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Abstract

Background: Previous research shows that Multicultural Psychology courses can produce significant improvements in students’ cultural competence-related attitudes in in-person and online courses.

Objective: We evaluated the impact of adding a skills-focused group assignment (i.e., Difficult Dialogues) to an online asynchronous Multicultural Psychology course.

Method: Undergraduate students filled out a battery of self-report measures at the beginning and end of the course. Of the 192 total students, 107 were in course sections which completed a Difficult Dialogue (DD) group project, and 85 were in the teaching as usual (TAU) section.

Results: Students in DD groups had significantly greater pre- to post- increases on social justice behavioral intentions and perceived behavioral control compared to TAU. There were no statistical differences between-groups on measures of other cultural competence constructs, though there were statistically significant within-group improvements on all outcome measures.

Conclusion: Results suggest that the DD project had a particular impact on improving social justice behavioral intentions and perceived behavioral control.

Teaching Implications: These shifts underscore the importance of including opportunities for students to learn and practice specific skills in Multicultural Psychology courses, and that online courses can effectively provide these opportunities.
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Impact of Difficult Dialogues on Social Justice Attitudes During a Multicultural Psychology Course

To educate as the practice of freedom is a way of teaching that anyone can learn. That learning process comes easiest to those of us who teach who also believe that there is an aspect of our vocation that is sacred; who believe that our work is not merely to share information but to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students.

bell hooks (1994, p. 13)

Multicultural psychology courses provide critical opportunities for growth that are profoundly consistent with a liberal arts education (Krislov, 2017). Understanding the impact that Multicultural Psychology courses have on student growth is timely. The U.S. is more diverse than ever. By 2045, the Census projects that more than half of all Americans will identify with a non-white ethnic and/or racial group (US Census Bureau, 2018). Inclusion helps potentiate the benefits of diversity. Inclusion is a broad concept that includes social and structural components (DiTomaso, 2020). An inclusive society would, by definition, be socially just. One way to cultivate inclusion at the individual level, is through the development of cultural competence. Thus, nurturing cultural competence in a Multicultural Psychology course could have meaningful impacts to society at large. Given the importance of social justice as an integral feature of both multicultural education (Cho, 2017) and cultural competence (American Psychological Association, 2017a; Ratts et al., 2016) we sought to elucidate how the teaching team for an undergraduate Multicultural Psychology course advanced both through the development of a difficult dialogue project.
Colleges and universities emphasize the importance of multicultural competence. College students are also aware of its importance. In a survey of undergraduates at a Predominantly White Institution (PWI), students reported being motivated to learn about diversity, valuing diverse content in courses, and understanding the importance of this knowledge for their future employability and intellectual/personal growth (Littleford, 2013). These values are consistent with those in the helping professions. The American Psychological Association (APA) code of ethics (APA, 2017b) refers to the necessity of being able to competently work with diverse people and intersecting identities while minimizing bias. The APA Multicultural Guidelines (APA, 2017a) and the American Counseling Association Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (Ratts et al., 2016), explicitly refer to the importance of cultural competence, social justice, and advocacy as part of the duties of helping professionals. Cultural competence and social justice models are inherently connected (Ratts et al., 2016). Cultural competence refers to the ability to appreciate, recognize, and effectively work with other cultural groups and has three components: self-awareness, knowledge, and skills (Sue et al., 1992). Social justice refers to values or beliefs related to the protection of human rights and equitable access to resources for all; awareness, knowledge, and skills are necessary to promoting social justice (Torres-Harding et al., 2012). Scholarship in cultural competence and social justice orientation emphasize that these are life-long processes (Ratts et al., 2016; Tehee et al., 2020).

Attitudes and behaviors are important aspects to consider in relation to cultural and social justice competence. Attitudes can reflect knowledge about a demographic group or awareness of self and others, and attitudes have the potential to influence behavior. A systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions for increasing cultural competence found that researchers often
aim to change attitudes and behavior (Beach et al., 2005; Bezrukova et al., 2016), both considered to be important aspects of developing cultural competence (APA 2017a; Sue et al., 1992). The positive effects of diversity trainings were greater among interventions that targeted awareness and skills development together rather than singly, and longer trainings were strongly and significantly associated with more positive reactions, and better diversity knowledge, attitudes, and skills, suggesting that longer diversity trainings are more effective (Bezrukova et al., 2016).

