"I now harbor more pride in my race": The Educational Benefits of Inter- and Intraracial Dialogues on the Experiences of Students of Color and Multiracial Students

Kristie A. Ford [a] & Victoria K. Malaney [a]

[a] Skidmore College
Published online: 10 Feb 2012.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

"I now harbor more pride in my race": The Educational Benefits of Inter- and Intraracial Dialogues on the Experiences of Students of Color and Multiracial Students

Kristie A. Ford and Victoria K. Malaney

Skidmore College

How do students of color and multiracial students learn to make sense of and navigate race within historically white institutions (HWIs)? And, what pedagogies and inter-/intragroup dynamics facilitate increased understanding of issues of race, racial identity development, and racism in the U.S.? This project examines students' of color (SOC) and multiracial students' learning in the Intergroup People of Color–White People Dialogues and Intragroup Multiracial Identity Dialogues at a small private liberal arts college in the Northeast. Through qualitative, inductively-derived analyses of student papers, this study advances understanding of how SOC/multiracial students make sense of their own racial group membership and how they navigate raced interactions in college. It also continues and extends national efforts to conduct and disseminate research on both the substantive nature and process of the Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues and their impact on students.

I admit, it's been a roller coaster semester for me, but the People of Color–White People Dialogues helped me keep my feet on the ground while allowing my brain to go to new places, far and beyond from where it ever was before . . . You know how people say, "You will always remember a specific class from college that changed your life," well that class is Dialogue. I continue on this journey next semester, ready to learn, grow and take on the world. —Rob, Latino man

It has been a challenging journey, but Multiracial Identity Dialogue has opened my perspectives and forced me to recognize that there are differences in society because I am usually blinded by the notion that I have not been triggered by references to my identity. —Makayla, multiracial woman

Racial diversity is the "buzz-word," or prevailing theme, in institutions of higher education; given that, many colleges and universities are looking for ways to become more racially and ethnically diverse (Chito Childs & Matthews-Armstead, 2006; Humphreys, 2002). Less attention, however, has been paid to the positive classroom-based pedagogical interventions that help students of color (SOCs) and bi/multiracial[1] students thrive in historically white institutions (HWIs).

Critical race theory (CRT) seeks to critically understand the experiences of people of color through an analysis of race, racism, and power (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Two CRT principles relevant to the framing of this study include recognizing that: (1) racism is normalized within U.S. society and impacts the everyday lived experiences of people of color; and, (2) people of color

Address correspondence to Kristie A. Ford, Skidmore College, 815 North Broadway, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866. E-mail: kford@skidmore.edu

have their own "voice of color" or unique experiences with oppression (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, pp. 7–9). With a somewhat different focus, Freire (1970) examines oppression through a pedagogical lens—focusing on dialogic modes of engagement that liberate, rather than oppress, groups. To that end, Freire argues: "We can legitimately say that in the process of oppression someone oppresses someone else; we cannot say that in the process of revolution someone liberates someone else, nor yet that someone liberates himself, but rather that human beings in communion liberate each other" (p. 133). Applying these theoretical frameworks to understand the racial experiences of SOC/multiracial students within HWIs we explore the following research questions: How do SOC/multiracial students learn to make sense of and navigate race in HWIs? And what pedagogies and inter-/intragroup dynamics facilitate increased understanding of issues of race, racial identity development, and racism in the U.S.?

In order to better prepare all students for an increasingly diverse society, it is crucial that colleges/universities find innovative ways of integrating race into the curriculum. To address these concerns, many institutions of higher education have developed Intergroup Relations Programs to help students navigate diverse learning environments, particularly in the first two years of college (Hurtado, 2005). This study explores the effect of two undergraduate courses on race, Inter- and Intragroup Dialogues, offered by an Intergroup Relations Program at a small, private, liberal arts college in the Northeast. These courses use inter- and intraracial dialogue modalities in an effort to assess the educational benefits of this pedagogy and its impact on student outcomes (generally) and the experiences of SOC/multiracial students (specifically). The former (interracial dialogue) brings students across racial identities together; the latter (intraracial dialogue) engages students from one shared racial identity category (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Tatum, 2003). More concretely, in this article, we examine SOC/multiracial student learning in the Intergroup People of Color–White People Dialogues (POC-W) and Intragroup Multiracial Identity Dialogues (MRID).

Extrapolating from Freire's (1970) work, we use the term "oppressive raced scripts" to signify students' reinforcement of internalized, often negative, messages or shared storylines about race, racism, and power. In contrast, we use the term "liberatory raced scripts" to signify the modified narratives that SOC/multiracial students embrace as they progress in their understanding of their racial identity in inter- and intraracial settings (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Freire, 1970; Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Tatum, 2003). In particular, we are interested in exploring how the Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues may affect SOC/multiracial students' understanding of race, hopefully resulting in script changes that reflect a more empowered "voice of color" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 9) or affirmative sense of self (Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Tatum, 2003).

INTER- AND INTRAGROUP DIALOGUE PEDAGOGY

Social justice education courses are one way to support the development of SOC/multiracial students within HWIs. By social justice education, we mean the study of structural and institutional inequities experienced by members of different social identity groups (e.g., race, gender, and sexuality) due to varying levels of power and privilege. This approach not only focuses on cognitive learning, but also seeks to apply these principles to create a more equitable and just world (Adams et al., 2007).

Intergroup dialogue is one of the most common social justice education practices being used to foster student engagement across differences in diverse college settings (Adams et al., 2007).

Zúñiga et al. (2007) defines intergroup dialogue as a facilitated, face-to-face encounter that aims to cultivate meaningful engagement between members of two or more social identity groups that have a history of conflict. Intergroup dialogue's objective is to provide a safe space for students to explore commonalities and differences, examine structures of power and privilege, and work toward equality and social justice. A race dialogue, for instance, would bring together students of color and white students; a gender dialogue might unite men, women, and transgendered students. The pedagogical components that distinguish intergroup dialogue from more traditional courses include establishing: (1) structured interaction (e.g., small group of students, equal representation of two or more social identity groups);[2] (2) active and engaged learning that balances both content (e.g., sociological and psychological readings) and process knowledge (e.g., critical self-reflection, experiential activities); and, (3) facilitated learning environment led by two trained peer-leaders (Nagda, Gurin, Sorensen, & Zúñiga, 2009; Zúñiga et al., 2007).

In addition to intergroup dialogue, increasingly dialogue practitioners are structuring intragroup dialogue courses to support the exploration of a single target or agent group identity. Target group refers to social identities that are subordinated within the societal power structure; agent group, in contrast, refers to social identities that hold societal power or privilege (Adams et al., 2007; Tatum, 2003). For example, the University of Michigan's Intergroup Relations Program recently implemented intragroup dialogues on multiracial identity (target group) and white racial identity (agent group).[3] Structurally and pedagogically similar to intergroup dialogue, in intragroup dialogue, students meet together to explore common experiences, issues of privilege and oppression, and the meaning of their racial group membership.

Students in the MRID, for instance, are able to explore feelings of ambiguity and confusion that often surface as multiracial individuals learn to navigate the complexity of their racial/ethnic identities within a monoracial-focused society. While the curricula may differ slightly, depending upon the focus of the dialogue, both courses follow a four-stage pedagogical model (forming relationships; exploring differences and commonalities of experience; discussing controversial topics; building alliances),[4] incorporate engaged learning activities and assignments (e.g., testimonials; social identity profile; cycle of socialization; privilege walk/cross the line; collaborative project; social justice box),[5] and contain foundational readings on key concepts (e.g., dialogue, debate, and discussion; socialization processes; socio-historical context of race relations in the U.S.; race and racial identity development; social identities and their intersections; discrimination and oppression; differing manifestations of racism; alliances and social change).

