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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Youth Dialogues on Race and Ethnicity in Metropolitan Detroit enables young people of African, Asian, European, Middle Eastern, and Latin American descent to challenge segregation, increase dialogue, and create change.

Young people meet in dialogues with other groups with whom they have historical differences. They take a metropolitan bus tour of neighborhoods and suburbs; conduct community service initiatives; plan action projects to challenge segregation; discuss public policy issues related to race and ethnicity; and reunite for a summit to share outcomes with community leaders.

In 2007 the program involved 88 young people from 16 community-based agencies and schools representing ten neighborhoods and six suburbs in the metropolitan area. Approximately 53 percent of the participants came from agencies in areas identified in the Good Neighborhood Initiative and 47 percent came from the suburbs.

The self-identified racial and ethnic composition of the participants was the following: African American (32%), European American (21%), Arab American and Chaldean (12%), Latino and Latina (11%), Asian American and Hmong (13%), and multi-racial (11%).

The dialogues had powerful effects on the young people. Findings from the pre- and post-test surveys and the youth-led evaluation survey revealed the following three outcomes from participation in the 2007 program:

1. Young people increased their knowledge of their own racial and ethnic identity and that of others.
2. Young people increased their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege.
3. Young people developed leadership skills and took specific actions to address issues of racism in their own lives, their families, and the communities of which they are part.

The program also increased their intergroup communication and collaboration across racial and ethnic boundaries, and enabled them to challenge discrimination, build relationships, and create community changes through action projects. It involved them public policy at the municipal and metropolitan levels, and prepared them for new roles as agents of positive change in society.

However, the focus of the present report is on how the program increased their knowledge of their own identities and that of others; their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege; and their leadership skills for specific actions to challenge discrimination, build relationships, and create changes through collaborative projects.
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EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This evaluation focused on the effects of Youth Dialogues on Race and Ethnicity in Metropolitan Detroit at multiple levels.

The evaluation process featured a mixed-method, multi-level approach utilizing video interviews, focus groups, photography, and surveys, led by a team of professional and youth evaluators.

Youth evaluators were drawn from the Youth Policy Leadership Team which works to identify policy issues that emerge from the dialogues and plays a leadership role in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.

The youth evaluators developed and utilized age-appropriate evaluation methods to assess the impact of the program on participants. They conducted 16 video interviews with representatives of each agency, held focus groups with participants and advisors, and administered a youth evaluation survey to identify specific lessons learned and recommendations for the program in future years.

In addition, the evaluation team created a pre- and post-test survey instrument to identify changes in participants’ attitudes, knowledge, awareness, and actions. Team members worked with the youth evaluators to develop an Action Scale, which was piloted in the 2007 evaluation to assess actual behavioral changes in participants about taking leadership and action on issues related to racism and segregation.

After the data was collected, the evaluation team worked collaboratively to examine quantitative and qualitative findings, identify emerging themes, and produce a video to enable youth participants to describe in their own voices how they were impacted by the dialogue program.

This report draws largely on findings from the quantitative pre- and post-test survey and youth evaluation survey. It incorporates quotes gathered during the youth-led interviews and focus groups, in addition to the surveys.

Overall, the evaluation team found that the program had significant effects on the youth who participated. Young people developed knowledge about their own racial and ethnic identity and that of others. They increased their awareness about issues of race and racism while developing a consciousness of racial privilege. Finally, they developed leadership and took action to address issues of racism in their families and communities.
2007 Evaluation Team (left to right):

Gabriel Davis, Detroit, Jennifer Young Yim, Ann Arbor, Katie Richards-Schuster, Ann Arbor, Sarah Yu, Canton, Ryan Neloms, Detroit.
EVALUATION METHODS

Following are the methods which were employed in the present evaluation:

**Pre- and Post-Test Survey**

The pre- and post-test survey used the following scales to measure attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors\(^1\) of young people on issues of race and ethnicity:

- Action Scale (Youth Dialogues Evaluation Team and Youth Public Policy Leaders, 2007)
- Communication Scale (CS; adapted from Chesler, 2001)
- Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992)
- Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000)
- Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES; adapted from Luhtanen & Crocker, 2002)

The Action Scale to measure actual actions taken to address issues of racism was developed specifically for the youth dialogues program by the evaluation team in collaboration with the youth dialogues public policy leaders.