Previous research by the current authors found that our 15-week undergraduate Multicultural Psychology course produced significant improvements in students’ cultural competence-related attitudes (Patterson et al., 2018), and that attitude shifts occurred in both in-person and online course sections (Alvarez & Domenech Rodríguez, 2020). These previous studies included a battery of measures of cultural competence-related constructs, including empathy, colorblind racial attitudes, and multicultural experiences. Measures were given at the beginning and end of the Multicultural Psychology course to inform the completion of a self-reflection assignment.

While the teaching team for this course have been encouraged by the positive impact of the course on students’ knowledge, awareness, and attitude shifts, our research suggested that more could be done to target skill development. To this end, the teaching team developed a group Difficult Dialogues (DD) assignment Summer of 2019 with the aim of increasing students’ opportunities to learn and practice specific skills related to cultural competence.

An important distinction between difficult and intergroup dialogues is that the former focuses on a specific topic of conversation that people from within a homogenous community might disagree on (e.g., should police officers carry guns to social services calls?) whereas the
latter focuses on bringing people together from different identity groups together to discuss issues that are relevant to those communities (e.g., should transgender athletes be able to compete with their identified gender group?). There is clear overlap in needed skills, but the focus on a topic rather than identity groups is particularly relevant and useful in a predominantly white campus where it is more practical (i.e., for lack of diversity) and where it is more ethical (e.g., to avoid singling out students with minoritized identities that might already feel overtaxed and overstressed) to focus on a topic.

There is limited empirical information regarding the use of difficult dialogues in classroom settings. However, the literature on intergroup dialogues is rich (Dessel & Rogge, 2008; Frantell et al., 2019) and suggests that intergroup dialogues hold promise for changing desired outcomes (e.g., perspective taking). The two reviews of this literature do note a dearth of empirical research, especially using experimental or quasi experimental methods. The purpose of the current study is to evaluate whether the addition of a DD assignment contributed to differential shifts in social justice and other cultural competence-related constructs in a Multicultural Psychology course compared to teaching as usual (TAU) using quantitative data and a quasi-experimental method.

**Method**

**Participants**

Data were collected from undergraduates enrolled in a semester-long online Multicultural Psychology class at a PWI during the semesters of Fall 2018, Spring 2019, Summer 2019, Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020. The final sample included 192 students from six classes (TAU group \( n = 85 \), DD group \( n = 107 \)). Participants’ age ranged between 18 and 56 years \((M = 25.22, SD = 7.07)\). According to university records, 89.1% of students identified as White, non-
Hispanic, 1.5% as Black, non-Hispanic, 8.5% as Latinx, 1.5% as Asian, 2.5% as Native American/Alaskan Native, and 3.0% as multi-racial. All university records reflected a binary gender; 27.4% of students identified as men and 72.5% identified as women. Due to the restricted options that students have when disclosing identities to the university, these records may not fully reflect the range of demographics represented in our sample. Data for all students enrolled during these semesters and who completed self-assessment measures were included in analysis (95.5% of enrolled students).

Teaching Team

The Multicultural Psychology course is taught by a teaching team of two or three members each semester. Co-instructors for the semesters included in this study are the instructor of record (third author), who is a middle aged, cisgender Latina, and five PhD students, four of whom identify as Latinx (including the second author), and one as white, European-American (the first author). Team members all identified as cisgender and the first author identifies as a queer woman. The team has a diversity of immigration and citizenship experiences.

Power

Power analysis was conducted using G*Power (Faul et al., 2009) for a Repeated Measures ANOVA with the effect size set at a .25 alpha at .05 and power at .80 for two groups (TAU, DD) and two repeated measures (pre, post). The analysis returned a needed sample size of 158, suggesting sufficient power to conduct planned analyses.

Measures

Social Justice

The Social Justice Scale (SJS; Torres-Harding et al., 2012) is a 24-item measure with a 7-point scale (1 = disagree strongly to 7 = strongly agree) A sample item is: “In the future I intend
to engage in activities that will promote social justice” (Torres-Harding et al., p. 85). The SJS returns four subscale scores and one total score and showed strong internal consistency in our sample. Specifically, social justice-related attitudes ($\alpha = .95$), subjective norms ($\alpha = .89$), perceived behavioral control ($\alpha = .88$), and behavioral intentions ($\alpha = .94$), and total score ($\alpha = .95$) had adequate Cronbach alphas. Higher scores indicate higher facets of social justice.

