TEACHING ANTIRACISM IN A LARGE INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY CLASS
A Course Module and Its Evaluation

SU L. BOATRIGHT-HOROWITZ
University of Rhode Island

The effectiveness of an Introductory Psychology course module on racism was assessed using a short questionnaire immediately afterwards and then later at the end of the semester. Students of color were consistently more aware of the prevalence and manifestations of racism in U.S. society today, compared to White students. White students also appeared to exhibit self-serving biases related to ethnicity-based privileges. Reported attitude changes were not correlated with actual attitude changes, as assessed with this questionnaire. Overall, this course module was effective in changing the attitudes about racism in White students, yet its effect was limited. On the other hand, given the permanence of racist attitudes and beliefs, any measurable success in this context should be celebrated.

Keywords: *racism; prejudice; attitude change; teaching; introductory psychology*

Racism, both overt and subtle, is a major issue for educators today (Singh, 2001), particularly for those teaching in the field of psychology (American Psychological Association [APA], 1998; Puente, 1993). Yet teaching antiracism is a difficult task (Nast, 1999) that requires a willingness to discuss emotion-laden, contro-

---

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The author would like to acknowledge the role that the University of Rhode Island (U.R.I.) Multicultural Fellows Program plays in educating faculty about issues of racism and multiculturalism. Eileen Tierney in the U.R.I. Media Department of the library provides invaluable guidance in making faculty

JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, Vol. 36 No. 1, September 2005 34-51
DOI: 10.1177/0021934704266508

versial topics in the classroom, creating positive effects for students from diverse backgrounds, including those who are actively racist, those who are unknowingly racist (i.e., dysconscious racism; King, 1991), and those who are the targets of racism themselves.

Unfortunately, discussions of racism are extremely difficult for most college students (Young, 2003). Speaking about these issues has been shown to be so distressing that it can cause anxiety even when students are alone (Millstein, 1997). Furthermore, many students seem to believe that they are already fairly well informed regarding racism (Khan, 1999), and they are likely to be resistant to having their "assumptive worlds" challenged (Millstein, 1997). White students may perceive discussions of modern racism as personal attacks on themselves or their family members (Donadey, 2002). They may find these discussions difficult due to fears of appearing ignorant and of being labeled racists, without opportunity to clarify their comments (Bischoping et al., 2001). Students of color may feel uncomfortable and self-conscious during these discussions due to concerns that their White classmates are looking at them for their reactions (Tatum, 1999a). Students of color may also experience adverse effects in the form of damage to their self-images (McGregor, 1993). Adding to these many teaching concerns, instructors are often uncomfortable discussing these issues, and they may be justifiably concerned that the inclusion of antiracism training has been referred to as "a kind of kiss of death" in the context of student evaluations (Nast, 1999, p. 105).

As the instructor of a large (500-plus students) introductory psychology course at a predominately White university, I have the

---

aware of teaching resources related to multiculturalism, and it was she who originally suggested that the author show the videotape, "A Class Divided" to introductory psychology students. Professor Janet Kulberg, Associate Dean of the U.R.I. Graduate School, provided helpful comments on an early version of this article. The author is also grateful to the U.R.I. Instructional Development Program and the Teaching with Technology Program for their continuing support and guidance regarding undergraduate instruction. Requests for reprints should be sent to Su L. Boatright-Horowitz, Director of the Undergraduate Program in Psychology, Psychology Department, University of Rhode Island, South Kingston, RI 02881-0808.

opportunity to affect many students' views on racism. I am also fortunate to have the full support of my department and administration in the effort to educate our students about modern racism, using evaluative methods to guide new teaching strategies. Although it is important to incorporate a multicultural perspective throughout the curriculum (Nieto, 2000), it is also useful to include a course module on racism each semester. This part of the introductory psychology curriculum typically occurs during the second full week of the semester, and the content of this module has been developed gradually over the past several years, based on feedback from students and teaching assistants (TAs) in the course. The primary goals for this course module are to (a) identify racism as an important issue in the field of psychology, (b) educate students about how racism is manifested in today's society, (c) make it clear that active racism will not be tolerated in my classroom or on our campus, (d) affirm the experiences of students of color in the context of racism, (e) encourage White students to question their long-standing racist beliefs and assumptions, and (f) encourage social activism in all of our students.