To explore the outcomes related to Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue, we begin by providing an overview of literature relevant to the development and experiences of SOC/multiracial students within predominately white college settings. Next, we explain our research methodology and present seven central themes that highlight students' pre- and post-dialogue learnings. Finally, we end with a discussion of the diversity-related implications of incorporating social justice education courses into the curricular offerings at HWIs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the Racial Identity Development of People of Color/Multiracial People

Race is a characteristic that is "ascribed, symbolically mediated as status or stigma, socially constructed, and consciously manipulated or performed" (Willie, 2003, p. 9). For this article, we are

interested in the raced experiences of people of color. We use the term "people of color" to refer to racial groups that have been historically marginalized or oppressed within the U.S. context, including people who identify as African American/black, Latino/Hispanic/Chicano(a), Asian/Pacific Islander/Asian American, American Indian/Native American, or multiracial (Tatum, 2003). While the racial/ethnic groups represented under the people of color category are heterogeneous and are defined by differing socio-historical contexts, immigration statuses, languages, ethnicities, cultures, and skin tones—the experiences of this socially constructed group often differs from the white hegemonic norm (Tatum, 2003).

Racial identity development, according to Tatum (2003), refers to the "process of defining for oneself the personal significance and social meaning of belonging to a particular racial group" (p. 16). For people of color, this process is certainly not monolithic. Cross (1991), for instance, developed a five-stage black racial identity development model: (1) pre-encounter: racial assimilation; (2) encounter: racial awareness and anger; (3) immersion/emersion: racial re-education and pride; (4) internalization: racial redefinition; and, (5) internalization-commitment: racial integration and change. More recent models also outline similar stages specific to the identity development of Latino/a (Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001) and Asian Americans (J. Kim, 2001). In addition, comparable to Cross (1991), Helms (1990, 1995) created a parallel people of color profile for racial/ethnic groups more broadly: (1) conformity; (2) dissonance; (3) immersion/emersion; (4) internalization; and (5) integrative awareness.

Finally, the developmental process of multiracial individuals can be especially complicated due to a number of factors, including: racial ancestry, socialization patterns, and the socio-historical context; the relationship between the one-drop rule and internal and external perceptions of self; underlying tensions between embracing or denying aspects of one's identity; colorism and ethnic options; white skin privilege and passing; physical appearance and exoticism; racial/cultural attachment, sense of belongingness, and identity confusion; and intersecting social identities and political consciousness (Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Spickard, 1992; Tatum, 2003; Wijeyesinghe, 2001; Xie & Goyette, 1998). In an effort to better understand the multiracial experience, recent research (e.g., Renn, 2003; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Wallace, 2001) has focused on the development of a multiracial identity model. Root (1996), for instance, articulates four possible interrelated themes or trajectories relevant to constructing a multiracial identity: (1) "having *both* feet in *both* groups," (p. xxi) in other words acknowledging and identifying with two (or more) racial groups; (2) shifting ethnicity or race depending on the situation or setting; (3) self-identifying exclusively as multiracial, without a clear reference to specific racial identities; and/or, (4) identifying primarily with one dominant race, while also appreciating the other races/ethnicities that also shape identity. Elaborating point two, Hyman (2010) argues that multiracial individuals can choose to code-switch—or change their behaviors, style, or language—based on their surroundings. This gives them the flexibility to use their multiple racial identities to their advantage in different social and academic settings (Hyman, 2010). Moreover, Wallace (2001) contends that multiracial people can acquire a healthy sense of self by identifying with any individual ethnicity or a combination of ethnicities. Finally, Renn (2003) expands upon Root's (1996) framework by adding another component to her model: (5) multiracial individuals can choose to "opt out of racial identities altogether by deconstructing them" (p. 385).

While these conceptual models cannot fully capture the complex, enduring, and non-linear nature of racial identity formation, they do provide general frameworks for understanding how

SOC/multiracial students can theoretically transition from an identity that lacks salience to an identity that reflects a positive racialized sense of self (Tatum, 2003; Wijeyesinghe, 2001).

Research on the Experiences of SOC/Multiracial Students at HWIs

Researchers continue to examine what factors determine a positive climate for racial diversity (Gurin, 1999; Henderson-King & Kaleta, 2000; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2005). In particular, Hurtado et al. identify four dimensions of campus life that impact perceptions of diversity on a campus: the (1) "campus' historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of various racial or ethnic groups; (2) its structural diversity (i.e., the numerical and proportional representation of diverse groups on campus); (3) its psychological climate (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about diversity); and, (4) its behavioral climate (i.e., how different racial and ethnic groups interact on campus" (p. 391). If these four dimensions are not proactively addressed by colleges/universities, SOC/multiracial students often end up navigating difficult race-related climate issues.

The higher education literature has documented that SOCs, particularly SOCs within predominately white academic settings, experience the classroom in racially inscribed ways that subsequently affect their academic experiences and social lives on campus (Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000; Massey, Charles, Lundy, & Fisher, 2003; Suarez-Balcaza et al., 2003). Through focus groups, Lewis et al. report that SOCs (black, Latino/a, Asian, and American Indian) experience racial and behavioral stereotyping by white students; pressures to assimilate; exclusion and marginality; white ignorance and interpersonal awkwardness; and white resentment and hostility around affirmative action. Moreover, discriminatory attitudes, behaviors, and biased incidents (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Suarez-Balcaza et al., 2003), racial "micro-aggressions" or "unconscious and subtle forms of racism" (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000, p. 60), academic performance-related stereotype threat or anticipatory discrimination (Steele & Aronson, 1995), the hegemonic college curriculum (Lewis et al., 2000), the lack of faculty of color role models (Neville, Heppner, Ji, & Thye, 2004), and the role of white faculty in reinforcing tokenism within the classroom (Gonsalves, 2002; Lewis et al., 2000) present other challenges for this group of students.

Gonsalves (2002), for instance, finds that black male students are affected by the quality of white faculty interactions both in and outside of the classroom. Specifically, culturally insensitive remarks made by white professors can negatively influence SOCs' academic coursework; in contrast, SOCs are more apt to interact with white professors who demonstrate some cultural sensitivity and awareness to issues of race and identity. Similarly, Neville et al. (2004) document the race-related stressors (e.g., faculty insensitivity, low academic expectations, lack of role models, racial isolation, interpersonal and institutional racism) that affect black college students' academic, personal, and social adjustment. Finally, Cureton's (2003) research suggests that black students' academic success is affected by interpersonal factors, perceptions of the campus climate, and the social and cultural opportunities at the college or university.

While there is a growing body of literature on SOCs, particularly black students, more work needs to be done on the educational experiences of multiracial students at HWIs. Developing a sense of belonging on campus is crucial to all students' academic and social success; within the literature on multiracial student development (O'Connor, Lewis, & Mueller, 2007; Renn,

2003; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996), social connectedness is highlighted as an especially salient theme (Johnson et al., 2007; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2001; Root, 1992). Unlike their monoracial peers, multiracial students tend to be internally divided because their intersecting racial/ethnic identities challenge monolithic racial categories (Root, 1996). Consequently, to be accepted by others, many find it easier to embrace a single racial identity (Renn, 2003; Root, 1996). For example, Williams, Nakashima, Kich, and Daniel (1996) argue that a "multiracial person disappears into a monoracial projection fostered by teachers, fellow students, or both. Unless interracial themes, histories, and concepts are presented as part of the course, either the credibility of the multiracial individual as a person of color is questioned or resisted" (p. 364). Moreover, as Williams et al. (1996) explain, in HWIs this complexity is never fully addressed; multiracial students are thus forced inside (e.g., token representative for a particular racial group) and outside (e.g., selection of which racial affinity group/club to join) of the classroom, to choose which monoracial background to publicly embrace and adhere to (Johnson et al., 2007; Williams et al., 1996).