**Empathy**

The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang et al., 2003) is a 31-item 6-point scale self-report measure of empathy toward people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds (1 = *strongly disagree that it describes me* to 6 = *strongly agree that it describes me*). A sample item is: “I share the anger of those who face injustice because of their racial and ethnic background” (Wang et al., 2003, p. 225). Scores are calculated as a mean, and higher scores indicate higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. The internal consistency for the scale in our sample was very strong ($\alpha = .92$).

**Colorblindness**

The Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000) is a 20-item self-report measure of color-blind racial attitudes with a 6-point scale (1= *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*). A sample item is: “Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison” (Neville et al., 2000, p. 62). Scores range from 20 – 120, with higher scores indicating higher levels of colorblind attitudes, Cronbach’s alpha for the current sample was excellent ($\alpha = .93$).

**Beliefs About Diversity**

The Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale (PBADS; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001) measures beliefs and knowledge of diversity through a 15-item self-report measure with a 5-point scale (1= *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). A sample item is: “Making all public facilities
accessible to the disabled is simply too costly” (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001, p. 178). Higher scores indicate higher openness/acceptance of diversity issues. The scale showed acceptable internal consistency in the current sample (α = .81).

**Multicultural Experiences**

The Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEQ; Narvaez & Hill, 2010), measures actual and desired multicultural experiences using the 15 items on a 5-point scale (1= never to 5 = always). A sample item is: “I want to travel outside of the country” (Narvaez & Hill, 2010, p. 5). Higher scores indicate higher experiences/desires for experiences in multicultural contexts. The scale showed acceptable internal consistency in the current sample (α = .73).

**Procedure**

Data were collected as part of regular course activities. The IRB approved this project as exempt (anonymized existing data). Students completed a battery of self-report measures during the start (pre), and near the conclusion of the course (post), that covered cultural competence constructs. Pre- and post- scores were calculated and returned to students; after receiving their scores, students were asked to complete a written self-reflection assignment.

The course was developed based on Sue’s Tripartite Model of Cultural Competence (Sue, 2001). Course syllabi for each semester, including detailed descriptions of each assignment and corresponding grading rubrics and access to the self-report measurement battery can be found on Open Science Framework (OSF; Hicks et al., 2022). Classes were structured to include weekly reading quizzes, discussion posts, assignments (i.e., brief papers or presentations), and a final paper. In the TAU group, the course included a final exam, whereas in the DD group, the final exam was replaced with the DD project. Due to the amount of time and effort needed to
complete the DD project, we decided this was comparable to the amount of time students spent studying for and completing a final exam.

**Difficult Dialogues Project**

After piloting an unstructured version of the assignment where students prepared for and completed their dialogue discussion independently, the assignment became a semester-long project encompassing various assignments (see Table 1 for detailed description). Students were placed into groups of four to six students and completed several assignments together in preparation for a discussion on a topic of their choosing, related to course content in which group members had varying viewpoints (e.g., immigration policy, Black Lives Matter movement, transgender athlete policies, magnitude/impact of white privilege) and pre-approved by the instructors. Students conducted research on their specific topics as well as complete readings and assignments on the barriers and facilitators to an effective dialogue, to develop content knowledge and interpersonal awareness and competencies. Discussions occurred synchronously, over Zoom, and were recorded to aid in student reflection. Discussions began with introductions, followed by a review of characteristics of difficult dialogues, barriers and facilitators of effective difficult dialogues, and a collaborative creation of group discourse rules for the discussion (e.g., taking turns speaking, reflect understanding before asking a clarifying question). These concepts had been previously reinforced in class content and instructors had provided students with strategies they could use, rather than things they should not do (i.e., instead of “don’t be disrespectful” saying “a validating response might sound like this”).

Instructors moderated the dialogues providing real time interpersonal feedback, ensuring that effective skills were used throughout, and ensuring the protection of students with underrepresented identities and/or beliefs. In order to increase effectiveness while moderating
discussions, instructors were versed in the identification of microaggressions and effective means for disarming them (Sue et al., 2007, 2019). Instructors also had knowledge of common dynamics that may arise when race talk is taking place (i.e., politeness, academic, and color-blind protocols) in addition to understanding the implications of verbal and non-verbal behavior (silence, tears, disclosures; Sue, 2013), and assigned Sue’s (2013) article on race talks as required reading for students prior to the DD discussion meeting.

