intellectual and scientific scope mainly to
the laboratory, where experimental situa-
tions can be carefully investigated even if they cannot be re-
duced to falsifiable theories (Rogoff, 2003). Psychology needs to get over its
“physics envy” and adapt its methods and theoretical approaches to its uniquely hu-
man topic, in all its cultural complexity and diversity, rather than endlessly and fruit-
lessly aping the natural sciences.

**Toward a Broader Philosophy of Our Human Science**

The four comments on my article (Arnett, 2008) are diverse, but together they suggest a need for a reexamination of psychology’s dominant philosophy of science. Even the two comments that were sympathetic to my thesis did not fully grasp the crux of the problem. Both assumed that a cultural un-
derstanding of human psychology could be attained through cross-cultural research, not realizing how transporting American-based theories and methods to other cul-
tures might result in missing the most distinctive and essential features of those cultures. The two opposing comments rep-
resented well the traditional approach to psychological research, with its confident assurance that progress in psychology is best served by following the model of the natural sciences, investigating basic pro-
cesses in search of universal laws, with limited or no attention to that distracting variable, cultural context, that actually means the most to how people behave, how they function psychologically, and how they understand and interpret their lives.

I advocate a broader, more intellectually vibrant and inclusive philosophy of science. The goal of the human sciences should not be simply the pursuit of universal laws and the falsification of theo-
rories—no matter how dull or trivial the theory, no matter how little relation the theory has to how people experience life outside the laboratory. The goal of the human sci-
cences should be to use the tools of the scientific method to illuminate our understand-
ing of human behavior, human func-
tioning, and human development. The tools of the scientific method in psychology should be construed broadly to include not just lab-
oratory tasks but any systematic investigation of human phenomena. In this philosophy of science, the structured interview and the ethn-
ography are no less legitimate as tools of the
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**Teaching White Privilege to White Students Can Mean Saying Good-bye to Positive Student Evaluations**

Su L. Boatright-Horowitz and Sojatta Soeung

University of Rhode Island

As faculty and instructors working to re-
duce racism in our students and ourselves, we certainly know about the phenomenon alluded to in the title of this comment. Many of us have discussed it with our colleagues and administrators, but we lacked empirical evidence to support our views. Teaching antiracism can have a negative impact on our careers when students eval-
uate our teaching efforts and abilities (in fact, teaching antiracism has been called “the kiss of death,” Nast, 1999, p. 105). The published literature abounds with an-
ecdotes about negative student reactions to antiracism teaching, particularly when it involves teaching White students about White privilege (McIntosh, 1988). Some scholars have reported that their classroom teaching experiences were negatively im-
pacted, and their professional legitimacy questioned, because they discussed racism.
with White students (Williams & Evans-Winters, 2005). Students often reject both message and messenger, projecting their frustrations and emotions about this topic onto instructors. White students have been known to gather complaining outside the classroom after discussions of racism and privilege (Gillespie, Ashbaugh, & DeFiore, 2002). Yet psychology teachers have been given the goal by the American Psychological Association (APA) Task Force on Undergraduate Psychology Competencies to increase sociocultural and international awareness in our students (http://www.apa.org/ed/pceu/reports.html). Specifically, White students need to be encouraged to confront their own racist tendencies and acknowledge their privileged statuses, an important first step as they begin to understand diverse viewpoints. But as instructors, we face a serious dilemma. This form of antiracism teaching is potentially harmful to faculty careers.

White privilege refers to the many ways, typically invisible to White persons themselves, that White skin color is associated with prestige, privilege, and opportunities unavailable to other persons in society (McIntosh, 1988; see also www.tolerance.org). Discussions of this topic with White students will result in resistance, according to Tatum (1994), particularly if they are made to feel that they are “the bad guys” (p. 463) in society. According to Derald Wing Sue (2004, p. 763), “[K]nowingly or not, color blindness allows Whites to deny the experiential reality of minorities by minimizing the effects of racism and discrimination in their day-to-day lives.” In fact, research suggests that most White college students do not view modern society as racist (Boatright-Horowitz, 2005). Antiracism teachers have spoken of the pain that their White students experience as they begin to give up old ways of thinking, including feelings of grief at losing their belief in the American dream (Hogan, 2006). Thus, there can be real discomfort among White students as they begin to reject long-held national beliefs. White students may even perceive discussions of racism and privilege as personal attacks on themselves or their family members (Donadey, 2002). Clearly, admitting privilege can be an uncomfortable, if not painful, process for White students. It is reasonable to believe that creating these painful and distressful emotions in our students may negatively impact the way these students evaluate us as instructors, thereby damaging our careers.

Given these numerous anecdotal reports, it seemed useful to empirically test whether student evaluations of instructor competency would be negatively affected by a controversial and emotion-laden topic such as White privilege. In an ongoing study at the University of Rhode Island, we presented each of 456 Caucasian undergraduate students with one of four scenarios: African American or White instructors teaching either White privilege or social learning theory. We then asked participants to respond to questions regarding instructor performance that were identical to those used on our campus for student evaluations of teachers. These participants evaluated the instructors teaching White privilege significantly more negatively than they evaluated the instructors teaching social learning theory. Although reading a short scenario about classroom events may not be equivalent to actually being in the classroom, we suggest that this finding is initial empirical evidence that instructors who teach antiracism may experience serious professional disadvantages. Future research should address the types of teaching techniques that can mitigate student negativity. It is also important to examine the necessity of creating these negative emotions in order to facilitate attitude change about modern racism. In other words, is it true that “if it’s not hurting it’s not working” (Gaine, 2001)?

One might ask if antiracism teaching is still necessary today. After all, the country has just achieved an important historical milestone in presidential elections. Yet, it is naïve to suggest that a single political event, however welcomed by many of us, will immediately eliminate oppression and the daily effects of racism on every person of color in the United States. On the night of the recent presidential election, a White male news commentator on prime-time television stated that persons of color “have no more excuses.” Exposed to such views, our White students may become even more vulnerable to the naïveté and complacency associated with being a White person in our society. It is this complacency that can be disrupted by antiracism teaching and discussions of White privilege.

So, what can be done in this context? Our research provides support for the view that doing the right thing—that is, teaching antiracism—can be harmful to an instructor’s career. Therefore, we believe that student evaluations for some courses (e.g., psychology, sociology, geography, political science) should include items about whether students have acquired a less racist, more multicultural perspective. Otherwise, deciding whether to teach such courses becomes a personal ethical issue. Are you willing to accept the negative consequences of this form of teaching? Are your faculty colleagues and university administrators willing to support you in these efforts? We hope that this commentary, as well as the APA guidelines for undergraduate teaching, will be useful to teachers as they discuss these issues with students and administrators on their own campuses.
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