Intersectionality of Race/Ethnic and Gender Identities in Intergroup Dialogue

by

Nora L. Stephens

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

With Honors in Psychology from the

University of Michigan

2013

Advisor:

Dr. Patricia Gurin

Abstract

This study looked at how Intergroup Dialogue Program students' use of race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms relate to their intersectional race/ethnic-gender identity and their dialogue topic of race/ethnicity or gender, and how their intersectional identities correlate with their desire and steps toward social justice action. Intersectionality is a process by which two identities, race/ethnicity and gender in this case, intertwine to create a new identity. I used the Multi-university Intergroup Dialogue Research Project data collected from students in race/ethnicity and gender dialogues to understand how intersectionality of race/ethnicity and gender are used by white women, women of color, men of color, and white men, and if students use more intersectionality terms in race/ethnicity dialogues or in gender dialogues. First off, women of color used the most intersectionality terms, but the dialogue topic did not have an effect on how intersectionality was displayed. Additionally, I found that using intersectionality terms to describe oneself produces greater likelihood to act on social justice action.

Keywords: intersectionality, race, gender, identity, social justice action

Intersectionality of Race/Ethnic and Gender Identities in Intergroup Dialogue

Everyone has multiple social identities, not just one, which is why someone may think of herself as a black woman or himself as an Asian-American man. Other people keep these identities separate and mostly think of themselves as a woman or an Asian American. It is necessary to acknowledge that all people have more identities than merely their race/ethnicity and gender, but my thesis focuses solely on these two identities. My thesis attempts to explain how people see themselves in terms of pulling their race/ethnic and gender identities together to form an intersectional race/ethnic-gender identity, and how this sense of self relates to likeliness to act on social justice issues.

First off, intersectionality is a process by which two identities, race/ethnic and gender in this case, intertwine to create a new identity. For example, a white woman is not just white and just a woman, but a white woman—the gender and race identity become one to form a new identity.

My interest in studying race/ethnic and gender intersectionality stemmed from my experiences facilitating both a gender dialogue and a white racial identity dialogue at the University of Michigan. In my gender dialogue in particular, I was very aware that women of color often referred to themselves as an "Asian woman" or "African American woman," whereas the white women more often referred to themselves as women without adding in their racial or ethnic identity. This difference led me to wonder why it is that the women of color more often attached their race or ethnicity to their gender, and if this also occurred in race/ethnicity dialogues (with women of color attaching their gender to their race or ethnicity).

Intergroup dialogue is a weekly, graded, intensive, course where two trained facilitators of different social identities guide a class of 10-16 undergraduates in how to dialogue across difference. The topics of these courses vary, but for the purpose of this thesis I used the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogue Research Project data that focused on race/ethnicity and gender. This is a study that looked at race/ethnicity and gender dialogues at nine American universities with Intergroup Dialogue Programs. The data were collected from questionnaires and final papers written by students in the dialogues.

This thesis is guided by the following three research questions: Of four groups of students, white women, women of color, white men, and men of color, which group uses the most race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms?; In which of two dialogues, race/ethnicity or gender, do participants use more race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms?; To what extent does describing oneself with intersectionality terms relate to being involved with social justice action on campus?

How Intersectionality Relates to Sense of Self

To understand intersectionality is to understand how a race/ethnic-gender identity can permeate in a person's life. The idea of intersectionality is very personal because intersectionality attempts to understand how "intersecting identities create instances of both opportunity and oppression, where a person can, depending on his or her particular identity in a particular social context, experience advantage, disadvantage, or both at the same time" (Warner, 2008). Experiencing intersectionality with two target identities or one target identity and one agent identity can have an effect on how one thinks of one's privilege in society. For example, a white woman may feel oppression from being a woman. She is then able to understand the privilege of being white in American society because she can compare her personal experiences