Intergroup Dialogue

In part, Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue, and the conceptual and pedagogical assumptions underlying it, was created to help address the historical exclusion of SOC/multiracial students and the related campus climate issues within HWIs; it was also designed to increase students' level of positivity toward interactional diversity (Gurin, 1999; Zúñiga et al., 2007). Applying contact theory, social identity theory, and intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Engberg, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), social psychologists have documented the positive outcomes associated with intergroup interaction, including mutual appreciation and understanding, constructive engagement with conflict, and collective action (Fiske, 2002; Huddy, 2001; Pettigrew, 1998; Schoepflin, 2006). Pettigrew also suggests that when the intergroup contact has equal status within the setting (e.g., equal racial representation of students), shared goals (e.g., community norms), cooperation in pursuit of those goals (e.g., group dynamics), and support from authorities (e.g., peer-facilitators), it allows for closeness and/or intergroup friendships to develop.

Likewise, emergent scholarship on intergroup dialogue has confirmed that dialoging across different social identity groups fosters positive effects in communication and personal growth within students, while furthering the prospects for social change (e.g., Gurin & Nagda, 2006; Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1998; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003; Sorensen, Nagda, Gurin, & Maxwell, 2009). As a result, Sorenson et al. and Hurtado et al. (1998) conclude that there are great benefits associated with having diversity in institutions of higher education, if utilized appropriately. Some of the benefits include students overcoming fears related to intergroup interactions, working together cross-racially, and becoming more likely to make integrated lifestyle choices post-college (Sorenson et al., 2009). Although these outcomes, to differing degrees, are evident for both students of color and white students, less is qualitatively understood about the dialogic educational benefits and identity development processes of marginalized social identity groups (generally)[6] and SOC/multiracial students (specifically). Consequently, in addition to understanding white student experiences (Ford, 2011), we need to focus on the positive classroom-based pedagogical interventions that help SOC/multiracial students thrive within HWIs.

This project extends research on Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues by assessing SOC/multiracial students' learning across inter- and intraracial dialogue settings. Specifically, it focuses on: (1) how SOC/multiracial students make sense of race, racism, and racial identity; (2) how their understanding of these concepts is affected by participation in an Inter- or Intragroup Dialogue on race; and, (3) the pedagogies and group dynamics that promote this understanding.

METHODOLOGY

This Institutional Review Board approved research takes place at a small private liberal arts college in the Northeast. In accordance with national trends within higher education, women out-number men on campus, 60% and 40% respectively. Approximately 20% of students self-identify as people of color and 80% identify as white. While the College continues to recruit and enroll increasingly diverse cohorts of first-year students, significant diversity-related challenges are still present at this HWI. Like many comparable institutions, this College faces a range of ongoing issues, including: (1) SOC/multiracial students are generally the sole representatives of their racial group(s) within a classroom; (2) SOCs, particularly black and Latino/a students, are often presumed to come from low income backgrounds and receive scholarships, an assumption that results in internal and external stereotypes regarding academic qualifications; and (3) biased incidents regarding race, social class, gender, and sexuality remain prevalent occurrences on campus.

Despite these identified campus climate issues, the College recognizes the importance of social justice education and recently included a provision in the revised 2010 Strategic Plan that focuses on developing the diversity-related knowledge and skills of faculty, staff, and students in hopes of building a more inclusive community. The plan also acknowledges the importance of Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue in achieving its overall mission (College website).

Within this context, a comparative approach was used in this pre-dialogue/post-dialogue design to qualitatively explore SOC/multiracial students' learning in the Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues held in 2009–2010. SOC/multiracial students interested in participating in a semester-long race dialogue were either enrolled in an Intergroup POC-W dialogue with white students or an intragroup experience (the MRID).[7] In total, the sample contained five sections of POC-W ($n = 21$) and one section of the MRID ($n = 10$) that enrolled an aggregate of 31 students. The group consisted of 10 men and 21 women representing the following racial identities: Hispanic/Latino/a ($n = 11$), Asian/Asian American ($n = 9$), multiracial ($n = 7$), and African American/black ($n = 4$). In addition, participants represented a range of other group and social identities, including differing class years (first-year students through seniors), nationalities (e.g., dual citizens, U.S. citizens); religious affiliations (e.g., Buddhist, Christian, agnostic, spiritual, non-religious); sexualities (e.g., gay, bisexual, heterosexual); and social classes (e.g., working, middle, upper).

An inductively-derived qualitative analysis of two written, graded assignments,[8] a four-page preliminary paper, and an eight-page final paper, allowed for a nuanced exploration of SOC/multiracial students' articulation of race, racial identity, and racism. Both papers required students to critically reflect on their experiences with and understandings of race, by addressing three topical areas: (1) social identities; (2) social structures; and (3) dialogue experiences. The final papers also required students to integrate course readings into their analysis. Specifically, the papers explored questions such as:

1. **Social Identities**: "What are some experiences that have made your race/ethnicity visible to you? What and how were you taught, explicitly or implicitly, about what it means to be a person of color/multiracial person, in terms of attitudes, behaviors, your future, the nature of the society, etc.? Broadly speaking, what does it mean to you to be a person of color/multiracial person? What do you know about your ethnic/cultural heritage (i.e., the culture, country or region of the world from which your ancestors came)? And how might this affect your feelings about being considered part of your racial group?"

2. **Social Structures**: "Throughout your life, have most of your friends and other people close to you been of the same racial/ethnic background? If so, why do you think this was the case? If not, what do you think led you to cross racial/ethnic lines in these relationships? Have you been subject to discrimination based on your race/ethnicity? If so, what type of discrimination (be specific with examples)? Has your racial/ethnic identity brought you any privileges or benefits? If so, what types of privileges or benefits (be specific with examples)? How do you think demographic changes that are currently underway in the U.S. and the world will affect your experiences with and attitudes relating to race/ethnicity and racism?"

3. **Dialogue Experiences:**
   o Preliminary Paper: "What are some of your hopes, or learning objectives, for this dialogue? What are some of your fears or concerns about participating in this dialogue?"
   o Final Paper: "What has been the impact of this semester's dialogue on your knowledge and views about being a person of color/multiracial person in U.S. society? What has been the impact of this semester's dialogue on your knowledge and views about race/ethnicity and racism? What, if any, are your goals for personal next steps concerning the topic of this dialogue? How, if at all, do you expect to use what you have learned in the future (both at the College and beyond)?"

Student grades were not contingent on participating in this research project. Upon completion of the dialogue, the 59 papers (28 preliminary/31 final)[9] of consenting students were assigned a number and cleaned of any personally identifiable information. To ensure consistency in the coding process, the papers were hand-coded by us and two trained research assistants of differing racial identities. Specifically, this inductive process included reading each paper several times, identifying core themes through open and focused coding, creating a coding scheme, and then entering the data into the Qualitative N-Vivo software program for further analysis (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Finally, by examining relevant excerpts and developing conceptual memos, themes from the preliminary and final papers were compared to discern common patterns across the students' narratives over time. While we also documented student-specific shifts in perspective, for this article, we were primarily interested in presenting themes that reflect group, rather than individual-level, pre- to post-dialogue differences. To protect confidentiality, participant names were changed in the analysis of the data.