The pre-test survey was administered at the beginning of the dialogue program (program orientation, June 2007) and at the end of the dialogue sessions (program retreat, August 2007).

The response rate for completing both the pre- and post-test surveys out of 88 youth dialogue participants was 92 percent.

**Youth Evaluation Survey**

The youth evaluators developed a survey which was administered as part of the post-test survey distributed at the program retreat. The survey asked participants to rate their experience and their level of learning on various items such as working with others, learning about their own identity, and learning about issues of racism. The evaluation survey also gathered recommendations for the program itself.

**Youth Video Interviews**

The video interviews asked 16 young people (one from each dialogue agency) to describe their experiences in the dialogues and the impact it had on them. The interviews were video taped and used to develop the 2007 Youth Dialogues Evaluation Video.

---

\(^1\) Additional information about the pre- and post-test survey scales is included at the end of this summary report.
Focus Groups

Two focus groups were held during the program retreat. The youth focus group involved one representative from each of the 16 dialogue agencies. The youth evaluators led the focus group and asked questions about the participant’s experiences and the impact of the program. The adult focus group involved advisors present at the retreat. The evaluation team led the advisor focus group and asked questions about the advisor’s experiences in the program and the perceived impact of the program on the youth from their respective communities.

Analysis

Youth participants who completed both a pre- and post-test survey were included in the quantitative analysis ($N = 81$). The quantitative analysis used paired t-tests to determine statistical significance across the entire participant population. The data was also sorted and analyzed using univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare participants in the GNI (Good Neighborhoods Initiative) and non-GNI agencies. The qualitative analysis used coding to develop themes from the survey short answer responses, video interviews, and focus group transcripts.
PROGRAM AGENCIES AND PARTICIPANTS

Community Agencies

Youth participants were recruited through community-based agencies and schools. University of Michigan Summer Youth Dialogues Program Staff reached out to engage potential agencies for participation. Sixteen agencies participated in the 2007 Summer Youth Dialogues Program.

Each agency created a team of racially/ethnically similar young people to participate in the Summer Youth Dialogues Program. Agencies were paired to create dialogue teams that represented young people from different racial/ethnic backgrounds.

2007 agencies, locations, and racial/ethnic team identifications were:

- Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS; Arab American)
- Allen Park High School (European American)
- Alternatives for Girls (AFG; African American)
- Asian Pacific American Club (APAC; Asian American)
- Detroit Youth Foundation (DYF; African American)
- Farmington Hills Mayor’s Youth Council (African American) (European American)
- Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development (LA SED; Latino/Latina)
- Mosaic Youth Theatre of Detroit (African American)
- People’s Community Services (PCS; Latino/Latina)
- Renaissance High School (European American)
- Rosedale Park Baptist Church (African American)
- Sacred Heart Chaldean Church (Chaldean American)
- St. Clair High School (European American)
- Southfield Community Foundation’s Youth Advisory Council (African American)
- United Family and Community Organization (UFCO; Hmong American)
Fifty-three percent of participants came from agencies in areas designated as Good Neighborhoods Initiative (GNI) areas.