of oppression based off her gender to her lack of feelings of oppression based on her white identity. But a woman who has not yet identified herself as a white woman misses an opportunity to grasp how two kinds of oppression and privilege interact with each other. White women and men of color are often more able than white men to recognize their respective race and gender privileges because of their experiences with oppression—white men often have a harder time talking about their privilege because they do not have a target identity to draw off of to understand discrimination and therefore the benefits of a privileged identity (Cole & Luna, 2010). Women of color hold target identities in both their race/ethnic and gender identities and therefore are especially able to grapple with ideas of oppression and to recognize privileges that they do not hold in society. It appears that holding at least one target identity in race/ethnic-gender intersectional identities is the factor that matters most in recognizing the privileges that one holds or does not hold in society.

Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach use the term "intersectional invisibility" to describe when a person with multiple target identities does not fit the prototypes of the agent groups and is therefore left out of the mainstream culture or conversation. Much of intersectionality has been studied in how people with two target identities, usually women of color, understand different parts of their lives because they are left out of the mainstream conversation (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). Therefore, the members of a group who have more agent identities (i.e., black men within a group of black men and black women) tend to have more social power or status within that social group (Warner, 2008). Moreover, experiencing intersectionality of two target identities can be particularly powerful in defining one's sense of self because one is experiencing "intersectional invisibility" everyday. It is this identity difference of having two marginalized identities from other race-gender intersectionality pairings that make women of color particularly

aware of their intersectional identities in ways that those with one or no marginalized identities less often are (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

Intersectionality and Stereotypes

Stereotypes are often drawn from a specific intersection of a person's race and gender, not merely one or the other. These stereotypes range in their effects on the people who are being stereotyped and the broader society that comes to accept them. One specific issue is around the stereotype of women of color being more sexually promiscuous than white women. This stereotype has broader implications for how rape of women of color, particularly black women is perceived (Crenshaw, 1993). The effects of stereotypes are important because the images, such as the stereotype for black women as welfare queens or promiscuous, reinforce racial divisions by denigrating black women in comparison to white women (Browne & Misra, 2003). The fact that a black woman is not grouped with only her race or only her gender, but the intersectionality of these two identities, is an example of the pertinence of intersectionality in American society. Stereotypes are pertinent in the world of men of color as well. The stereotype that black men from the inner city are lazy and dangerous prevents them from gaining employment; the feminized Asian man is not seen as a leader at school or work (Browne & Misra, 2003). Furthermore, stereotyping is not always done negatively, but positively as well. "Positive discrimination" refers to the practices through which white elite men keep their societal privileges via connections in the elite world and the halo-effect of white male managers and colleagues at work (Browne & Misra, 2003).

The broader idea of stereotyping also relates to why studying intersectionality is so important: understanding intersectionality is necessary so that we can understand why multiple-

targets tend to be defined as non-prototypical members of their constituent identity group and draw stereotypes about them (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

Intersectionality and Social/Political Movements

Historically, it is also important to have a deeper understanding of how race and gender intersectionality permeate in people's identities because there have been a number of discrimination cases that have revolved around intersectionality. For example, there have been several rejections of plaintiffs' cases based on discrimination of being specifically black women—these cases were rejected because plaintiffs had to base their claim on discrimination of either their race or gender, but not both. This was discouraging given that the black men and white women were paid fairly, but black women made considerably less (Crenshaw, 1993).

Additionally, black feminism was created out of sentiments from Black women as feeling left out of both the feminist movement and the black power movement (Pinderhughes, 2008). The need to create a separate intersectional identity-based movement stems from the idea of social movements only focusing on one identity. The whole idea of solidarity for one group leaves out members who are not part of the main group, often leaving those with more than one target identity in the out-group (Hancock, 2007).