A major premise in teaching this course module is that if you are White, then you are at times racist (see Blum, 1999, for a discussion of definitions of racism). The effects of "White privilege" (McIntosh, 1988) are unavoidable, given our historical time period and U.S. culture, so that even the nicest and most well-intentioned White people will be racist in their thoughts and actions (Millstein, 1997). Acknowledging this concept in the classroom can have benefits for both White students and students of color (Young, 2003; but see Levine-Rasky, 2000). Therefore, during the fall 2001 semester, I attempted to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of this course module, with the goal of assessing its quality for future improvement. It also seems likely that a teaching module on racism, even as a "work in progress," will be useful to other instructors who teach undergraduate courses, many of whom believe that "as educators, it is our quest to make our students aware of their 'personal baggage' (Beane, 1990), to help them look at their personal filters, and to gently remove their ethnocentric blinders" (Vora & Vora, 2002, p. 390).

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in a large (500-plus) introductory psychology course at a predominately White (approximately 89%) northeastern university. Participation was voluntary throughout this study and students did not receive course credit for participation.

PROCEDURE

This course was organized so that students attended class in a large lecture hall twice weekly and met in smaller groups, or recitations of about 35 students, at the end of each week. Graduate student TAs taught the recitations and were given structured outlines and reading materials for teaching preparation. Materials for the recitations on racism were discussed in a TA meeting prior to the scheduled classes as well as in a follow-up meeting. In general, each TA was responsible for teaching four recitation classes per week, except for one individual who, due to a different graduate assistantship assignment, taught only one recitation per week. During the semester that these data were collected, the TAs consisted of five individuals from varied ethnic backgrounds, including Turkish, Indian, African American, White American, and Hispanic American.

At the start of the fall semester, I asked my introductory psychology students to complete a short questionnaire to assess their attitudes and beliefs about racism in modern U.S. society. This pretest questionnaire consisted only of five items and was specifically designed to allow rapid administration in the large lecture hall, leaving ample class time for the class discussion and film presentation. Items on this questionnaire were also carefully worded to apply to the experiences of students from diverse ethnicities and backgrounds. In this pretest questionnaire, students were asked to indicate their levels of agreement with each statement below, using a scale ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*):

1. "Racism is still a major problem in the U.S. today."
2. "Racism affects the way I behave with others."
3. "Other people are likely to view me as racist."
4. "I have personally experienced many privileges based on my race or ethnicity."
5. "In general, Whites in U.S. society can be viewed as racist."

During this initial pretest, students were informed that they could keep their responses anonymous by writing a nickname of their choice at the top of the questionnaire, but they also were asked to remember their nicknames so that pretest responses could be matched with their responses on follow-up questionnaires later in the semester. The students were also told that they could use their own names for this purpose if that was their preference.

To initiate the class discussion on racism, I presented the Multicultural Mission Statement of the Psychology Department at our university (accessible via www.uri.edu/artsci/psy/ugresearch/mission.htm). Emphasis was placed on the broad definition of multiculturalism espoused in the department, incorporating ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, age, and other factors as potential sources of prejudice. A brief history of our department's struggle to develop this mission statement was presented, with mention of the heroic actions of several graduate students of color, who in previous years, were openly critical of our curriculum and the social climates in their respective graduate programs (Jones-Hudson, 2003). In the introductory psychology class, no attempt was made to present this information in a smooth and polished fashion; rather, it was a sincere and heartfelt description of events that probably seemed hesitant and slightly emotional, allowing students to see my personal discomfort in discussing these issues (see Locke & Kiselica, 1999). This presentation style was in distinct contrast to that used in several previous classes on research methods, which involved a more traditional lecture style. Finally, the difficulty of "living up" to the department's mission was mentioned, with the conclusion that it is our responsibility to struggle to do this in our own individual ways on a daily basis.

Next, the film "A Class Divided" (Peters, 1985) was introduced, and students were told that written comments from students in previous semesters would suggest that our class would also be a class divided—along racial or ethnic boundaries. Students in previous semesters were asked to write about their reactions to the film, indicating whether the antiracism training depicted in the film would be useful today. In general, written comments from students of color have indicated that they viewed racism to be a major problem in modern U.S. society, with the consequence that antiracism training, however painful for the individuals involved, should be part of an educational curriculum. In contrast, many White students in past semesters tended to suggest that racism is a less important issue today, seeming to view it as an unpleasant aspect of U.S. history without major implications for modern society. Thus, my personal observations in this context are consistent with those of Bischoping et al. (2001), who reported that White individuals often view racism to be a distant issue, rather than an immediate problem for themselves.