Students were instructed to complete research informing their stance on the DD topic and be able to share information or statistics as relevant during the dialogue. The discussion meetings were one hour, with time for introductions, approximately 30-40 min for the DD discussion, and time to debrief. After the DD discussion, students received brief feedback from the instructor and were asked to subsequently review their effectiveness and select their group’s most and least effective moments during the dialogue to create a presentation to share with the class. They then reviewed three other groups’ presentations, giving students an opportunity to practice skills during the dialogue itself, and to reflectively examine performance afterwards. Reviewing the work of others allowed for a third-party perspective on skills and provided models of effective and ineffective strategies.

**Results**

We compared shifts in attitudes between the DD and TAU groups on the facets of SJS and the other cultural competence measures (SEE, CoBRAS, PBADS, MEQ) from pre to post using repeated measures analysis of variance (RM ANOVA); see Table 2 for means and standard deviations. Data was normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk’s test, and assumptions for homogeneity of variance were met, as assessed by Levene’s test.
RM ANOVAs for the SEE, CoBRAS, PBADS, and MEQ total scores were statistically significant for time for each outcome measure, but not for the interaction of time by condition (see Table 3). Using Cohen’s (2013) guidelines for interpretation, effect sizes ranged from small (PBADS) to medium (SEE and MEQ) to large (CoBRAS). This is consistent with the results of Patterson et al. (2018) and Alvarez and Domenech Rodríguez (2020), showing statistically significant improvements over time across the course sections.

The hypothesis unique to the current study was that there would be no differential shifts between those in the DD and TAU groups on social justice measures. Results from RM ANOVAs for each of the SJS subscales showed a main effect for time, indicating that students across all sections of the course meaningfully improved in social justice facets over the semester; see Table 4. Effect sizes ranged from small (SJS Attitude, SJS Subjective Social Norms, and SJS Total Score) to medium (SJS Perceived Behavioral Control and SJS Behavioral Intention). Additionally, the Perceived Behavioral Control and Behavioral Intentions subscales produced statistically significant interactions and small effect sizes of time by condition, ($p = .039, \eta^2 = .023$; and $p = .036, \eta^2 = .024$ respectively), meaning that DD students had greater improvements on these facets of social justice than TAU students.

**Discussion**

Students across six sections of Multicultural Psychology in both the DD and TAU groups reported significant shifts in the desired directions for all cultural competence constructs, which included measures of social justice (Torres-Harding et al., 2012), colorblind racial attitudes (Neville et al., 2000), ethnocultural empathy (Wang et al., 2003), multicultural experiences (Narvaez & Hill, 2010), and beliefs about diversity (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). Importantly, the inclusion of the DD did not appear to have any negative impact on typically observed gains in
colorblindness, empathy, multicultural experiences, and beliefs about diversity. Those in the DD sections reported significantly higher increases in specific facets of social justice than students in the TAU sections; for students in DD groups, shifts were significantly higher on the Perceived Behavioral Control and Behavioral Intentions subscales of the SJS. Taking into account the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), this suggests that the addition of the skills-focused DD group assignment had a meaningful and quantifiable impact on students’ confidence in their ability to engage in social justice behaviors and action, as well as their desire to do so. Given the importance of skills for effectively engaging in social justice advocacy, the greater shifts in SJS Perceived Behavioral Control and SJS Behavioral Intentions subscales for the DD groups aligns with the instructors’ expectations for the impact of the DD assignment based on the literature.

Implications

The importance of multicultural education extends beyond the subject of multicultural psychology and the field of psychology— it is of critical importance to the education of students across majors and across professions. Multicultural psychology courses can serve to develop students’ cultural competence and social justice competence. In addition to teaching the content-knowledge of the subject material instructors of these courses can also support students’ growth in attitudes, awareness, and skills.