Potential Limitations

It is important to acknowledge that the results from this small, non-random sample, which includes an unequal number of POC-W and MRID participants, is not necessarily generalizable across various institutional contexts or representative of larger student populations. In particular, because

Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue courses are voluntary, this self-selected group of students may have been more attuned to or interested in exploring issues of race than the average student. Finally, it is unclear, without additional longitudinal data, if these results are sustainable over an extended period of time.

RESULTS

In both the Inter- and Intragroup Dialogues, SOC/multiracial[10] student papers demonstrated self-reported growth—in content learning and dialogue processes—over the course of the semester. Reflecting on this experience, all 31 of the students noted the ways in which they have been positively transformed. For example:

> I definitely went into the racial dialogues feeling that I would know a lot . . . Perhaps I did have a lot of diverse experiences with race but that doesn't qualify me as some type of race expert, and coming to race dialogues definitely showed me that I had so much to learn from my peers and from myself as well. —Sergio, Latino man

> The POC-W dialogue course forced me to confront my insecurities and develop emotionally while coming to recognize the make-up of society in ways I never had before, bringing me one step closer to self-actualization and teaching me how to be more of the person I want to be in society . . . The most important thing a student could take away from the [POC-W] dialogue course is the importance of knowing yourself before you can know others. It is impossible for one to fathom understanding, let alone appreciating and critically considering another opinion until they are on relatively solid ground with who they feel they are, what they believe, and how their identity places them in their larger world. —Nadia, biracial Latina

> Looking back on this experience, I can see how much of a journey we have all embarked on. It has been a long one, but one that is never finished. It's sort of like going hiking—you have to acquire the tools (and learn to use them) before you can actually begin the climb. We have tools and use them, and we're climbing; we have all climbed a great deal. However, with everything, we will take on more complicated tools and learn how to use them as our journey continues. —Rose, Asian American woman

The SOC/multiracial students have clearly expressed benefiting from their experiences in the POC-W and MRID. This finding aligns with Denson and Chang's (2008) research, which suggests that undergraduate education is positively impacted by diversity-related courses on college campuses. Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue courses, in particular, provide unique opportunities for students to gain a background in social justice that can help prepare them for their futures as, in Rose's words, their "journey continues." What follows is an overview of some of the pre- and post-dialogue themes and representative examples each. In particular, notable changes from pre- to post-dialogue included understanding the: (1) saliency and meaning of racial identity; (2) complexity of racial identity development; (3) relationship between skin color and self-esteem; (4) individual biases and prejudices; (5) structures of power and privilege/agent and target identities; (6) experience of race at the College; and, (7) importance of personal accountability and responsibility in creating change. More concretely, Table 1 outlines six primary themes, and the related raced scripts, that changed from pre- to post-dialogue; it also lists one major theme

TABLE 1
Student of Color/Multiracial Learning Outcomes

	POC-W	MRID
(a) Pre-Dialogue Themes, (b)Post-Dialogue Themes, (c) New Scripts, Post-Dialogue		
1. Saliency and Meaning of Racial Identity	√	√
a. "Race is central to my identity." OR "I do not identify with a race."		
b. "I now understand the meaning, complexity, and importance of my racial identity."		
2. Complexity of Racial Identity Development		√
a. "I do not know where I fit in . . . I feel torn between two different cultures."		
b. "I no longer feel divided . . . I am whole."		
3. Relationship Between Skin Color and Self-Esteem	√	√
a. "I am not comfortable in my skin; I wish that I was lighter."		
b. "I am comfortable in my skin; I now feel proud to be brown."		
4. Individual Biases and Prejudices	√	√
c. "I now recognize that I also hold stereotypes and biases against other groups."		
5. Structures of Power and Privilege/Agent and Target Identities	√	√
a. "The system is unfair and limits opportunities."/"I am oppressed because of racism."		
b. "I better understand how racism is embedded in our social structures."/"Although I may be oppressed as a SOC/multiracial person, I am still privileged in other ways."		
6. Experience of Race at the College	√	√
a. "Coming to this College was a culture shock."		
b. "Coming to this College is still a culture shock, but now I have a community of support."		
7. Personal Accountability and Responsibility	√	√
a. "I want to create change."		
b. "It is my responsibility to take action, develop allies, and create change."		

√ = theme present in the corresponding dialogue section.

that only emerged in the final papers, and delineates the intergroup (POC-W) and intragroup (MRID) differences.

The Saliency and Meaning of Racial Identity

Most of the SOC/multiracial students in the sample began with a nuanced understanding of race and racism when they entered the race dialogues. In her preliminary paper (i.e., pre-dialogue), Leigh, a black woman, for instance, stated:

> My identity is one of the important aspects of my life and I always questioned, who am I? Who do I want to be? I feel as if I always have to be aware of my race because of all the negative things that have happened in the past to Blacks and things even now. I do not believe that the "majority" is out to get us, but I have to be aware, proud, and even pay respects to my race because we have struggled and still are struggling to make a place for us in America and also the world.

This type of statement is not surprising given the socio-historical context of race relations in the U.S.; generally, targeted (or non-privileged) racial identity groups are more aware of systematic dis/advantage based on power structures than their privileged counterparts (Tatum, 2003). Most

SOC/multiracial students emphasized the centrality of race in their lives (pre-dialogue), and were able to re-define race and further embrace its significance by the end of the semester (post-dialogue). This pattern did not hold true for all participants. In an attempt to challenge the social construction of race, an Asian American woman, early in the MRID process, preferred to identify as "raceless":

> I view myself as raceless, and though it sounds isolating, it has been liberating as an idea. On paperwork, there is no box under Race/Ethnicity to be checked off for "None." When asked, "Where are you from?" I answer that I am from New York. I know that isn't what is being asked of me, and [I] am always urged on with a remark like, "No, originally . . .?" I want to understand what others feel when they answer questions about race and ethnicity, if only to understand what it means to be proud of one's heritage . . . I know that by claiming racelessness I am denying myself the opportunity to feel a part of a community. —Sarai, Asian American woman, pre-dialogue

Throughout the course of the dialogue, however, an interesting shift in consciousness occurred. This student refined her position on "racelessness" as she began to understand both the individual and societal implications of race:

> I used to feel raceless. I used to think that to admit a racial identity was an individual choice, and I, personally, chose to ignore race as a presence in my life . . . Race is not an individual choice, but a system that exists to establish power dynamics. I can no longer choose to ignore my race, because I am now aware that it has been imposed on me by society. —Sarai, Asian American woman, post-dialogue

Identifying as raceless is a well-documented strategy and identity stage within the literature; by disconnecting from a marginalized racial identifier, it allows SOCs to better assimilate into dominant cultural values and norms (J. Kim, 2001; Tatum, 2003; Tuan, 1998). In doing so, however, Tuan argues that Asian Americans, like Sarai, often ignore institutionalized racism and its effects on their lived experiences.

The Complexity of Racial Identity Development

In other ways, the complexity of racial identity constructions emerged in many of the initial student papers. More concretely, in the MRID, many of the multiracial students articulated identity confusion (and, in a few cases, internalized oppression/self-hatred) around a lack of belonging-ness or feeling unsure about where they "fit in" (Johnson et al., 2007; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2001; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996). The notion of racial authenticity becomes relevant here. As Jackson (2001) explains, while representations of racial authenticity are arbitrary and contextually determined, they nonetheless have social implications. Moreover, situational identities and negotiations over self-image are often dependent on group recognition and monitoring of authenticity (Howard, 2000). Feeling racially inauthentic—due to mode of dress, complexion, mannerisms, or others' opinions—resonates with a number of the multiracial student experiences.

