intellectual and scientific scope mainly to the laboratory, where experimental situations can be carefully controlled. The problem with this focus is that laboratory studies are often ecologically invalid and have little relation to how people actually live and how they experience their lives. There are many aspects of human development, behavior, and experience that are worth investigating even if they cannot be reduced to falsifiable theories (Rogoff, 2003). Psychology needs to get over its "physics envy" and adapt its methods and theoretical approaches to its uniquely human topic, in all its cultural complexity and diversity, rather than endlessly and fruitlessly 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 understanding of human psychology could be attained through cross-cultural research, not realizing how transporting American-based theories and methods to other cultures might result in missing the most distinctive and essential features of those cultures. The two opposing comments represented 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 processes 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 theories—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 sciences should be to use the tools of the scientific method to illuminate our understanding of human behavior, human functioning, and human development. The tools of the scientific method in psychology should be construed broadly to include not just laboratory tasks but any systematic investigation of human phenomena. In this philosophy of science, the structured interview and the ethnography are no less legitimate as tools of the

scientific method than are the laboratory or the questionnaire. Many diverse methods are welcome, and all contribute valuable pieces to the mosaic that makes up a full understanding of humanity.

That mosaic is still missing many large and essential pieces, over a century after psychology was first established as a field. However, many research psychologists are working daily to fill it in, using a wide range of theories and methods (Jensen, in press). What we need now in American psychology is not a narrowing of theories and methods to those that seem best to mimic the methods of the natural sciences, but a wider range of new, creative theories and methods, synthesizing cultural perspectives from all over the world, that will broaden our understanding of the endlessly fascinating human experience.

REFERENCES

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63,* 602–614.

French, D. C., Rianasari, J. M., Pidada, S., Nelwan, P., & Buhrmester, D. (2001). Social support of Indonesian and U.S. children and adolescents by family members and friends. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 47,* 377–394.

Haeffel, G. J., Thiessen, E. D., Campbell, M. W., Kaschak, M. P., & McNeil, N. M. (2009). Theory, not cultural context, will advance American psychology. *American Psychologist, 64,* 570–571.

Jensen, L. (in press). *Bridging developmental and cultural psychology: New syntheses in theory, research, and policy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kalipeni, E., Craddock, S., Ghosh, J., & Oppong, J. R. (2008). *HIV and AIDS in Africa: Beyond epidemiology.* New York: Wiley.

Larson, R., Verma, S., & Dworkin, J. (2003). Adolescence without disengagement: The daily family lives of Indian middle-class teenagers. In T. S. Saraswathi (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives in human development: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 258–286). New Delhi, India: Sage.

Laursen, B., Coy, K. C., & Collins, W. A. (1998). Reconsidering changes in parent–child conflict across adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Child Development, 69,* 817–832.

LoSchiavo, F. M., & Shatz, M. A. (2009). Reaching the neglected 95%. *American Psychologist, 64,* 565–566.

Meehl, P. E. (1978). Theoretical risks and tabular asterisks: Sir Karl, Sir Ronald, and the slow progress of soft psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46,* 806–834.

Norenzayan, A., & Heine, S. J. (2005). Psychological universals: What are they and how can we know? *Psychological Bulletin, 131,* 763–784.

Popper, K. R. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery.* London: Hutchinson.

Population Reference Bureau. (2006). *2006 world population data sheet.* Washington, DC: Author.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Schlegel, A., & Barry, H. (1991). *Adolescence: An anthropological inquiry.* New York: Free Press.

Steinberg, L. (1989). Pubertal maturation and parent–adolescent distance: An evolutionary perspective. In G. Adams, R. Montemayor, & T. Gullotta (Eds.), *Advances in adolescent development* (Vol. 1, pp. 71–97). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Stroebe, W., & Nijstad, B. (2009). Do our psychological laws apply only to Americans? *American Psychologist, 64,* 569.

Van Horn, K. R., & Cunegatto Marques, J. (2000). Interpersonal relationships in Brazilian adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24,* 199–203.

Webster, G. D., Nichols, A. L., & Schember, T. O. (2009). American psychology *is* becoming more international. *American Psychologist, 64,* 566–568.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Jeffrey Jensen Arnett, Department of Psychology, Clark University, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610. E-mail: arnett@jeffreyarnett.com

Teaching White Privilege to White Students Can Mean Saying Good-bye to Positive Student Evaluations

Su L. Boatright-Horowitz and Sojattra Soeung
University of Rhode Island

As faculty and instructors working to reduce 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 evaluate 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 anecdotes 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 impacted, 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/pcue/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 naivete 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.

REFERENCES

Boatright-Horowitz, S. L. (2005). Teaching antiracism in a large introductory psychology class: A course module and its evaluation. *Journal of Black Studies, 36,* 34–51.

Donadey, A. (2002). Negotiating tensions: Teaching about race issues in graduate feminist classrooms. *NWSA Journal, 14,* 82–102.

Gaine, C. (2001). If it's not hurting it's not working: Teaching teachers about 'race.' *Research Papers in Education, 16,* 93–113.

Gillespie, D., Ashbaugh, L., & DeFiore, J. (2002). White women teaching White women about White Privilege, race cognizance and social action: Toward a pedagogical pragmatics. *Race, Ethnicity & Education, 5,* 237–253.

Hogan, M. I. (2006). Making contact: Teaching, bodies, and the ethics of multiculturalism. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28,* 355–366.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies* (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

Nast, H. J. (1999). Sex, race, and multiculturalism: Critical consumption and the politics of course evaluations. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 23,* 102–115.

Sue, D. W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist, 59,* 761–769.

Tatum, B. D. (1994). Teaching White students about racism: The search for White allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record, 95,* 462–476.

Williams, D. G., & Evans-Winters, V. (2005). The burden of teaching teachers: Memoirs of race discourse in teacher education. *The Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 37,* 201–219.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Su L. Boatright-Horowitz, Psychology Department, University of Rhode Island, Kingstown, RI 02881. E-mail: ugpsych@gmail.com