According to Donadey (2002), it is often easier to discuss experiences of oppression than our privileges. It is also important to acknowledge that White Americans cannot be categorized as "oppressed" versus "oppressor" in a way that determines all of an individual's social experiences (Kim, 2001). Therefore, in the subsequent recitation sections at the end of the week, the TAs discussed various aspects of modern racism, beginning with the suggestion that many of us have experienced discrimination in our lives (e.g., related to gender, religion, sexual orientation, geographical origin). TAs also included the caveat that these experiences will vary in both quality and quantity as a function of the characteristics of the individual that elicit prejudice in others. It was also pointed out that skin color is a highly salient personal characteristic that influences all of our daily social interactions. As a means of initiating group discussions on prejudice, the TAs asked their students for examples of situations in which they felt that they were targets of discrimination. When it was difficult to initiate student participation, the TAs stimulated group discussion by providing examples of their own personal experiences in this context, encour-

aging students to consider the pain and frustration associated with prejudice. The TAs then presented information regarding White privileges (McIntosh, 1988; see also Locke & Kiselica, 1999), identifying any specific examples that they felt would best illustrate this concept. Illustrations of the subtleties of modern racism were provided (e.g., "stereotype threat"; Wolfe & Spencer, 1996), and emphasis was placed on the concept that even nice people can unintentionally be racist in their thoughts and actions. Models of Whiteness (as discussed in Tatum, 1994) were presented, and students were asked to indicate in which category of the model (i.e., "White supremacists," "What Whiteness?," "guilty Whites," and "White allies") they belonged. The TAs also pointed out that, consistent with our department's multicultural mission statement, the category, "White allies" should probably be modified to reflect more types of prejudice. The term "multicultural allies," or even just "allies," was then suggested by the TAs or their students to incorporate this perspective. Next, the difficulties of being a social activist or "multicultural ally" were acknowledged, with mention of Tatum's poignant illustration (Lawrence & Tatum, 1997) of a woman who said, "I've had opportunities to be an ally and haven't been brave enough." Finally, the TAs discussed Tatum's (1999b) views on "what to do if you are called a racist," encouraging students to avoid defensiveness, to ask why they have given offense, then to seriously consider how their own actions may have caused someone to feel this way. At the end of each recitation, questionnaires were again administered to provide immediate feedback regarding changes in students' attitudes and beliefs about racism in modern society. Time constraints were less of a problem in the recitations; therefore, this second questionnaire included new items as well as the five items from the first questionnaire. In this longer version of the questionnaire, students were also asked, "How likely are you to join student organizations or participate in campus events that focus on reducing racism?" and "How much have your attitudes about racism changed as a result of our class presentation on racism?" with possible responses ranging from 0 (*highly unlikely*) to 10 (*highly likely*). Multiple-choice quizzes administered in the subsequent recitations included items relevant to both models of

racism and "what to do if you are called a racist." Furthermore, at the end of the semester, the longer version of the questionnaire was administered a second time in recitations to provide an additional assessment of long-term or "sleeper" effects (McGregor, 1993).

RESULTS

Although the total enrollment in the course was 544, only 350 students participated in the pretest, 440 participated in the immediate posttest, and 280 participated in the delayed posttest. Of these, 173 students participated in all three testing procedures. Students of color in this latter group consisted of 7 students who identified themselves as Black, 8 students who self-identified as Hispanic, 7 students who self-identified as Asian, 3 students who self-identified as Egyptian, and 1 student who self-identified as Polynesian. For students present in all of the class periods associated with this racism course module, means and standard deviations for student responses to the initial five items on the racism questionnaire are shown in Table 1. For the three test procedures, mean responses for the students of color tended to be higher than those of the White students for each of these five items.[1] Furthermore, an examination of Table 1 shows that 80% of the mean responses during immediate and delayed posttests were higher than those in the pretests. Specifically, for the students of color, 17 of the possible 20 mean responses for the two posttests were higher in value compared to pretest values; whereas, for the White students, 19 of the possible 20 mean responses for the posttests were higher in value than pretest values.

These data did not meet the assumptions for repeated measures testing, therefore, nonparametric tests were used in the following analyses.