Sarai, for instance, discussed the impact of 9/11 on Muslims and individuals who are assumed to be Muslim based on dress or language use: "I remember after 9/11 how my race seemed to flare out, obvious to others, and I feared I would be linked to the terrorists . . . Many Muslims altered their customs so that they would not attract much attention. I didn't have to do this because I was already 'one of them,' I was more American than any other culture. I think this was when I started

to really feel unsettled by racial issues. Because I wore jeans and tank tops I did not endure the discrimination that others did." Likewise, Nadia, a biracial Latina, wrote about visibly "passing" as white and feeling disconnected from communities of color. Other students clearly expressed a sense of double-consciousness (DuBois, 1989), or feeling torn between two different cultures or identities:

> I was accused of being "the least black, black kid," an insult I would come to hear regularly . . . They told me I wasn't black because I was raised by white people. Thus, I began to hang out with my white friends more frequently. However, the ridiculing continued, only now I became the token black kid . . . I slowly began to lose my biracial identity, convinced that I had to choose between black or white. —Aaron, biracial man, pre-dialogue

> My parents expect me to excel in school, obey their every wish, and more importantly not lose my cultural identity . . . But my parents failed to realize that by bringing me to the United States at such a young age I would lose my cultural identity indefinitely. They brought me into a culture that stresses individuality rather than loyalty to tradition. To solve this dilemma I formed a double identity one that I wanted and another superficial one that my parents wanted. —Stanley, Asian American man, pre-dialogue

> I feel paradoxically too American to be [Asian], and too "brown" to be American . . . But I hope I can make sense of what it means to be this racial hybrid. —Sarai, Asian American woman, pre-dialogue

In contrast, by the end of the semester, these same students were not only able to make sense of what it means to be a "racial hybrid," they were also able to develop a fluid sense of identity that embraced this complexity. Sydney, a biracial woman, noted: "instead of attempting to label myself as one ethnicity or the other, I have found it suits my chameleon nature to just be both." The recurrent theme—"I no longer feel divided; I am whole"—is also evident in the subsequent quotations:

> I found reason to identify as mixed only, without having to explain my exotic racial make-up to everyone I meet. I'm not divided within myself but rather united with all those around me who identify as multiracial as well, regardless of their race percentiles. These realizations inspired a satisfaction with and growth of my character, and I now harbor more pride in my race than I had ever before. —Aaron, biracial man, post-dialogue

> Really, I am handed three cultures—the one based on my upbringing, one given by birth, and the one society gave me. However, difficult at times it is, I can appreciate my complexity . . . [This course] personally played into my multiple social identities through validating my feelings. My understanding of my own social legitimacy was definitely something I did not have before MRID. Multiracial individuals are constantly re-defining their identity and struggling with straddling two or more identities they will never fully fit into . . . I might be a walking contradiction, but I am a legitimate one, and if society has a problem with it, they only have themselves to blame for shaping my identity in this way. —Rose, Asian American woman, post-dialogue

> Before I entered this course, I tried very hard to fit in a category and that usually meant identifying as Hispanic/Latina, but now I realize that although society makes it this way, it shouldn't be like this . . . I am also Biracial. From now on, I will use my fractioned identity to challenge society's social binaries and embrace difference. —Marianna, Latina woman, post-dialogue

In sum, this experience provided a safe space for many SOCs, especially multiracial students, to develop a sense of empowerment and pride in their multiple and intersecting social identities, and to use these identities to challenge racial binaries.

Skin Color and Self-Esteem

Porter and Washington (1993) define two different types of self-esteem: "group self-esteem" refers to how the individual feels about racial or ethnic group membership, and "personal self-esteem" refers to how the individual feels about the self in a comprehensive manner. For SOC/multiracial students, developing both a positive group and personal self-esteem can be challenging as they strive to fit into U.S. racial and cultural constructs (Porter & Washington, 1993). Specifically, since SOC/multiracial students are in the racial minority at HWIs, race often becomes a prominent, visible marker of difference (Johnson et al., 2007; Root, 1992; Tatum, 2003). Julian, a Latino male, believes that "being a person of color in America means that one must give in to 'white culture.' By giving in I mean having to compromise some of our own ethnic ties or traditions in order to assimilate." Root (1992) acknowledges that the development of healthy self-esteem is even more complicated for multiracial people due to a number of factors, including lack of social acceptance and sense of belonging, social stress, and challenging family dynamics.

In contrast to their preliminary papers, which reflected SOC/multiracial students' struggles to develop a positive racial sense of self, their final paper reflected a better understanding of themselves, and a more positive outlook on their futures. To that end, Lacey contended:

> Through the POC-W dialogue, I became aware of how my racial and ethnic identity has shifted; I am more aware of my minority status, but I am also not afraid to identify as a person of color. I think I am more confident in my identity as a biracial individual. Furthermore, through this class I realized how comfortable I am in my brown skin, and how proud I am to be brown. —Lacey, biracial woman, post-dialogue

Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues helped others to realize the implications of internalized oppression and resist tendencies to hide or downplay their cultural background:

> Us minorities who have come from different backgrounds felt that we had to hide ourselves when we arrived at [the College], to be more Americanized and behave less Asian, Hispanic, or black. We felt this way because the majority of the campus is white . . . In order to be accepted we have to abandon our backgrounds, to be more "white," to be civilized, to be a normal American. But what did that all mean? Was abandoning who we are helping or hurting ourselves? At least in one point of our lives we wished we were not who we are, either to have straight hair instead of curly, or to have whiter skin than dark. We dislike ourselves all because of what society tells us is perfect, what is beautiful, and what is acceptable. —Mai, Asian American woman, post-dialogue

In the above examples, students grappled with the societal implications of having a darker skin tone; other SOC/multiracial students, however, dealt with a divergent issue: visibly looking white. In contrast to students who viewed their complexion as a liability, these students had to reconcile the privileges associated with unintentionally passing for white. Within the context of

this article, "passing" refers to social situations in which a person of color or multiracial person knowingly or unknowingly identifies (or is identified by others) as white (Root, 1992).

> I believe that because I welcome this biracial background, and truthfully, [I] look more white than I do Hispanic, I have many privileges laid at my feet. This advantage is something I was completely unaware of before I took this POC-W dialogue class. The dialogue was in some ways very hard for me, because it forced me to see aspects of my identity that I do not necessarily relate with or care for. I was challenged to confront my own whiteness . . . I acknowledge this privilege and rather than remaining oblivious, rejecting, or misusing it, I feel more capable of actively putting these benefits to good use. —Sydney, biracial woman, post-dialogue

This quotation suggests that the POC-W dialogue helped empower Sydney to take ownership of the relationship between her skin tone, racial identity, and self-esteem. Most notably, Sydney was able to articulate the societal implications of phenotypically passing (Root, 1992) and explore proactive ways to use her white skin privilege to create change.