TABLE 1: Dialogue Pairings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development*</th>
<th>Southfield Community Foundation’s Youth Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Family and Community Organization*</td>
<td>Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Youth Foundation*</td>
<td>Allen Park High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives For Girls*</td>
<td>St. Clair High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Community Services*</td>
<td>Farmington Hills Mayor’s Youth Council (European American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedale Park Baptist Church*</td>
<td>Asian Pacific American Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Youth Theatre of Detroit*</td>
<td>Sacred Heart Chaldean Church*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance High School*</td>
<td>Farmington Hills Mayor’s Youth Council (African American)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth Participants

Eighty-eight young people participated in the 2007 youth dialogues program with the following representation:

---

2 GNI Agencies are designated with an asterisk*.
3 Participants included in the pre- and post-test survey quantitative analysis were fairly distributed across agencies.
- The average age of a participant was 16 years
- The majority of participants were going into the 11th or 12th grade
- 67 percent of participants were female
- 16 percent were born outside of the United States
- Most reported their socio-economic status as middle class

The participants reported that over the last year, 68 percent went on at least one vacation, 15 percent did not leave Michigan for visits or vacation, 31 percent took at least one trip on an airplane, and 22 percent had their family car break down at least three times. Additionally, 6 percent reported that their family uses public transportation at least once a week, 80 percent reported that their family had more than one car, 78 percent went to the dentist at least once a year, 65 percent went to the doctor regularly for check-ups, and 36 percent had a guest room in the house.

Participants self-identified themselves across a range of racial and ethnic categories, which are represented in the graph below.
OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Overall, Youth Dialogues on Race and Ethnicity had statistically significant impacts on the participants’ knowledge, awareness, understanding, and behavioral changes, all related to issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination, and segregation.

There were three major findings from this evaluation. As a result of participation in the program:

1. **Young people increased their knowledge about their own racial and ethnic identity and that of others.**

   Young people came to a greater understanding about their own racial and ethnic identity, including an increased self-esteem related to their racial and ethnic social identity, and an increased awareness about how their racial and ethnic identity impacts their life. Participants learned about those different from themselves, including an increased knowledge about other groups' racial and ethnic identities and a desire to want to learn more. In the process of learning about others, young people also described increased skill and confidence in their ability to work with others across racial and ethnic backgrounds.

2. **Young people increased their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege.**

   Overall, young people demonstrated an increase in their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege. Young people were more likely to have a more complex understanding of racism and how racial privilege affects individuals in society. Through the dialogue experience, young people described an increased awareness of current social issues related to race and ethnicity.

3. **Young people developed leadership skills and increased their actions to address issues of racism in their community.**

   Youth participants demonstrated a statistically significant increase in their behavior and actions to address issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation. Young people also described an increase in their leadership on issues of racism, and an increase in actions to address racism in their families, schools, and communities during their participation in the program.
“I learned that there are many stereotypes about my own group, and that there are stereotypes of other groups. I also learned a number of historical facts about my group and others, both through the dialogues and the action projects.”
ACCESS (Arab-American)

Awareness of Own Racial and Ethnic Identity

As a result of participation, young people increased their knowledge about racial and ethnic identity.

Seventy-eight percent of program participants agreed or strongly agreed that they had a better understanding about their own racial and ethnic identity as a result of the dialogues.

Young people also demonstrated a statistically significant increase in their knowledge of their own racial and ethnic identity and how their identity impacts themselves and others (CS Knowledge $t(80) = 6.32$, $p < .001$; CS Awareness $t(80) = 3.33$, $p < .01$; MEIM $t(77) = 1.98$, $p < .10$).

Participants also showed an increase in self-esteem related to their own racial or ethnic identity (CSES $t(78) = 3.24$, $p < .01$).

Awareness of Others

Participants reported an increase in their knowledge of other groups, cultures, and histories ($t(80) = 1.85$, $p < .10$).

“The youth dialogues program made me want to learn more about other racial and ethnic groups. Now, I understand more about discrimination in my community.”
United Family and Community Organization (Hmong American)

As a result of participation, young people were more likely to report they had knowledge of the ways in which institutional systems of privilege and oppression may affect interpersonal and intergroup dynamics ($t(77) = 6.51$, $p < .001$).
Young people also described their desire to learn more about other racial and ethnic backgrounds.

