable to conclude its exact effects, as the material was not readily accessible.

Group size differences was another significant finding. In an ideal or original version of IGD, there were between 14 and 16 students (*Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices, 2007*). Yet, in the eleven studies, the number of students ranged from eight students to 28 students, none of them with the exact same number. This inconsistency in numbers implores a further question in group size: does it truly matter to be between 14 and 16 students? Additionally, this number was difficult to define in some multi-university studies. For example, in the study by Alimo (2019), 365 students participated in the study itself, while 1,463 students participated in the course. At each university, each course contained a different number of students, making sample size difficult for comparison.

Lastly, according to Clark (2005), inadequate facilitation structure often leads to unequal participation. In order to facilitate the course, University of Michigan offers in-person facilitator trainings, but eight out of eleven articles did not mention the facilitator training much, if at all. From personal experience, I did not have any facilitator training due to lack of accessibility, and often times in class there was unequal participation. Similar to pedagogy, since there was little data on how facilitators were prepared, essential parts of facilitation cannot be evaluated.

Discussion

From all of this, some theoretical best practices have been developed. At the heart of social justice, a main goal is to increase action and tangible change. If the goal is to increase inclusion across campuses through Intergroup Dialogue, this must be applied across the curriculum. These ideas discussed cannot only include students who care about the issues presented (Lundquist & Henning 2020). One suggestion being that all first years are required to take the course as well as having a series of courses that build upon one another (Thakral et. al, 2016)

Another finding from the data was the inconsistency in assessment methods. With this, we must utilize pre-tests and place students based on their knowledge and experience with these topics (Lundquist & Henning 2020). For example, if there is a student whose intended major is women's studies and is very familiar with social justice issues, but there is another student with many identities of privilege, they may not come into the course with the same basis of knowledge on these topics. Implementing a pretest would allow us to see this disparity and place students in respective classes based on this (Lundquist & Henning 2020).

Another best practice is implementation of facilitation techniques. This theory is based partly off of personal experience, as facilitator training likely would have increased participation in my application of Intergroup Dialogue. In addition to this, in Christine Clark's (2005) analysis of IGD pedagogy, she emphasizes the importance of structured facilitation and preparation of facilitators. Overall, facilitators must be able to direct and maximize interactions.

The last consideration for Intergroup Dialogue, one other best practice would be to emphasize stage four in the pedagogy, which refers to alliance building. Alliance building allows students to apply their knowledge with others along with evaluating next steps. The emphasis on stage four relates back to Bloom's Taxonomy. Multiple studies within the literature review supported Intergroup Dialogue's ability to increase awareness, which relates to the "understand" and "remember" building blocks of Bloom's Taxonomy. If the goal is to increase inclusion, awareness is not enough (Raphael, 2021). Future applications of IGD must move beyond awareness, toward application, evaluation, and creation, which may be done in alliance building.

Implications for future research and practice:

It may not be surprising that further research within IGD is needed. Future research should look at group climate and size and how these affect the effectiveness of the course. As

mentioned in the results, group size differed amongst all applications. In order to understand whether class size impacts effectiveness, research must be done on a consistent number of students. Additionally, as mentioned in the results, pedagogy and course materials were not available for review. If IGD as an entity were to create a resource guide, or perhaps provide class materials, scholars would be able to take a closer and more critical examination of pedagogy. Lastly, facilitator training should be researched and structured in a clear, measurable way. Intergroup Dialogue should develop, or perhaps research the best facilitation techniques to include all participants at an equal propensity.

Intergroup Dialogue is an important and interesting pedagogy model and theory that can be applied at higher education institutions, but to ensure effectiveness, more research is required. This class and pedagogy are more critical than ever. Not only in today's political climate, but in Ohio legislation. There is a bill that is currently in the Ohio House of Representatives, HB616, that would greatly affect education curriculum. This bill would prohibit "divisive, or inherently racist topics" which includes critical race theory, intersectional theory, as well as diversity, equity and inclusion outcomes (Ohio Legislative Service Commission, 2022). Not only would the bill change public school curriculum, but it would alter possibly erase the history of many marginalized communities. These topics, while they may be challenging, are conversations necessary for a more fair and equitable society. Discussing these topics is not only important for increasing campus inclusion, but at the heart of it all, having pedagogy like Intergroup Dialogue may allow individuals to feel safe and welcomed in spaces where that has not always been the case.