Individual Biases and Prejudices

Through this dialogue experience, SOC/multiracial students were also able to dissect their previously held biases and preconceptions. To that end, Liane, a black woman noted: "One of the main things that I learned about myself is that while I may not be quick to publically judge others based on stereotypes that I am aware of, I do still sit by some stereotypes and they arise sometimes . . . I have learned to question myself more now than I have ever about my actions, others' actions, and my own perceptions and viewpoints." Likewise, a multiracial and black woman more specifically relate their realizations regarding unrecognized raced stereotypes and/or prejudices of other racial/ethnic groups:

> MRID has also helped me to better recognize my actions towards others regarding race. For example, I asked my classmate to take a "super Asian" photo of several of our friends. I soon realized that this foolish comment set a stereotype of Asians . . . it is essential for me to recognize and correct racial terminologies when they fit the stereotypes of particular races. —Makayla, multiracial woman, post-dialogue

> I believe that my resentment [of white people] stems from the fact that the majority of those with privilege are oblivious to the fact that they have such privilege. The more I was forced to read, listen, and discuss various aspects of race and identity, the closer I came to confronting my feelings with honesty and clarity. I resent those with agency because of my lack thereof . . . I guess I resent white people because it is *I* who ultimately finds it hard to connect with them. Like all problems, the first step is to acknowledge that it is there. Now that I can identify my problem and one of the basis of my feelings I am more equipped to challenge myself and attempt to pivot my center of view . . . I can now look back on situations like that and analyze my own biases and prejudices. If anything, this course has reminded me that I am not free from the stains of racial prejudice and biases. Not only do I have biases against other races, but I've learned that I have several against my own race as well. —Danielle, black woman, post-dialogue

These quotations demonstrate the value of engaged pedagogies and how the co-learning process can promote change in students. Without comparable opportunities to meaningfully grapple with issues of race, as Henderson-King and Kaleta's (2000) research reminds us, a student will often

"become less positive in her or his feelings toward people of color, as well as some other groups, over the course of a semester" (p. 145). In this study, it is quite the opposite; these data demonstrate how student assumptions and biases can be realized and, hopefully, reconsidered.

Structures of Power and Privilege/Agent and Target Identities

Although many SOC/multiracial students generally begin the course with a more sophisticated understanding of race, power, and privilege than their white counterparts (Ford, 2011), they nonetheless develop a deeper appreciation for these issues over time. Delgado and Stefancic (2001), using CRT, argue that "racism is ordinary, not aberrational" —it is "the usual way society does business, the common, everyday experience of most people of color"' (p. 7). As a result of the Inter-/Intragroup Dialogues, SOC/multiracial students began to more fully recognize the complicated structures of power and privilege in the U.S. as well as its relationship to racial hegemony.

A common pedagogical exercise used to demonstrate the implications of privilege is the "privilege walk." The privilege walk is an interactive activity designed to visually highlight the interpersonal and structural implications of privilege based on race, gender, social class, or sexuality (Adams et al., 2007). Through this exercise, Camille, an Asian American woman, came to the following realization about structures of power and privilege:

> I remember I knew that [name], who was a Caucasian male, was going to end up in the very front while the rest of the Caucasian girls in the class were going to trail behind him. I ended up in the middle while my friends were at the back. Half of me was like, "Oh wow, this is a bit brutal," but the other half thought well this is the harsh truth or reality. This is what the real world is like out there.

This quotation demonstrates the process in which Camille and her classmates started to come to terms with the hegemonic nature of whiteness and white privilege in the U.S.

In addition, many of the SOC/multiracial students began to recognize their multiple, intersecting identities—some of which are denied power (target identities), and others of which receive societal privileges (agent identities). Highlighting this point, Sydney notes: "Something that I am incredibly grateful to this class and its members for is helping me own my identity and the power it brings me," and Marianna, who identifies as Latina, recognizes: "Although I have been oppressed because of my ethnicity and socioeconomic class, I have realized that I am both dominant and subordinate." Elaborating this point, Sarai and Makayla discussed how their various social identities intersect in complicated ways:

> I have begun to become really sensitive and aware of my heterosexual privilege. An experience with a friend revealed how paralyzing his status as a homosexual has been in his life. Being heterosexual, I often talk about my partner without any qualms and can even joke or dream about my future husband or wedding day. For my friend, there is no such luxury . . . Knowing what it feels like to be privileged passively, that is, without actively seeking that privilege or using it to oppress others, was really alarming . . . This course has really challenged me to examine the effect of these systems on my social self, and until now I had never noticed much of their impact. —Sarai, Asian American woman, post-dialogue

I don't feel that I belong to an oppressed category because I usually fall in the advantaged group of the identity wheel. I can pass as white (race), am Christian (religion), am straight (sexual orientation), financially secure (class), am able-bodied (ability), am over 21 years of age (age), and am a female (gender/sex) who has not encountered any problems with this latter point . . . However, I felt mortified to be at the front of the "privilege walk" during one of our class discussions. As I am one of the few students in the multiracial class who can afford college without financial assistance, I can also pass as white . . . Therefore, my ashamed reaction was expected because it implied that even though I challenge the status quo, I am linked to the "oppressor" compared to an individual of color as the "oppressed." —Makayla, multiracial woman, post-dialogue

The Experience of Race at the College

Despite this newly developed appreciation for the complexities underlying their multiple inter-secting social identities, for most SOC/multiracial students, the experience of race at the College remains challenging. For instance, many students, particularly those from racially diverse home-towns, expressed how unprepared they were to deal with the "shock" of coming to such a racially homogenous environment:

Arriving here to [the College] I was hit with a severe cultural shock. I was taken by surprise by the amount of Caucasian students on campus and how small the minority community is . . . It became very apparent the first day of school at [the College], while sitting in my first course of the day and realizing that I was the only female of color in the room . . . I was hit very hard by reality which made me feel as though I do not belong here sometimes. —Bryanna, Latina woman, pre-dialogue

Moreover, this sense of isolation was often amplified for students who experienced overt (e.g., racist remarks; discriminatory treatment) or covert (e.g., tokenism; stereotypical assumptions) forms of racism when interacting with some white faculty, staff, and students in various curricular and co-curricular venues on campus (Gonsalves, 2002; Lewis et al., 2000; Neville et al., 2004; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002). According to Lewis et al. (2000), SOCs, particularly black students, encounter raced and gendered insults from their white peers. These disparaging comments serve as a constant reminder to black students that they are the outsiders within HWIs. Lacey confirmed this sentiment: "Being at a predominately white campus has made me feel more of a minority and more black than I have ever felt before."

In spite of these challenges, the College sites that were perceived to be the most welcoming/nurturing include offices that support SOCs' achievement; individual faculty members, most commonly faculty of color or white faculty sensitive to issues of race, and spaces that support non-traditional curricular endeavors (e.g., Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue). Elaborating the final point, an Asian American man notes that his experience at the College was positively changed by having the opportunity to engage with race in a space designed for SOC/multiracial students:

My experience at [the College] can be defined by a constant challenge to establish a unique personal identity that is true to my own background and heritage in the face of the dominant cultures represented on campus . . . MRID has helped me get in touch with a variety of diverse voices and experiences that I had previously been distracted from proactively seeking out . . . Virtually all of my friends are white, and I knew that even if they sympathized with me, they could never truly understand or relate. When I entered the Dialogue, I realized that for the first time ever at [the College], I was in a room of only people of color. When I found that I was not alone, that was when I was ready to become

less defensive and listen. I realized that I did not have to speak at great lengths about the problem of racial injustice at [the College], because everyone in the room was already aware of it. —Trent, Asian American man, post-dialogue

Through this experience, Trent recognized that he is not alone in the struggle for racial justice.