Two Target Identities: It's Implications for Social Justice Action

As Sojourner Truth's famous "Ain't I A Woman" speech ("Ain't I A Woman," n.d.) reminds us, there is something special about experiencing two target identities that makes taking social justice action more imperative for these specific groups than for groups with one or no marginalized identities. In fact, black women, who experience marginalization as being black and a woman are more likely than white women to identify as feminist (Cole, 2009). As history shows us, black women who felt marginalized in the civil rights movement and the feminist

movement, did not sulk away, but instead formed their own groups to fight for rights as both women and black people. These black women rallied for the rights of their intersectional identity as women of color and as such created the black feminist movement (Pinderhughes, 2008).

The fact that the black feminist movement even needed to be created is a statement of how powerful intersectionality has been in American society. The idea of intersectionality is a critique of "this group unity equals group uniformity logic" (Hancock, 2007), and therefore women of color needed to take action steps themselves because they were left out of the inner circle of the feminist and black power movements.

Intersectionality Research

"Race, class, gender, and sexuality are interrelated systems at the macroinstitutional level—they are created, maintained, and transformed simultaneously and in relation to one another. Therefore, they cannot be understood independently of one another" (Weber, 2001). The idea of intersectionality within the social sciences stemmed from feminist and critical race theory because psychologists generally aimed to simplify models to make research easier, leading to intersectionality of identities not being tested (Cole, 2009). A problem with simplifying how psychologists gain data is that the data they are collecting are often not representative of greater society. An example of this is that student samples have often been used to understand women in psychology, but this means mostly white and frequently middle class or higher women are representing all women in these surveys (Sue, 1999).

Much has been written in terms of how intersectionality should be studied and understood. Some follow the additive model, believing that the more target identities one holds, the more stereotyped and oppressed their intersectional identity is (Almquist, 1975), but this approach can lead to what is referred to as the "oppression Olympics" (Dhamoon, 2011). The

"oppression Olympics" refers to a focus on the more target identities one holds the more marginalized one is and therefore the "oppression Olympics" loses sight of the specific differences that are inherent to different intersectional groups (Hancock, 2007). This additive approach neglects the complexity of identities (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

Other social scientists follow what is called the interactive approach, a belief that, "race is 'gendered' and gender is 'racialized,' so that race and gender fuse to create unique experiences and opportunities for all groups—not just women of color" (Browne & Misra, 2003). This interactive approach to intersectionality research treats categories in a more critical and complex way, which is by nature, why intersectionality should be studied anyway (Carbado, 2000). Furthermore, research needs to honor with its methods the complexities within different identities; therefore, it is not valid to have a study that is primarily white women and say that the study represents all women (McCall, 2005). As McCall states, "scholars also see categories as misleading constructs that do not readily allow for the diversity and heterogeneity of experience to be represented" (McCall, 2005). McCall's point relates to the idea that this interactive form of research is by nature complicated because it focuses on combinations of identities. However, intersectional identity research is harder to conduct and analyze.

The Program on Intergroup Relations

The Program on Intergroup Relations was founded at a time of heightened racial and ethnic tensions at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor campus in 1988. Through academic courses, workshops, research, resources, and outreach, IGR provides opportunities for both the UM campus and the general community to explore issues of intergroup relations, explicitly focusing on the relationship between social conflict and social justice ("About IGR," n.d.). An intergroup dialogue, which is what students in the Multi-University IGD study participated in,

brings students from two or more social identity groups together to talk about issues of privilege, oppression, and power dynamics between these different social identity groups. These social identity groups are often groups that have had contentious relationships with each other, or in the least have lacked opportunities to talk in non-superficial ways. Moreover, race/ethnic and gender were the social identities focused on for the M-IGR project and these two groups have pasts filled with historical and structural inequalities, of which the dialogues focus on (See Gurin, Nagda & Zúñiga, 2013, for complete coverage of this project).

Intergroup dialogue aims to guide students in learning how to talk with and listen to students from different backgrounds, discern commonalities as well as differences in these interactions, work cooperatively across differences, and normalize and learn how to negotiate intergroup conflicts. The actual dialogues vary in logistics from campus to campus, but all take the form of having facilitators who serve as moderators and suggest topics of conversation, an equal number of students from the focused-social identity groups (i.e. the same number of students of color and white people in a race/ethnicity dialogue), and a focus on equality within the classroom: everyone's air space is valued and talking about personal sentiments is held on a pedestal.