**Ability to Work with Others**

In the process of learning about others, youth participants also developed confidence in their ability to work with others from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. The youth evaluation survey showed that 95 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they learned skills that help them work in groups as a result of participating in the program.

For example, a Latina participant said, “I think before I speak about other races. Also I feel more confident to speak with other races.” (People’s Community Services)

Another African American young person stated, “I learned correct ways to work with another culture [and] another group.” (Alternatives for Girls)

A European American youth said, “I have learned more about myself and about others. It was a very personal experience, and while I learned factual things about other groups, about intergroup dialogue, and about program planning, what I really learned and am taking away is something deeply felt and difficult to describe.” (Renaissance High School)
Good Neighborhoods Initiative

Young people from the Good Neighborhoods Initiative (GNI) agencies demonstrated an increase in their overall knowledge about dialogues, in their awareness of their own and other social identities, and in their ability to communicate with others (CS Overall $t(42) = 3.99, p < .001$). GNI youth participants reported a significant increase in their communication skills during the program, such as the skills to discuss controversial issues and challenge others constructively (CS Skills $t(42) = 1.92, p < .10$). In the pre-test survey, GNI youth reported significantly fewer communication skills than youth from non-GNI agencies, but this discrepancy diminished after two months of the dialogue program (pre-test $F(1,78) = 7.55, p < .01$; post-test $F(1,79) = 3.39, p < .10$).

One young person from a GNI neighborhood stated, “You should really get to know the person and not just judge from the outside.” (Sacred Heart)

Our research suggests that young people from GNI neighborhoods gained a greater confidence in their knowledge about themselves and about others, and stronger communication skills, than young people from non-GNI neighborhoods.
“Personally the program impacted me a great deal. I realized that even though I do not think of myself as privileged, I am because of my skin color – and this needs to change. It will cause me to work harder to change racism in the U.S. and the world.” Farmington Hills (European American)

“I feel like I don’t have to be so angry about ignorance all the time.”
Mosaic Youth Theatre (African American)

Overall, young people reported an increase in their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege.

Findings from the evaluation demonstrate that the dialogues program is effective in increasing the awareness of young people about race-related issues and racism in society.

**Understanding of Racial Issues**

The pre- and post-test findings suggest that young people had a statistically significant improvement in their understanding and awareness of complex racial issues over the course of the youth dialogues program (CoBRAS \(t(77) = 3.34, p < .01\)).

“*This program has helped me answer some of these questions I had about segregation and racism, and it also has brought up new ones. I want to continue with these topics and take action against segregation. This program has helped me to see what’s important, a that as an individual, I need to change myself before I can change others.*”
Asian Pacific American Club

After participating in the dialogues, young people were more likely to report that they were aware of how race and ethnicity relate to privileges and disadvantages (CS Awareness \(t(80) = 3.33, p < .01\)). Young people were also more likely to report that racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S. \(t(79) = 2.74, p < .01\).

The youth evaluators’ survey also found that 93 percent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that they better understand social issues related to race and ethnicity as a result of the program.
Blatant Racism and Racial Privilege

Participants showed changes in the areas of racial privilege, (CoBRAS Racial Privilege $t(79) = 2.68, p < .01$) and blatant racial issues (CoBRAS Blatant Racial Issues $t(78) = 3.13, p < .01$), demonstrating that they became more aware of the role that racial privilege plays in race relations, as well as the existence of overt racial discrimination.

Blatant racial issues are those that recognize racism as a major problem in the United States. For example, young people were more likely to disagree with the idea that racism is only a problem of the past but is not an important problem today ($t(77) = 2.56, p < .05$).

Good Neighborhoods Initiative Perceptions

Youth from GNI agencies became more aware of racial privilege at a statistically significant level during the youth dialogues experience, whereas youth from non-GNI agencies did not report any change in awareness of racial privilege (CoBRAS Racial Privilege $t(41) = 3.92, p < .001$).