Personal Accountability and Responsibility in Creating Social Change

Lastly, the SOC/multiracial students acknowledge that a change in mindset is an important first step on the path to creating a more racially diverse and inclusive environment at the College and beyond. Accordingly, Kylie, an Asian American woman, revealed: "I also found through this class, how to empower my target status, to de-victimize myself, as I had realized that while it was the responsibility of those that perpetuate discrimination to end the cycle, I could do my part to not let these institutionalized forms of discrimination inhibit my own personal progress." The next step is taking action. Rob, a Latino man, assumes responsibility for helping to transform campus climate by affirming: "Gone are the days where I would not speak up when someone uses a derogatory comment. I will not conform and accept the privileges that come with it. I will use my knowledge to challenge the status quo." Finally, Gabriela and Taylor articulated their vision for social change in the following manner:

> It takes one person at a time to make a difference. The domino effect will begin with me and the other students in my class. We can all talk to our friends and show them the importance of becoming allies and therefore help fight whatever cause it may be. —Gabriela, Latina woman, post-dialogue

> I do not have all the answers but once we stop trying to point fingers and focus on problems facing humanity, I believe race relations will improve greatly. I'm not asking people to forget who they are, rather I am asking them to bring this to the proverbial table and listen with the same amount of vigor in which they speak. Without openness and understanding nothing can change. —Taylor, biracial man, post-dialogue

In the end, through this process of personal growth and transformation, SOC/multiracial students understand that it is their responsibility to create positive social change for their well-being and the well-being of those around them.

The SOC/multiracial students in the inter- (POC-W) and intragroup (MRID) dialogues underwent an important journey, a journey that has helped them to discover and re-connect with the meaning and importance of race in their lives. By revising their oppressive, raced scripts (e.g., "I do not know where I fit in," "I am not comfortable in my skin," "I am oppressed because of racism"), they were more willing to embrace the complexities underlying their intersecting racial identities (e.g., "I no longer feel divided . . . I am whole"), to grapple with internalized oppression (e.g., "I now feel proud to be brown"), to explore preconceptions (e.g., "I now recognize that I also hold stereotypes and biases against other groups"), and to recognize structures of power and privilege (e.g., "Although I may be racially oppressed, I am still privileged in other ways"). Finally, they wanted to use this newly acquired knowledge to create change in their lives and the lives of others. Accordingly, Rob noted:

I am leaving for home this summer an educated soldier, fighting for truth and justice, my weapons being the knowledge I gained from class. I can fight racism and prejudice with the theory of color-blind racism, my skills as a facilitator and my increasing passion and dedication towards social justice work around the world. —Rob, Latino man, post-dialogue

Through this process, Rob—and the other SOC/multiracial students—have indeed been transformed; the noted change in racial scripts from pre- to post-dialogue are one indicator of the progress they have made in understanding their racial identity (Cross, 1991; Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001; J. Kim, 2001; Renn 2003; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Tatum, 2003).

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

This class provided a voice for individuals to talk about their own social identity groups. As a result, one of the things I learned in this course is the aspects of my social identity that I am comfortable with, and the aspects I am still struggling to understand. —Lacey, Biracial woman

POC-W was a pleasant surprise that allowed me to have the perfect balance of reading views from scholars, hearing views from my classmates, and sharing my own views in a comfortable environment . . . I believe this kind of [co-learning] environment really helped us learn from each other as well as learn about ourselves. —Riley, Asian American woman

According to H. Kim and Markus (1993) "talking is an important part of peoples' social lives. Talking is also affected by the 'relationship' because talking also functions as a tool of connecting and maintaining connectedness among people" (p. 183). As Riley and Lacey's comment suggest, SOC/multiracial students have their own unique raced stories that need to be told (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001); in order to effectively do so, establishing a safe, co-learning environment is fundamental to Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue pedagogy and its related outcomes (Gurin & Nagda, 2006; Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1998; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003; Sorensen et al., 2009). While SOC/multiracial students began this process at different places in their racial identity development (Cross, 1991; Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001; J. Kim, 2001; Renn, 2003; Root, 1990, 1992, 1996; Tatum, 2003), by merging content (e.g., sociological and psychological concepts) and process knowledge (e.g., affective engagement), students were able to grow, both personally and intellectually, from this unique dialogic experience (Nagda et al., 2009; Zúñiga et al., 2007). In sum, as these data suggest, being able to learn with and from each other, through Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue pedagogies, often facilitated notable transformations in students.

Tatum (2003) argues: "For many people of color, learning to break the silence is a survival issue. To remain silent would be to disconnect from her own experience, to swallow and internalize her own oppression. The cost of silence is too high" (p. 198). Through this experience, many SOC/multiracial students have been able to break the silence and identify their own unique "voice of color;" they have also developed a new understanding of how the normalization of racism affects people of color in the U.S. (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). More concretely, through liberatory raced scripts, the SOC/multiracial students in this sample have grown to better understand the saliency and meaning of racial identity, as well as its complexity; they also recognize that true social change requires a concerted effort from both target (SOC) and agent (white) groups in intra- and interracial settings. Although the racial climate at this HWI proves challenging at times, they are eager to engage with race issues within a supportive and affirming classroom or institutional

context. Establishing a positive climate for diversity, however, is not easy (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado et al., 1998); it requires HWIs to be sensitive to a range of identity issues that SOC/multiracial students commonly encounter—including social and academic marginalization, tokenism and exoticization, and racial discrimination (Lewis et al., 2000; Tatum, 2003)—so that these students can establish and maintain a positive racialized sense of self (Porter & Washington, 1993; Tatum, 2003; Wallace, 2001; Wijeyesinghe, 2001).

More broadly, the implications of this study suggest that the identity-specific challenges that SOC/multiracial students encounter in HWIs can be partially combated if colleges and universities provide more opportunities for meaningful interaction within and across social identity groups (Hurtado, 2005). This will not only help to better support SOC/multiracial students while in college; it will also prepare them to enter an increasingly diverse and global world. Hurtado (2005) argues, "We can no longer leave intergroup relations to chance, because they play a central role in ensuring that students can function in a diverse workforce and pluralistic society" (p. 607). Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue courses are crucial to these efforts as they promote affirmative race-related learning outcomes in white students (Ford, 2011) and SOC/multiracial students. As a result of this type of dialogue-focused pedagogical intervention, students, like Aaron, are able to confidently state: "I now harbor more pride in my race than ever before." Future research can build on these promising results by further exploring the nuances of SOC/multiracial student development across pedagogical approaches and demographic settings; it should also integrate a post-post-dialogue component to assess the sustainability of these outcomes over time.

Hurtado's (2005) study concludes that the "quality of student interactions with diverse peers is key (positive and meaningful interaction) in producing a host of important outcomes" (p. 606). This study confirms Hurtado's fundamental premise: In order to foster meaningful racial climate change on college campuses, and encourage amendments to prevailing racial scripts, HWIs need to make a real commitment, through courses like Inter-/Intragroup Dialogue, to social justice education.

NOTES

1. In the remainder of this article, we use the term "multiracial" to be inclusive of individuals who identify as bi- or multiracial.

2. Depending upon the institutional context, colleges and universities might have to approach the balancing of social identities differently. At the private college represented in this study, this is achieved through reserved seating and an application process.

3. For more, see: www.igr.umich.edu.

4. For more explanation of the four stages, see Zúñiga et al., 2007, pp. 27–28.

5. Zúñiga et al. (2007) and Adams et al. (2010) provide an overview of some of these activities.

6. For more discussion on raced differences in dialogue experiences, see: Ervin (2001), Hyers and Swim (1998), and Miller and Donner (2000).