Appendix A:

Title	Authors	What they called it	How many people	Length of time	Time commitment	Goals	Assessment methods	Key Findings	How successful they think they were?	How closely does this match your goals?
The Comparative Impacts of Social Justice Educational Methods on Political Participation, Civic Engagement, and Multicultural Activism	Amy Krings Elizabeth A. Austic Lorraine M. Gutierrez Kaleigh E. Dirksen	Three courses: service learning, intergroup dialogue, or lecture-based diversity classes vs.. Intro to Psychology	653 college students that completed all assessment methods	Three years	All students required four different courses	To measure political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism and the differences between courses.	Pre, post test and follow-up surveys: demographic info, motivations for taking course, previous participation of SJ course, knowledge of social inequality, attitudes, and interest in civic and political action	Students reported an increase in political participation and multicultural activism	Intergroup dialogue participants demonstrated increases in all three outcomes, while participants of lecture-based classes focusing on social justice issues demonstrated increases in political participation and multicultural activism, but not civic engagement.	Talks about the difference in pedagogy in all three types of learning. Very helpful and influential study.

Oppression Pedagogy: Intergroup Dialogue and Theatre of the Oppressed in Creating a Safe Enough Classroom	Betty Garcia, Elizabeth Crifasi, and Adrienne B. Dessel	“Creating a Safe Enough Classroom” Oppression Class	28 students	Semester-long class	3 hour class session once a week	Heightened awareness Class Culture Experiential Learning	Measure and examine self-reported experiences of students.	They contribute the success to – teaching communication skills, inquiry and critical consciousness -Face to face interactions -Many representatives represent different levels of social power -Incorporates content on injustice, experiential activities and development of skills for social interaction -pedagogical strategies to stimulate student engagement, increased self-awareness, and curiosity to learn about the other	They believed many of the key themes such as awareness promoted seeing uniqueness in themselves.	Helpful in terms of pedagogy, breaks down each stage and what they did, but there are other elements: theater that may influence
Intergroup Dialogue: A Critical Dialogic Approach to Learning About Difference, Inequality, and Social Justice	Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda, Patricia Gurin	Intergroup Dialogue	9 universities	Semester long	No consistent length among all universities	Expand understanding of the critical-dialogical engagement	Quantitative and qualitative methods. Quan: Pre and post tests and follow up survey one year after participation Qualitative: reflection papers	Internal and External Validity: every IGD course can differ in terms of content and	They really emphasize the humanity that comes with IGD... emphasizing empathy, etc.	This will be helpful in both my literature review for sure, but I’m not sure.. There’s no present study that talks about the findings and methodology/pedagogy

<p>Intergroup Dialogue in Undergraduate Multicultural Psychology Education: Group Climate Development and Outcomes</p>	<p>Joel T. Muller and Joseph R. Miles</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>19 universities. Total of 161 participants. 20 to 24 years of age</p>	<p>Required students to have 3 sections of the course, twice a week, for three semesters.</p>	<p>75 min per week, three consecutive semesters</p>	<p>Group Climate within the group: compared IGD to group therapy</p> <p>Goal: to increase awareness of other perspectives and identities as a means of improving interpersonal relations</p>	<p>Completed both pre and post dialogue surveys</p>	<p>Measuring group climate as it relates to avoidance and conflict. Increased in abilities to empathically take the perspective of those in social identity groups different from own. Key: developing empathy through an emphasis on relationships</p> <p>*** Chesler (2001) suggested that dialogue in higher education (as opposed to community-based or corporate dialogues) may be less likely to lead to social action</p>	<p>Wanted to measure the outcomes versus the process. Basically pedagogy, and psychological terms that help identify what makes IGD so effective. Group Climate</p>	<p>Varying levels of engagement can affect outcomes of individual members.... Establishing trust is key*</p>
--	---	----------------------------	--	---	---	--	---	--	---	--

<p>Diversity Initiatives in Higher Education: Intergroup Dialogue Program Student Outcomes and Implications for Campus Radical Climate: A Case Study'</p>	<p>Craig Alimo Robert Kelly Christine Clark</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>8 students</p>	<p>Semester long course</p>	<p>No time indicated</p>	<p>Cognitive and Affective Outcomes, more so experimental within resident hall climates</p>	<p>Phone interviews after</p>	<p>Key Finding: Social Justice Education seeks to create and support learning environments where education is the practice of freedom and where the student and teacher are mutually engaged in the construction and transformation of knowledge into social action and change"</p> <p>About both process and content</p> <p>Idea that group size matters</p>	<p>Focused on race</p>	<p>Was used on different types of students (purposeful sampling)</p>
<p>Heterosexual Students' Experiences in Sexual Orientation Intergroup Dialogue Courses</p>	<p>Adrienne B. Dessel PhD LMSW , Michael R. Woodford PhD , Robbie Routenberg & Duane P. Breijak</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>9 IGD groups: between 8 and 15 students</p>	<p>Semester long course: many students</p>	<p>No time indicated</p>	<p>Homophobia was something that seemed apparent across this campus, wanted to create a safer campus climate</p>	<p>Examining final papers: qualitative data... Post dialogue semi-structured interviews</p>	<p>Specifically focused on sexuality</p> <p>Very interesting quote:</p> <p>The lack of opposition and conflict really made our dialogues uninteresting.</p>	<p>Big takeaway is the conversations reported with friends or family: constituting as real change... There's this sort of plan to have tangible change, but sometimes falls short</p>	<p>This article is VERY helpful in both content and for Literature Review</p>