Youth from non-GNI agencies experienced a greater awareness regarding blatant racism, demonstrating that they became more aware of racism as an important problem in society after participating in the dialogue program (CoBRAS Blatant Racial Issues $t(37) = 2.83, p < .01$).
YOUNG PEOPLE DEVELOPED LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND TOOK ACTION AGAINST RACISM AND SEGREGATION

“I feel accountable for all that I learned, and will be more accountable for my actions, because now I ‘know better.’ I also will share and teach others what I have learned.”
Rosedale Park Baptist Church (African-American)

Youth participants reported a statistically significant increase in their behavior and action to address issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation, as a result of their time in the program (Action Scale $t(80) = 9.82, p < .001$).

Developing Leadership

Young people described an increase in their leadership ability to address issues of racism in their home communities. More than 80 percent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that they developed skills about how to create an action plan, form coalitions, and address issues of race and ethnicity.

In the post-test evaluation survey, young people wrote:

- “I learned many things about myself through this program, like I can be an effective team leader when I want to be and when needed. I also learned not to be shy in large groups, to have confidence in myself, and not to give in to peer pressure. I will use these leadership skills all through life.” (ACCESS)

- “This program has helped me see what’s important to me and that as an individual, I need to change myself before I can change others.” (APAC)

- “After this program, I think that when I see racial stereotypes on TV, I won’t just change the channel, I’ll do something about it. If I see someone being racially stereotyped, I will stick up for them, and stop it.” (Allen Park)
• “This program fueled my fire within even more to continue to fight the battle against racism. I will move forward strongly to commit to my part to abolish racism. Whether the change is big or small, it’s still worth the struggle.” (St. Clair)

**Taking Action**

The table below represents a list of actions taken by young people to address racism in their community. The “yes pre-test” column reflects the number of young people who reported they took that action in the two months before the youth dialogues program began. The “yes post-test” column reflects the number of young people who stated that they had taken this action during the two months of the program (June-August 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Scale Item</th>
<th>Yes pre-test</th>
<th>Yes post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenged or checked a friend who uses a racial slur or makes a racial joke.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenged or checked a family member who uses a racial slur or makes a racial joke.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Challenged or checked an adult who uses a racial slur or makes a racial joke who is not a family member (i.e. parent’s friend, coach, boss, teacher, etc.).</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challenged or checked myself before using a racial slur or making a racial joke.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Talked with friends about issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination and/or segregation.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talked with a family member about issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination and/or segregation.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Paid attention to news articles/media stories about issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Called/written/emailed the media (i.e. newspaper, TV, internet) when you have seen something that is offensive.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Called/written/emailed an elected official (i.e. city council, mayor, legislator).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Made efforts to get to know others of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Attended a meeting on an issue related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Joined a club or group working on issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Attended a protest on an issue related to race, ethnicity, discrimination and/or segregation.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Organized your own action project on an issue related to race, ethnicity, discrimination and/or segregation.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tried to get into a leadership role or committee (i.e. student council, group officer position, organizing an event or program).</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Invited someone to a meeting or protest related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Inspired others to work on issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Researched/investigated issues or social problems in my community.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Participated in a leadership group or committee working on issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation (i.e. youth organizing group, school club, after school program, youth advisory council).</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sat with others who are different racially/ethnically from me in the school cafeteria or at an event.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Defended a friend who is the target of a racial slur or joke.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Defended a stranger who is the target of a racial slur or joke.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action pre-test mean = 10.56; post-test mean = 14.64; \( t(80) = 9.82, p < .001 \).
On the dimensions in this section, youth dialogue participants increased most in organizing action projects, challenging a family member who uses a racial slur or makes a racial joke, participating in leadership positions related to issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation, and inspiring others to work on these issues.

