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KEY THEMES FROM STUDENT FINAL PROJECTS
Facilitation skills
"I developed the ability to trust my co-facilitator despite our different facilitation and work styles."

Identity exploration and development
"My position as a facilitator enabled me to be a positive role model for my peers of color to instill in some of them a stronger social consciousness and to connect with others through our experiences of being social minorities."

Understanding social justice concepts
"I gained new ideas about effectively communicating the reality of power and oppression to participants and challenged myself to make similarly creative contributions."

Building interpersonal and intergroup relationship skills
"While in the past I never challenged the perpetuation of stereotypes in public spaces, my doing so has become more commonplace in my day-to-day experience at the university and in the workplace."

KEY FINDINGS

(1) Several scales evidence good reliability for future research on IGR:
- Cognitive Empathy: 5 items measuring perspective-taking (α = .65 to .88 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Parallel Empathy: 4 items assessing empathic understanding with different social groups (α = .67 to .86 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Emotions in Intergroup Settings: 8 items rating respondents’ feelings in group dialogues (α = .89 to .86 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Gender Inequality: 4 items assessing awareness of and structural attribution for social inequality by gender (α = .72 to .78 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Blames for Wealth: Borrowed from the work of Joe Feagin, 3 items measuring perceived importance of political power and wealth on social dynamics (α = .70 to .90 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Facilitator Effectiveness: 13 items self-assessing peer facilitator’s effectiveness at managing group discussion (α = .79 to .85 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Frequency of Action: 9 items asking participants to indicate how frequently they engage in behaviors supporting a diverse society (α = .75 to .86 on pre-/and post-tests)

(2) Four NEW scales have potential for future research. For some implementations of the survey, Cronbach’s alpha was low, which may be due to small sample size.
- Religious Inequality Awareness: 4 items assessing awareness of and structural attribution for religious inequality (α = .72 to .89 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Identity Awareness: 4 items (α = .39 to .74 on pre-/and post-tests)
- Co-facilitator Relationship: 12 items (α = .89 on post-tests)
- Social Orientation: Inequality Awareness: 4 items (α = .30 to .74 on pre-/and post-tests)

(3) Several scales have potential for future research but need to be enhanced, because of challenges in assessing student social justice learning.
- For example, Allyship, which measures agreement with 4 statements about the concept, offered mixed responses because it may capture both students’ beliefs and actions.

(4) Mixed methods are needed to fully assess student learning from courses like IGR.
- Student work analysis gave us more insight into student learning.
- Themes include students’ development of facilitation skills, personal identity, relationship skills, and understanding of social justice concepts.

REFERENCES:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:
We would like to acknowledge the insightful Student Learning (SLS) Staff Program.