Moreover, commitment to social justice action is created through participating in an intergroup dialogue—a commitment to social justice action is described as an increased frequency in actions such as educating others and collaborating with others about social justice issues (Gurin, et al., 2013). "The theoretical model posits that dialogue pedagogy fosters distinctive communication processes, which influence psychological processes that, in turn, relate to action," (Gurin et al., 2013) and it is this sense of action based on a student's intersectional identity that I looked at in this paper.

I use the following three hypotheses to test how intersectionality is exhibited within intergroup dialogues:

H1.) I hypothesize that women of color will use the most race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms because the meshing of two target identities is especially powerful in creating an intersectional identity, and that this will occur in both race/ethnicity and gender dialogues.

H2.) I hypothesize that students in race/ethnicity dialogues will use more race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms than students in gender dialogues because race is such a powerful issue in our society.

H3.) I hypothesize that students who display great evidence of intersectionality awareness will be more likely to engage in social justice action than those who describe themselves with fewer race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms.

Method

The data came from the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogue Research Project in which 720 students wrote final papers in 52 dialogue courses at nine institutions: Arizona State University, Occidental College, Syracuse University, University of California (San Diego), University of Maryland, University of Massachusetts, University of Michigan, University of Texas, and University of Washington. Although I was not part of the team that collected these data, I used the final papers and questionnaires of these 720 students as the basis for this project (Gurin et al., 2013).

Participants

The final papers and questionnaires of students from 52 intergroup dialogues were used ($N = 741$). Half of these dialogues were focused on race/ethnicity (26 dialogue classes) and half

focused on gender (26 dialogue classes). Of these 720 participants, there are fairly equal percentages of white women, white men, women of color, and men of color: 27% white women (*n* = 194), 24% white men (*n* = 173), 26% women of color (*n* = 187), and 23% men of color (*n* = 166) (Gurin et al., 2013).

Assessments and Data

Students in both the race/ethnicity and gender dialogues completed the same 10-page final paper assignment at all nine institutions. The paper assignment asked them to construct a comprehensive 10-page essay that addressed four themes: 1) hopes and fears at the beginning of the dialogue; 2) understanding of their own and other students' identities and of privilege, power, and inequality at the beginning and end of the dialogue course; 3) analysis of how the dialogue group handled a disagreement or conflict and what they learned from those experiences; and 4) the intergroup relations skills they had learned, and how they saw themselves applying that learning in society at large (Gurin-Sands, Gurin, Nagda, & Osuna, 2012). The final papers of the participants were used to study Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 through a textual analysis.

Additionally, surveys collected from all 720 students at the end of the intergroup dialogue course were used in this project for demographic information (race/ethnic and gender) and for their questions and responses about social justice action after taking the intergroup dialogue course. The data from these surveys were used to study Hypothesis 3.

Measures and Analysis

Through NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software program, I completed text searches for race/ethnic-gender compound terms (such as African American woman, Asian man, white woman, black man, Hispanic woman). A race/ethnic-gender compound term is when race/ethnic and gender identity terms appear together, and is therefore different from when a person

describes him or herself by only his or her gender or his or her race/ethnicity. NVivo provides counts of the number of times across the student's paper she/he used intersectionality terms.

From NVivo I transferred these counts to Microsoft Excel and from Excel to SPSS. In SPSS, I ran one Univariate Analyses of Data on the race/ethnic-gender compound terms. These analyses gave me access to means, between-subject effects, univariate tests, post-hoc tests, and frequency tables, all of which allow me to test Hypotheses 1 and 2.