<p>From Dialogue to Action: The Impact of Cross-Race Intergroup Dialogue on the Development of White College Students as Racial Allies</p>	<p>Craig John Alimo</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>MIGR: Multiple universities using identical programs across campuses. 1,463 students involved, but only 365 participated in study</p>	<p>Semester Long course (offered for four semesters)</p>	<p>24 contact hours</p>	<p>Bias reduction and White Racial Ally Development: how likely are white people to have an increase in confidence in allyship (relating to racism)</p>	<p>MANCOVA: Pretest posttests</p>	<p>Mentions participant have a demographic that tends to be of higher class</p>	<p>IGD did have an impact on frequency of engaging in behaviors that align with white racial ally development Did not find confidence in taking action: previous studies may not have looked at only white students Although these white students may aspire to work against racism by virtue of enrollment in the dialogue (Edwards, 2006), they may be largely unaware of the complexity of whiteness surrounding them</p>	<p>Interesting perspective Focused heavily on white students and their reactions and perceptions* Help/contribute to development of behaviors congruent w white racial ally development.</p>
--	-------------------------	----------------------------	---	--	-------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	---	--	--

<p>Fostering a Commitment to Social Action: How Talking, Thinking, and Feeling Make a Difference in Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>Chloé Gurin-Sands , Patricia Gurin , Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda & Shardae Osuna</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>Critical-Dialogic model. 52 classes, 9 universities included</p>	<p>Lasting 10-14 weeks</p>	<p>Weekly meetings 2-3 hrs.</p>	<p>Comparing the differences in tangible action between race focused classes, or gender focused classes.</p>	<p>Qualitative; Final Papers Thematic Analysis</p>	<p>Students in race/ethnicity: Educating others highly correlated with the course, also used more emotion words. Topic only played a minor role (educating others)</p>	<p>No clear data in which topic produces more action... Big takeaway: Is that educating their friends, families, and acquaintances about social justice demands being able to build alliances, utilize their emotions, and understand their identities in political terms.</p>	<p>Shows that topic doesn't necessarily matter. Does talk about the importance of self change as it relates to tangible change</p>
<p>Understanding Difference Through Dialogue: A First-Year Experience for College Students</p>	<p>Charu Thakral, Philip L. Vasquez, Bette L. Bottoms, Alicia K. Matthews, Kimberly M. Hudson, and Steven K. Whitley</p>	<p>First-year Dialogue Seminar</p>	<p>100 students</p>	<p>1 credit half semester course</p>	<p>Weekly meetings for 110 min</p>	<p>Only an introduction to dialogue: not a full/traditional IGD course. Less in depth</p>	<p>Pre and post test measures</p>	<p>Allowed all and any 1st year Confidence was higher for students in relation to social actions Political issues were not significantly different from the comparison group</p>	<p>Although their course differed a bit, they still follow the pedagogical process model (4 stages)</p>	<p>This is the same course design that Matt and Lauryn (I) used to make our IGD class.</p>

Diversity Initiatives in Higher Education: Intergroup Dialogue as Pedagogy across the Curriculum	Christine Clark	The Intergroup Dialogue as Pedagogy Across the Curriculum (INTERACT) Pilot Project	10 pilot project participant who were faculty from all different disciplines Called a scholar cohort	Met 24 times across 3 semesters	1) building trust 2) attempted dialogue 3) Trying this in their respected areas	Examine the efficacy of adapting intergroup dialogue-based pedagogy to classroom teaching across disciplines/subject areas, academic levels, and education	Qualitative: Thematic analysis of the faculty and what they noticed (anecdotal)	Looked at connection between student motivation, interest in learning, and academic achievement, and the use of non-traditional education processes (IGD)	Emphasized importance of facilitator preparation: Topic/other things don't necessarily matter, facilitators do	Mention of identity as well Useful for facilitator perspective
Intergroup Dialogue and Democratic Practice in Higher Education	Gretchen E. Lopez, Ximena Zúñiga	Intergroup Dialogue	9 campuses, 1400 participants	No time indicated, Perhaps not consistent	Not mentioned, perhaps not consistent	Quantifying the effects of IGD in comparison to a WS, Social Science and Psychology Class	Pre and posttest measures Student Essays & interviews Compared students to a social science class	Focused heavily on the facilitation aspect Claimed to be very influential in terms of confidence raising of discussing issues	They thought their examination and implementation were influential; so much that they claimed their next steps to use pedagogy within SJE Masters program	Heavily discusses facilitation Interesting that they are adding it to curriculum for SJE Masters Program