The results of the current study are consistent with existing research describing the impact of a Multicultural Psychology course on improving students’ cultural competence-related attitudes (Alvarez & Domenech Rodriguez, 2020; Patterson et al., 2018). The current study also expands upon this existing research by adding measures of SJS, and by adding opportunities for students to develop and practice cultural and social justice competence skills by implementing a group skills-focused DD assignment. It is relevant to contextualize the movement in the social
justice subscales. The SJS (Torres-Harding et al., 2012) was designed based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). While the scale and the theory measure four constructs that predict behavior change, Ajzen (1991) pointed to perceived behavioral control and behavioral intentions as sufficient to predict behavioral action with accuracy. More recent systematic reviews of studies implementing the theory of planned behavior also found that attitudes were the strongest predictor of behavioral intention, and that behavioral intentions were the strongest predictors of the related behavior (Bhocchhibhoya & Branscum, 2018; Riebl et al., 2015). Given the importance of perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention in the theory of planned behavior, the impact of the DD project on students’ scores on these two SJS scales is promising. Results suggest that implementing the DD project in Multicultural Psychology courses is a worthwhile and effective way to help students develop confidence and willingness to use their learned skills to engage in social justice advocacy. More broadly, these results suggest that instructors of online, asynchronous courses can effectively incorporate group projects and live group discussions into their courses, and that students benefit from the inclusion of these opportunities.

Limitations

The conclusions of the current study are limited by several research design elements. Because results stem from ongoing course evaluation where education is primary and research is secondary, course sections were not randomly assigned to TAU or DD. Rather, the DD project represents an update to the course, and this paper is part of an evaluation of that curriculum change. Additionally, results of the study are limited by the lack of data regarding student’s behavior outside of the course, and lack of longitudinal data. The research would be enriched by the addition of qualitative and observational data, such as observational data related to students’
behavior on course discussion boards or during the DD meeting, as well as qualitative analysis of the DD meetings by coding students’ use of skills during the discussions. Further, future studies could additionally assess how culturally responsive the instructors of the multicultural psychology courses are by adding in a measure for the cultural competence of the instructors, such as the Multicultural Teaching Competencies Inventory (Prieto et al., 2012).

**Additional Implementation Considerations**

Details about the structure and implementation of the DD project can be found in Table 1 and the Method section. However, there are important additional considerations for instructors who wish to implement a similar project in their courses. First, it is important that instructors have worked toward developing their knowledge, awareness, and skills in preparation for competently moderating the DD discussion; to this end, we highly recommend reading Sue’s (2015) book on race talks and assigning Sue’s (2013) article on the same topic for specific considerations and strategies related to facilitating effective difficult dialogues. Instructors do not need to be experts, but they should be well prepared.

Second, while the structure of the project (i.e., tasks spread over the semester to foster knowledge and group collaboration; reviewing skills and strategies for effective dialogue and creating group discourse rules) is meant to prevent ineffective dialogues, the instructors must have the skills needed to intervene in the event of harmful or ineffective behavior. In general, effective interpersonal skills related to active listening, validation, and assertive communication are useful in the event that gentle guidance or proactive re-orienting is needed (e.g., student is dominating the conversation or is very quiet; group is tangential or engaging in avoidance). More specifically, we recommend reading Sue et al.’s (2019) article and book (2021) on disarming
microaggressions for specific intervention strategies in relation to handling microaggressions if they arise, as this is crucial to the safety of students with marginalized identities.

Third, we acknowledge that implementing this project adds time, effort, and emotional labor on the part of the instructor. We are fortunate to work in teaching teams (instructor(s) and teaching assistant(s) [TA]), which allows for splitting the number of dialogues to facilitate (though we recommend co-facilitating, especially when first implementing), as well as for a space to debrief if a dialogue is emotionally draining for the facilitator(s). In addition to receiving TA support, our department capped our course enrollment at 35 students. We encourage department administrators who value diversity, equity, and inclusion (EDI) to support instructors of courses like this, which can act as robust cultural competence interventions, by providing the structural support (i.e., TA support and reasonable course enrollment caps) needed for instructors to deliver effective courses sustainably. We believe that the “cost” of implementation is well worth the benefit illustrated by the results of this study and the implications of those results, and we encourage implementation of similar projects by other instructors of multicultural psychology.

Conclusion

Overall, we learned about the value of adding a DD component to a Multicultural Psychology course to support students’ development of specific skills in engaging difficult dialogues. Students in the DD groups increased their confidence to engage in promoting social justice after participation in the course. In a context in which EDI training is criticized for its neutral or negative impact, we provide positive support for shifts in attitudes and skills over the course of a semester.
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Table 1

Difficult Dialogue Group Project Guidelines

GROUP PROJECT

Group project goal: To have a Difficult Dialogue (DD) and practice effective communication strategies. This larger project has been broken down into 7 smaller tasks, which are to be completed over the course of the semester.

Group project tasks: You are welcome to work ahead of the timeline!