To address Hypothesis 3, I took the responses to questions about social justice action from the surveys administered after taking the intergroup dialogue. These questions had three different foci, each testing for confidence level and frequency of completing said social justice actions. The three social justice action questions centered around: taking social justice action towards others, taking social justice action to further educate oneself, and engaging in intergroup collaboration. A fourth aspect was intention to act towards social justice post-college.

Through SPSS, I ran correlations between the number of race/ethnicity-gender compound terms used and each of the following action measures: confidence and frequency in taking social justice action towards others, in personally taking social justice action, and in engaging in intergroup collaboration. I also ran correlations between the number of intersectionality terms used and likeliness to engage in social justice action post-college.

Results

Women of Color's Use of Intersectionality Terms

Hypothesis 1: I predicted that women of color will use the most intersectionality terms because the meshing of two target identities is especially powerful in creating an intersectional identity. I also predicted that this will occur in both race/ethnicity and gender dialogues.

The four demographic groups differed in how many intersectionality terms they used in their final papers ($F = 6.35$, $p < .001$). The means in Table 1 show that women of color use more intersectionality terms than all three other demographic groups: white women ($p = .001$), white men ($p = .031$), and men of color ($p < .001$). Although not statistically significant, white men use marginally more intersectional terms than men of color ($p = .056$). Hypothesis 1 is supported: women of color used the most intersectionality terms compared to men of color, white women, and white men.

Table 2 illustrates that the dialogue topic affected which demographic groups used the most intersectionality terms. Although in both race/ethnicity and gender dialogues, women of color stood out, their usage of intersectional terms was statistically higher than white women ($p = .002$) and men of color ($p = .008$), but not more than white men. Moreover, within race/ethnicity dialogues, women of color used more intersectionality terms than men of color ($p = .036$), but not more than the two groups of white students. Thus, the expectation that women of color would be especially likely to use intersectionality terms is generally supported, although there were some exceptions in the findings.

Dialogue Topic and Intersectionality Terms

Hypothesis 2: I predicted that students in race/ethnicity dialogues will use more race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms than students in gender dialogues because race is such a powerful issue in our society. Table 3 proves this hypothesis wrong: there is no difference between race/ethnicity dialogues and gender dialogues in mean number of intersectionality terms used ($F = .81$, $p = .489$).

Use of Intersectionality Terms and Social Justice Action

I predicted that students who use more intersectionality terms will be more likely to engage in social justice action than those students who did not use as many intersectionality terms. This hypothesis was proven mostly correct (See Table 4a and 4b). Of the seven aspects that we define as making up social justice action (confidence in taking social justice action towards others, confidence in taking social justice action to further educate oneself, confidence in engaging in intergroup collaboration, frequency of taking social justice action towards others, frequency of taking social justice action to further educate oneself, frequency in engaging in intergroup collaboration), and intentions to act towards social justice after college, five of them were found statistically related to the number of intersectionality terms students used (See Table 4a and 4b). As Table 4a illustrates, the students who used the most intersectionality terms in their final papers were more confident about being able to take social justice action toward others ($p = .05$), and also participated in such action more frequently ($p = .01$). They also were more confident about being able to engage in intergroup collaboration ($p = .05$) and more frequently took action to educate themselves further ($p = .05$). Finally, (See Table 4b) they expected to be more involved in post-college action ($p = .01$).

Discussion

The present study aimed to further understand race/ethnic-gender intersectionality by using the final papers of intergroup dialogue participants to understand if demographic category or dialogue topic, or both, affected the number of intersectionality terms students used. This study also aimed to understand if having an attachment to one's race/ethnic-gender intersectionality correlated with wanting to take further social justice action. This research had three primary hypotheses.

The first was that women of color would use the most intersectionality terms. This hypothesis was supported. Results showed that women of color used more race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms in their final papers than white women, white men, and men of color.

The second hypothesis was that students in race/ethnicity dialogues would use more intersectionality terms than students in gender dialogues. This hypothesis was not supported. Students in race/ethnicity dialogues did not use significantly more numbers of intersectionality terms than students in gender dialogues.