<p>Personal Experience:</p> <p>Intergroup Dialogue Course</p>	<p>Lauryn Hulett</p> <p>Matt Kaufman</p>	<p>Intergroup Dialogue</p>	<p>8 students</p> <p>All white</p> <p>Some variance in gender and sexuality identity</p>	<p>7 week course</p>	<p>1 hr. 50 minutes</p>	<p>Learning Outcomes:</p> <p>Students will demonstrate the ability to engage in open conversations and personal inquiry about a variety of identity-related subjects.</p> <p>Students will recognize and assess the worldviews and biases of their peers and themselves.</p> <p>Students will describe their experiences using personal story-telling and self-disclosure in a discussion-based and/or written format.</p> <p>Students will actively and empathetically listen to others when they share their stories.</p> <p>Students will reflect on themselves, their identity, and their</p>	<p>Final Projects presentation various mediums</p>	<p>Students had increased means of self-awareness, but actual tangible change is unknown.</p>		
---	--	----------------------------	--	----------------------	-------------------------	---	--	---	--	--

						value in the world.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--	--	--	--

References

- Alimo, C. J. (2012). From dialogue to action: The impact of cross-race intergroup dialogue on the development of white college students as racial allies. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 45*(1), 36-59.
- Alimo, C., Kelly, R., & Clark, C. (2002). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Intergroup dialogue program student outcomes and implications for campus radical climate: A case study. *Multicultural Education, 10*(1), 49.
- Clark, C. (2005). Diversity Initiatives in Higher Education: Intergroup Dialogue as Pedagogy across the Curriculum. *Multicultural Education, 12*(3), 51.
- Corsino, L., & Fuller, A. (2021). Educating for diversity, equity, and inclusion: A review of commonly used educational approaches. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 5*(1), E169. doi:10.1017/cts.2021.834
- Dessel, A. B., Woodford, M. R., Routenberg, R., & Breijak, D. P. (2013). Heterosexual students' experiences in sexual orientation intergroup dialogue courses. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*(7), 1054-1080.
- Dessel, A. B. (2011). Dialogue and social change: An interdisciplinary and transformative history. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 81*(2-3), 167-183.
- Division of diversity and belonging*. Bowling Green State University. (n.d.). Retrieved January 18, 2022, from <https://www.bgsu.edu/equity-diversity-and-inclusion>
- Eber, P. A., & Parker, T. S. (2007). Assessing student learning: Applying Bloom's taxonomy. *Journal of Human Services, 27*(1), 45-54.
- Forward. BGSU strategic plan*. Bowling Green State University. (n.d.). Retrieved January 18, 2022, from <https://www.bgsu.edu/forward.html>
- Fuentes, M. A., Zelaya, D. G., & Madsen, J. W. (2021). Rethinking the Course Syllabus: Considerations for Promoting Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. *Teaching of Psychology, 48*(1), 69–79.
- Garcia, B., Crifasi, E., & Dessel, A. B. (2019). Oppression pedagogy: Intergroup dialogue and theatre of the oppressed in creating a safe enough classroom. *Journal of Social Work Education, 55*(4), 669-683.
- 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*(1), 60-79.
- Gwayi-Chore, M., Del Villar, E. L., Fraire, L. C., Waters, C., Andrasik, M. P., Pfeiffer, J., . . . Heffron, R. (2021). “Being a person of color in this institution is exhausting”: Defining and optimizing the learning climate to support diversity, equity, and inclusion at the

University of Washington School of Public Health. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 9. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.642477

- Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Definition, Origins, and Practices. (2007). ASHE Higher Education Report, 32(4), 1–128. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.3204>
- Krings, A., Austic, E. A., Gutiérrez, 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(3), 403-417.
- Lopez, G. E., & Zúñiga, X. (2010). Intergroup dialogue and democratic practice in higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(152), 35-42.
- Lundquist, A. E., & Henning, G. (2020). From avoiding bias to social justice. *Developing an Intercultural Responsive Leadership Style for Faculty and Administrators*, 47-61.
- 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(1), 52.
- Nagda, B. R. A., & Gurin, P. (2007). Intergroup dialogue: A critical-dialogic approach to learning about difference, inequality, and social justice. *Journal of New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 111(2).
- Ohio Legislative Service Commission. (2022, April 4) H.B. 616 Bill Analysis. Ohio Legislature. <https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/download?key=18953&format=pdf>
- Raphael, C. (2021). Moving from dialogue to deliberation ... - nsuworks.nova.edu. Retrieved April, 2022, from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1135&context=elthe>
- Thakral, C., Vasquez, P. L., Bottoms, B. L., Matthews, A. K., Hudson, K. M., & Whitley, S. K. (2016). Understanding difference through dialogue: A first-year experience for college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(2), 130.