Overall, Youth Dialogues on Race and Ethnicity affects the participants’ ability to affect racism at the family, school, and community levels.
CONCLUSION

The 2007 Youth Dialogues on Race and Ethnicity in Metropolitan Detroit had powerful effects on young people. Findings from the pre- and post-test surveys and the youth-led evaluation survey revealed the following three outcomes from participation in the 2007 program:

- Young people increased their knowledge of their own racial and ethnic identity and that of others.
- Young people increased their awareness and understanding of racism and racial privilege.
- Young people developed leadership skills and took specific actions to address issues of racism in their own lives, their families, and the communities of which they are a part.

The program increased participants’ intergroup communication and collaboration across racial and ethnic boundaries, and enabled them to challenge discrimination, build relationships, and create community changes through action projects. It involved young people in public policy at the municipal and metropolitan levels, and prepared them for new roles as change agents in society.

The findings from the pre- and post-test evaluation are significant. They suggest that participation in this program can make a difference in the way in which young people understand and take action on issues of racism. Efforts of this type – which bring young people together across racial and ethnic boundaries to discuss segregation and increase dialogue, and to learn how to take action for change – are exceptional. If only a fraction of the nation’s young people had program opportunities of this type, the effects would be extraordinary.
APPENDIX I
OVERVIEW OF SPECIFIC MEASUREMENT SCALES

**Action Scale**: The 22-item Action Scale was co-created by the youth dialogues evaluation team and youth policy leadership group. Participants responded “yes” or “no” to measure their participation in actions addressing issues of race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation over the previous two months. Items described actions such as, “challenged or checked a friend who uses a racial slur or makes a racial joke”, “called/written/e-mailed an elected official”, and “inspired others to work on issues related to race, ethnicity, discrimination, and/or segregation”.

**Communication**: The Personal Assessment Chart for facilitators (Chesler, 2001) was adapted for use in the 20-item Communication Scale (CS) to measure participants’ level of knowledge, awareness, and skills relevant to the dialogue process. Participants indicated their agreement with items such as, “I have knowledge of other groups, cultures, and histories”, “I’m aware of how much social identities (race/ethnicity) impact others”, and “I have skills to discuss controversial issues” (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean value was calculated for an overall Communication score, along with subscale means for knowledge, skills, and awareness.

**Ethnic Identity**: The 20-item Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) has been tested for validity and reliability among racially and ethnically diverse adolescent populations and was used to measure participants’ attitudes toward ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Participants indicated their agreement with items such as, “I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own” and “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments” (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean value was calculated for an overall MEIM score, along with subscale means for: Other Group Orientation, Affirmation and Belonging, Ethnic Identity Achievement, and Ethnic Behaviors.

**Color Blindness**: The 20-item Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) was used to measure the level of color-blindness in participants (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). Previous studies have linked color-blindness with modern racism (McConahay, 1986). Participants indicated their agreement with items like, “Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich” and “Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today” (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean value was calculated for an overall CoBRAS Score, along with subscale means for: Racial Privilege, Institutional Discrimination, and Blatant Racial Issues.

**Racial/Ethnic Self-Esteem**: An adapted 15-item version of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES) was used to measure the self-esteem of participants in relation to racial/ethnic social identities (Luhtanen & Crocker, 2002). The scale was adapted by replacing the term “social groups” with “racial/ethnic groups”. Participants indicated their agreement with items like, “I often regret that I belong to some of the racial/ethnic groups that I belong to” and “In general, others respect the racial/ethnic groups that I am a member of” (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean value was calculated for an overall CSES score, along with subscale means for: Membership, Private, Public, and Identity.
## APPENDIX II

### PRE- AND POST-TEST MEAN SCORES FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>+4.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>+0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+0.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>+0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>+0.12†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group Orientation</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>+0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation &amp; Belonging</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>+0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Blindness</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Privilege</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blatant Racial Issues</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-esteem</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>+0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>+0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>+0.16†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>+0.14†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>+0.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = $p \leq .001$, ** = $p \leq .01$, * = $p \leq .05$, † = $p \leq .10$