• Unit 5: Task #1 Determining Availability: Go to the Doodle Poll and select times that work for you to meet with your group. Return a Screen Capture of your Doodle Poll by the end of Unit 5 (5 points). Students that do not sign up for a group may have serious difficulty completing this Group Project.

• Unit 6: Connect with your group: The professor and TA will create the groups the following week, based on your reported availability, and notify you as soon as possible. Please connect with your group members to agree on ways that you can complete your group tasks.

• Unit 7: Task #2 Discussion Selection: Groups will communicate and get to know each other and select a topic for the Difficult Dialogue. What is key at this point is that the group discuss a topic during the Difficult Dialogue where they have differing opinions. Disagreement. Return Discussion Selection Assignment (10 points)

• Unit 8: Task #3 Brief Paper: Read Sue (2013) and Difficult Race Dialogues. Prepare a document that responds to these questions: (a) What is a difficult dialogue? (b) What are the barriers to effective dialogue? (c) What are the facilitators of effective dialogue? You can return a Word or document or Power Point slides. The group will use these notes at the outset of their meeting to serve as a good launching point for their Difficult Dialogue. (10 points)

• Unit 10: Task #4 Difficult Dialogue Discussion: Each group will meet at the scheduled time. The professor or the TA will be present to moderate the discussion. Groups will start on time and begin with introductions, and a review of: What is a difficult dialogue? And what are barriers and facilitators of effective dialogue? Discussants will then agree on rules for the discourse and then introduce the chosen topic and each student will present their perspective. Remember the goal of Difficult Dialogues. In preparation for this dialogue, students should review the required readings and do a little research on the topic of their discussion. During the Difficult Dialogue session students are expected to arrive to the scheduled group meeting on time, prepared to discuss, and able to give the group and this task their full attention. The Group Discussion will take place over Zoom and will be initiated and recorded by the professor or TA. The Discussion will last approximately 30 mins and will be worth 30 points.

• Unit 11. Task #5 Clip Selection: After the group meets, the professor or TA will make the group discussion recording available for the group to review. The group will then select 1 – 3 clips of their “best moments”, those are moments when they used effective tools in the Difficult Dialogue. The group will also select 1 – 2 clips of their “worst moments” which are moments when they used ineffective strategies in the Difficult Dialogue. The group will return the clip list with a rationale for the selection of the clip and the time stamps. This assignment is worth 10 points.

• Unit 12: Connect with your group: Work on your presentation— it’s due next week!
• Unit 13: **Task #6 Difficult Dialogue Presentation:** Your group will meet and put together a 15 min presentation for the rest of the class. The presentation will start with the discussion topic, then provide the clips of best/worst moments with a context for what the effective/ineffective communication strategies were, and end with a brief discussion of what each member learned about themselves and Difficult Dialogues in the process.

• Unit 15: **Task #7 Difficult Dialogue Presentation Review:** Students will watch 3 presentations and return a brief paper on what were similarities and differences in DDs across the three different presentations. Students will share anything new they learned about DD. Students must connect their observations with the required readings (Sue, 2013). This assignment is worth 20 points.
### Table 2

**Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Format, Semester</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS)</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE)</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEQ)</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale (PBADS)</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Scale (SJS) - Total Score</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS - Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS - Attitude</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS - Subjective Social Norms</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAU</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS - Behavioral Intention</td>
<td>Difficult Dialogues</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAU</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Mean and standard deviation of scores for each measure by condition (Difficult Dialogues or Teaching As Usual [TAU]).
Table 3

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for SEE, CoBRAS, PBADS, and MEQ total scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>(\eta_p^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>21.54***</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35.24**</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBADS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.79**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>25.06***</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Repeated Measures ANOVAs computed for the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE), Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS), Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale (PBADS), and Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEQ) all produced statistically significant results for time, but not for the interaction of time by condition.
# Table 4

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for the Social Justice Scale (SJS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>$\eta^2_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJS Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>22.41***</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10.05**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Subjective Social Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.29**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Behavioral Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>25.61***</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>4.49*</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>20.50***</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Time</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Repeated Measures ANOVAs computed for each subscale and the total score of the Social Justice Scale (SJS) produced statistically significant results for time. Additionally, the SJS Perceived Behavioral Control and SJS Behavioral Intentions subscales produced statistically significant results for the interaction of time by condition, and the SJS Attitude and the SJS Subjective Social Norms subscales verged on significance for the interaction of time by condition. The degrees of freedom for each analysis was 183.*