The third hypothesis was that students who display greater evidence of intersectionality would be more likely to engage in social justice action than those who describe themselves with fewer intersectionality terms. This hypothesis was mostly supported. Five of the seven categories defined as making up social justice action and intentions to act towards social justice after college were found statistically related to the number of intersectionality terms students used.

These findings are consistent with the literature around intersectionality. The idea that women of color are especially aware of their race/ethnic-gender intersectionality because of the meshing of two target identities (Cole, 2009; Pinderhughes, 2008) was illustrated by women of color standing out in their usage of intersectionality terms. This idea that women of color are particularly aware of their intersectional identity relates to this project's finding that the more intersectionality terms used, the more likely one was to engage in social justice action. Although the data on social justice action are not broken down by demographic group, it is a statement of how being aware of one's identities can impact choices related to the effects of those identities. As a facilitator of two intergroup dialogue courses, I was very aware that women of color would more often refer to themselves by intersectionality terms than any of the other three demographic categories. Additionally, women of color often appeared to be the demographic group most

willing to talk about action steps related to social change that they felt needed to occur outside of class. An example that jumps out to me occurred while facilitating a gender dialogue in Winter 2011: an Indian woman would continually bring up examples of when she had felt discriminated against because of her ethnicity and her gender—she used these examples to tie in how sexism can occur in similar ways to racism and how her fellow students of agent identities should take more of a stand when they hear sexist or racist language used. This led to a particularly meaningful conversation because even though the course was focused on gender, students were then able to delve into talks about how sexism relates to other forms of discrimination.

The fact that there was no difference between race/ethnicity and gender dialogues in intersectionality word usage is an important aspect of intergroup dialogue. Intergroup dialogue courses are set up so that there are equal opportunities to examine one's identities through a very similar curriculum no matter which social identity is the topic of the semester-long course. Students have equal amount of time and resources to delve into their personal sentiments around their social identities and they may or may not use race/ethnic-gender intersectionality in their final papers, depending on if they became, or were already, aware of this specific intersectionality. Therefore the finding that intergroup dialogue topic did not make a difference in intersectionality word usage makes sense and is telling of intergroup dialogue's nature.

Future Implications

Knowing that use of intersectionality terms correlated with more likeliness to engage in social justice action, it is necessary for people involved with intergroup dialogue to think critically about how and when intersectionality is brought up within the semester-long course. This project is a testament to the fact that critically thinking about the completeness of one's identity goes along with social justice action. Therefore more time spent delving into

intersectionality in class may be beneficial in aiding students to feel empowered to act for social change. Knowing that intersectionality is equally brought out in race/ethnicity and gender dialogues, time should be spent analyzing how intergroup dialogue facilitators can create meaningful conversations around these two identities, or other intersectionalities in dialogues of other topics (i.e. socio-economic status and race, gender and sexual orientation, etc.).

Limitations

There were a few limitations related to this project. One such limitation is that a majority of literature around race/ethnic-gender intersectionality is about black women, but all people of color differ from each other—they face a diverse array of experiences and stereotypes assumed of them for being non-white. Thus, it would have been useful if I could have examined intersectionality separate for various groups of color, but the M-IGR decided that since students from the various groups of color were not sampled evenly, this would not be possible. This is a major limitation because as noted above, all people of color are different and it is not accurate to group them in one category. This is especially true since the white students' group accurately represents their race as opposed to the students of color's group, which places them in a category of non-white without recognizing the specific differences between distinctive races and ethnicities.

The last limitation is a question about how this project was approached: is intersectionality term usage a good indicator of being aware of intersectionality? It is important to realize that there are other ways to understand, possibly more deeply, how intersectionality permeates in a person.