7. Due to the complexity of racial identity constructions, the POC-W and MRID sections were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Accordingly, some students of multiracial background, identified more closely with the SOC experience and were placed in the POC-W dialogue; and, some monoracial SOCs more closely identified with the multiracial experience for a variety of reasons (e.g., Asian adoptees, Latino/a identity, multi-ethnic/national blended family situation, etc.) and were placed in the MRID.

8. The grading criteria for the papers included assessment of: (1) writing clarity and organization; (2) critical engagement with the assignment prompt; and (3) integration of the readings (for the final paper).

9. The discrepancy in numbers is due to the fact that three students only submitted their final papers for analysis.

10. Broad racial categories are used, instead of more specific racial identifiers, to protect student identities. For example, students from the African Diaspora (e.g., African American, Caribbean, African) are identified as "black;" students from various regions in Asia (e.g., India, Korea, Japan) are identified as "Asian" or "Asian American;" and "Latino/a" is inclusive of people from Latin America or of Spanish-speaking decent (e.g., Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Spain). Although the experiences of SOCs from various racial/ethnic backgrounds are certainly not monolithic, the data presented here reflect trends found across these racial groups.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Chito Childs, E., & Matthews-Armstead, E. (2006). Racial divides on a diverse campus: An exploration of social distance at a state liberal arts university. In R. M. Moore, III (Ed.), *African Americans and Whites: Changing relationships on college campuses* (pp. 103–115). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Cross, W. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Cureton, S. (2003). Race-specific college student experiences on a predominantly white college campus. *Journal of Black Studies*, *33*(3), 295–311.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2008). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American Educational Research Journal*, *46*(2), 322–353.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1989). *The souls of black folk*. New York, NY: Bantam.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Engberg, M. E. (2004). Improving intergroup relations in higher education: A critical examination of the influence educational interventions on racial bias. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(4), 473–524.

Ervin, K. S. (2001). Multiculturalism, diversity, and African American students: Receptive, yet skeptical? *Journal of Black Studies*, *31*(6), 764–776.

Ferdman, B. M., & Gallegos, P. I. (2001). Racial identity development and Latinos in the United States. In B. Jackson & C. Wijeyesinghe (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 32–66). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Fiske, S. T. (2002). What we know now about bias and intergroup conflict, the problem of the century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *11*(4), 123–128.

Ford, K. (2011). *"What can I learn from other white people?" The educational benefits of inter- and intra-racial curricular dialogues on white students' racial identity development*. Unpublished manuscript.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury.

Gonsalves, L. M. (2002). Making connections: Addressing the pitfalls of white faculty/black male student communication. *College Composition and Communication*, *53*(3), 435–465.

Gurin, P. (1999). Selections from the compelling need for diversity in higher education, expert reports in defense of the University of Michigan. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *32*(2), 36–62.

Gurin, P., & Nagda, B. A. (2006). Getting to the what, how, and why of diversity on campus. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(1), 20–24.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helm's white and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuka, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Henderson-King, D., & Kaleta, A. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(2), 142–164.

Howard, J. A. (2000). Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 367–393.

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 127–156.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(3), 595–610.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 26, No. 8. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Hyers, L. L., & Swim, J. K. (1998). A comparison of the experiences of dominant and minority group members during an intergroup encounter. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 1(2), 143–163.

Hyman, J. (2010). The new multiracial student: Where do we start? *The Vermont Connection*, 31, 128–135.

Jackson, J. L., Jr. (2001). *Harlem world: Doing race and class in contemporary black America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J. B., Alvarez, P., Kurotsuchi Inkelas, K., Rowen-Kenyon, H., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 525–542.

Kim, H. S., & Markus, H. R. (1993). Speech and silence: An analysis of the cultural practice of talking. In M. Fine & L. Weis (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 181–196). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kim, J. (2001). Asian American identity development theory. In B. Jackson & C. Wijeyesinghe (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 67–90). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Lewis, A. E., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. A. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly white university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 74–91.

Lopez, G., Gurin, P., & Nagada, R. (1998). Education and understanding structural causes for group inequlties. *Journal of Political Psychology*, 62(3), 553–576.

Massey, D. S., Charles, C. Z., Lundy, G. F., & Fisher, M. J. (2003). *The source of the river: The social origins of freshman at America's selective colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2005). Curriculum matters: Creating a positive climate for diversity from the student perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(4), 389–412.

Miller, J., & Donner, S. (2000). More than just talk: The use of racial dialogues to combat racism. *Social Work with Groups*, 23(1), 31–53.

Nagda, B. A., Gurin, P., Sorensen, N., & Zúñiga, X. (2009). Evaluating intergroup dialogue: Engaging diversity for personal and social responsibility. *Diversity & Democracy*, 12(1), 4–6.

Nagda, R., & Zúñiga, X. (2003). Fostering meaningful racial engagement through intergroup dialogues. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 111–128.

Neville, H. A., Heppner, P. P., Ji, P., & Thye, R. (2004). The relations among general and race-related stressors and psychoeducational adjustment in black students attending predominately white institutions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(4), 599–618.

O'Connor, C., Lewis, A., & Mueller, J. (2007). Researching "black" educational experiences and outcomes: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *Educational Researcher*, 36(9), 541–552.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85.

Pewewardy, C., & Frey, B. (2002). Surveying the landscape: Perceptions of multicultural support services and racial climate at a predominately white university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 71(1/2), 77–95.

Porter, J. R., & Washington, R. E. (1993). Minority identity and self-esteem. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19, 139–161.

Renn, K. A. (2003). Understanding the identities of mixed-race college students through a developmental ecology lens. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 383–403.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2001). *Beyond black: Biracial identity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Root, M. (1990). Resolving "other" status: Identity development of biracial individuals. *Women & Therapy*, 9(1–2), 185–205.

Root, M. P. P. (1992). *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Root, M. P. P. (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schoepflin, T. (2006). Let's talk about *The Simpsons* or something: Interracial interaction at a predominantly white university. In R. M. Moore, III (Ed.), *African Americans and Whites: Changing relationships on college campuses* (pp. 129–140). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(1/2), 60–73.

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*(1), 3–35.

Spickard, P. (1992). The illogic of American racial categories. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 12–23). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 797–811.

Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Orellana-Damacela, L., Portillo, N., Rowan, J. M., & Andrews-Guillen, C. (2003). Experiences of differential treatment among college students of color. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *74*(4), 428–444.

Tatum, B. D. (2003). *"Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, *16*(12), 951–957.

Tuan, M. (1998). *Forever foreigner or honorary Whites? The Asian ethnic experience today*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Wallace, K. R. (2001). *Relative/outsider: The art and politics of identity among mixed heritage students*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Wijeyesinghe, C. L. (2001). Racial identity in multiracial people: An alternative paradigm. In B. Jackson & C. Wijeyesinghe (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 129–152). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Williams, T. K., Nakashima, C. K., Kich, G. K., & Daniel, G. R. (1996). Being different together in the classroom: Multiracial identity as transgressive education. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 359–379). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Willie, S. S. (2003). *Acting black: College, identity, and the performance of race*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Xie, Y., & Goyette, K. (1998). The racial identification of biracial children with one Asian parent: Evidence from the 1990 census. *Social Forces*, *76*(2), 547–570.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., Chesler, M., & Cytron, A. (2007). *Intergroup dialogue in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice*. ASHE Higher Education Report, Vol. 32, No. 4. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kristie A. Ford is the Director of the Intergroup Relations Program and an assistant professor of Sociology at Skidmore College. Her research and teaching interests include race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, and social justice education.

Victoria K. Malaney is a recent graduate of Skidmore College. Victoria hopes to pursue a Ph.D. in Sociology focusing on multiracial identity development.