Conclusion

This study has concluded that using more race/ethnic-gender intersectionality terms in an intergroup dialogue is not a product of being in a specific dialogue, but rather of being of a specific demographic category. Women of color using more intersectionality terms in their final papers is telling of the complexity of holding two target identities in American society. Additionally, the fact that more intersectionality term usage correlated with more social justice action is a statement of the importance of aiding intergroup dialogue participants in delving into more than one of their social identities—being aware of how two social identities permeate within oneself can empower students to be more likely to act for social change.

References

About IGR. (n.d.). Igr.umich.edu. Retrieved February 28, 2013 from

http://igr.umich.edu/topic/about.

Ain't I A Woman. (n.d.). Sojournertruth.org. Retrieved March 25, 2013 from

http://www.sojournertruth.org/Library/Speeches/AintIAWoman.htm.

Almquist, E. M. (1975). Untangling the effects of race and sex: The disadvantaged status of

Black women. *Social Science Quarterly, 56*, 129–142.

Browne, I., and Misra, J. (2003). The intersection of race and gender in the labor market. *Annual

Review of Sociology, 29*(1), 487-514.

Cole, E. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, (64)*(3),

170-180.

Cole, E. & Luna, Z. (2010). Making coalitions work: Solidarity across differences within U.S.

feminism. *Feminist Studies, 36*(1), 71-98.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique

of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of

Chicago Legal Forum*, *1989,* 139-167.

Dhamoon, R. (2011). Considerations on mainstream intersectionality. *Political Research

Quarterly, 64*(1), 230-243.

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). *Dialogue across difference: Practice, theory and

research on intergroup dialogue.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gurin-Sands, C., Gurin, P., Biren, R., Nagda, A., & Osuna, S. (2012). Fostering a commitment to

    social action: How talking, thinking and feeling make a difference in intergroup dialogue.

    Equity and Excellence in Education, 45(1), 60–79.

Hancock, A. (2007). Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm: Multiplication doesn't

    equal quick addition. *Perspectives on Politics, 5*(1)*,* 63-79.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: The Journal of Women, Culture,*

    and Society, 30(3), 1771-1800.

Pinderhughes, D. (2008). Intersectionality: Race and gender in the 2008 presidential nomination

    campaign. *The Black Scholar, 38*(1), 47-54.

Purdie-Vaughns, V. & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive

    advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59*,

    377-391.

Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American*

    Psychologist, *54*(12), 1070-1077.

Warner, L. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research.

    Sex Roles, 59, 454-463.

Weber, L. (2001). *Understanding race, class, gender and sexuality: A conceptual framework*.

    Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Author Note

Table 1

Means of Compound Race/Ethnic-Gender Terms Used by Demographic Category

Demographic Category	Mean	Standard Error
White Woman	4.079	.298
White Man	4.528	.313
Woman of Color	5.463	.300
Man of Color	3.686	.311

Table 2

Means of Compound Race/Ethnic-Gender Terms Used by Demographic Category Within Dialogue Topic

Topic	Demographic Category	Mean	Standard Error
Gender	White Woman	3.240	.423
	White Man	4.193	.442
	Woman of Color	5.161	.430
	Man of Color	3.418	.435
Race/Ethnicity	White Woman	4.918	.419
	White Man	4.864	.442
	Woman of Color	5.765	.419
	Man of Color	3.954	.445

Table 3

Mean Number of Compound Race/Ethnic-Gender Terms Used by Dialogue Topic

Dialogue Topic	Intersectionality Terms	Standard Error
Race/ethnicity	4.003	.216
Gender	4.875	.216

Table 4a

Correlations Between Compound Race/Ethnic-Gender Terms Used and Social Justice Action

Measure	Confidence Level	Frequency
Taking social justice action towards others	0.082*	0.117**
Taking social justice action to further educate oneself	0.069	0.081*
Engaging in intergroup collaboration	0.086*	0.054

Note *$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

Table 4b

Correlations Between Compound Race/Ethnic-Gender Terms Used and Social Justice Action

Measure	Intention Level
Post-college involvement	0.103**

Note *p<.05, **p<.01