Item 1: "Racism is still a major problem in U.S. society today." According to a Wilcoxon signed ranks test, there was a significant increase in agreement from pretesting to the immediate posttesting ($Z = 2.62$, $n = 147$, $p = .01$) for the White students. On the other hand, Wilcoxon tests that compared the results of pretesting with

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Items on Racism Questionnaire, Including Only Students Attending All Classes Related to Racism Course Module

		Pretest			*Immediate Posttest*			*Delayed Posttest*		
	Item	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Students of color	1	7.65	1.50	26	7.73	1.40	26	6.85	1.76	26
	2	3.81	3.03	26	3.54	3.06	26	4.12	3.18	25
	3	1.12	1.56	26	1.46	1.79	26	1.52	1.81	25
	4	3.77	2.57	26	3.73	2.27	26	4.44	2.53	25
	5	6.85	2.78	26	7.15	2.29	26	7.04	2.05	25
White students	1	7.07	1.96	147	7.39	1.94	147	6.68	1.87	147
	2	2.11	2.26	146	2.39	2.26	146	2.65	2.27	147
	3	1.01	2.03	147	1.23	1.83	147	1.36	1.71	146
	4	3.71	2.98	147	4.46	2.69	147	4.40	2.68	147
	5	5.31	2.79	146	6.05	2.56	146	5.83	2.52	146

delayed posttesting as well as immediate with delayed posttesting were significant, suggesting that, at the end of the semester, White students agreed less with the idea that racism is still a major problem in the United States ($Z = 2.60$, $n = 147$, $p = .01$ and $Z = 4.46$, $n = 147$, $p = .00$, respectively). For the students of color, there was no significant difference in responding between pretesting and the immediate posttest ($Z = 0.47$, $n = 26$, $p = .64$); however, response values for the delayed posttest decreased in comparison to the pretest ($Z = 2.69$, $n = 26$, $p = .01$) as well as in comparison to the immediate posttest ($Z = 2.48$, $n = 26$, $p = .01$).

Item 2: "Racism affects the way I behave with others." Wilcoxon tests did not reveal significant differences in results among the three tests for the students of color (all $p > .05$). Furthermore, according to Wilcoxon analyses, there was no significant difference in responding between pretesting and immediate posttesting for the White students ($p > .05$). On the other hand, the White students' mean responses to Item 2 were significantly greater (i.e., representing more agreement) for the delayed posttest compared to the pretest ($Z = 2.99$, $n = 146$, $p = .00$), and they approached significance in comparison to the immediate posttest ($Z = 1.92$, $n = 146$, $p = .06$).

Item 3: "Other people are likely to view me as racist." Wilcoxon tests revealed significant results, suggesting that the students of color increased their agreement with this statement from the time of the pretest to the immediate posttest ($Z = 2.08$, $n = 26$, $p = .04$). For these students, there were no significant differences between the pretest and delayed posttest ($Z = 1.04$, $n = 25$, $p = .30$) or between the immediate and delayed posttests ($Z = 0.41$, $n = 25$, $p = .68$). For the White students, there was a significant increase in the tendency to agree with this statement for the immediate posttest compared to the pretest ($Z = 2.89$, $n = 147$, $p = .00$) as well as for the delayed posttest compared to the pretest ($Z = 3.24$, $n = 146$, $p = .00$). There was no significant difference between the two posttests for these students ($Z = 0.99$, $n = 146$, $p = .32$).

Item 4: "I personally have experienced many privileges based on my race or ethnicity." For the White students, Wilcoxon tests revealed significant increases in agreement between pretesting and both immediate and delayed posttesting ($Z = 3.38$, $n = 147$, $p = .00$ and $Z = 2.72$, $n = 147$, $p = .01$, respectively). There were no significant differences in responding for the two posttests for these students ($Z = 0.06$, $n = 147$, $p = .95$). None of the Wilcoxon tests for the students of color were significant (all $p > .05$).

Item 5: "In general, Whites in U.S. society can be viewed as privileged." In this context, for the White students, there were significant increases in agreement between pretesting and the immediate posttest ($Z = 3.30$, $n = 145$, $p = .00$) as well as between pretesting and the delayed posttest ($Z = 2.13$, $n = 145$, $p = .03$). Comparison of the results for the immediate and delayed posttests were not significant for this group ($Z = 1.14$, $n = 145$, $p = .26$), and there were no significant differences in responding for the students of color (all $p > .05$).

The immediate and delayed posttests contained two additional items; therefore, data analyses for these two items are presented separately from the preceding items (see Table 2). As shown in this table, mean responses for the students of color were consistently greater than those for the White students for these additional questionnaire items.

TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Two Additional Items on Racism Questionnaire, Including Only Students Attending All Classes Related to Racism Course Module

		Immediate Posttest			*Delayed Posttest*		
	Item	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Students of color	6	6.27	2.69	26	5.21	2.98	26
	7	3.61	3.61	24	4.08	2.73	24
White students	6	4.92	2.73	147	4.15	2.56	143
	7	3.21	2.53	145	3.15	2.47	143

Item 6: "How likely are you to join student organizations or participate in campus events that focus on reducing racism?" The results of Wilcoxon tests showed that there was a significant decrease in the reported likelihood of engaging in these activities for both groups of students ($Z = 2.18$, $n = 24$, $p = .03$ for students of color; $Z = 3.40$, $n = 138$, $p = .00$ for White students).

Item 7: "How much have your attitudes about racism changed, as a result of our class presentation on racism?" Wilcoxon tests showed no significant differences in responding for either the students of color or the White students, in comparisons of the immediate and delayed posttests (all $p > .05$). For each of the initial five items on the questionnaire, measures of attitude change for individual students were computed by calculating ratios with posttest responses as the numerators and pretest responses as the denominators, so that higher ratio values represented greater actual attitude changes. These ratio measures of attitude change were not correlated with students' reported attitude changes in Item 7 (all $p > .05$), although reported attitude changes for the two posttests were significantly correlated with each other ($r = .39$, $p = .00$, $n = 224$).

An examination of the data for students who appeared to miss one or more class presentations during the racism component of the course revealed some interesting findings. Specifically, when students missed or failed to participate in the large lecture or the recitation portions of this course module, but were present to respond to

the questionnaire at the time of the delayed posttest, there was less agreement with Item 4 regarding their personal experiences of White privilege ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 2.85$, $n = 88$) and less agreement with Item 5 regarding the general statement that White privilege exists in today's society ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 2.86$, $n = 87$), compared to students who were present for these classes ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 2.62$, $n = 191$ and $M = 5.96$, $SD = 2.48$, $n = 190$, respectively). t test results were significant (i.e., for Item 4, $t[277] = 2.37$, $p = .02$, two-tailed, and for Item 5, $t[275] = 2.16$, $p = 0.03$, two-tailed). Students who were apparently absent from the large lecture, but were present and willing to participate at the time of the delayed posttest, agreed significantly less with Item 4 related to personally benefiting from White privilege ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 2.71$, $n = 47$), compared to students who were present and willing to participate during these class periods ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 2.69$, $n = 232$; $t[277] = 2.33$, $p = .02$, two-tailed). Furthermore, comparison of these same two groups revealed a difference that approached significance for Item 6 regarding joining clubs or attending events related to racism (for students apparently absent from the lecture, $M = 3.65$, $SD = 2.41$, $n = 46$; whereas for those who were present, $M = 4.44$, $SD = 2.64$, $n = 227$; $t[271] = 1.88$, $p = .06$, two-tailed), suggesting that the large lecture also had a desirable effect on students' willingness to engage in social activism. Finally, mean responses for students who were apparently absent from the recitation, but present for the delayed posttest, were compared with those students who were present for the recitation. This analysis revealed a difference for Item 2 that approached significance (absent from the recitation, $M = 2.13$, $SD = 2.15$, $n = 45$; present and willing to participate, $M = 2.86$, $SD = 2.57$, $n = 232$; $t[275] = 1.78$, $p = .08$, two-tailed), suggesting that students were more likely to view their behavior to be affected by racism as a result of the recitation portion of the racism course component.

DISCUSSION

Although participant numbers differed substantially, these results suggest that ethnicity played a strong role in student reactions to this course module on racism. Students of color were consistently more aware of the existence and manifestations of racism in modern U.S. society than the White students. These data also suggest that the course module affected the views of White students in a variety of ways. For instance, White students showed an increased tendency to agree that racism is still a major problem in U.S. society today, although this tendency did not appear to last until the second posttest at the end of the semester. There was no such increase in agreement regarding this statement for the students of color, presumably because many of these students were well aware of the existence of racism prior to enrollment in the course. It is interesting to note that both of these groups of students agreed less with this statement at the end of the semester. One interpretation of this latter finding is that student experiences on our campus may lead them to believe that racism is less of a societal problem. Many people on our campus make a strong effort to provide antiracism training for undergraduate students. Our campus has a very active Multicultural Center as well as a highly successful administrative organization called Talent Development that recruits and provides academic and other support to students of color. Furthermore, every fall semester, we have a weeklong series of workshops on diversity, with thousands of students attending or participating. Our large (500-plus students) and very popular Sociology 100 course involves active antiracism training, as do many other courses on our campus, including the mandatory freshmen orientation course called URI101. These efforts, and those of many other administrative offices and student organizations, are relatively high profile; therefore, it is also feasible that our students are led to believe that racism on campus is less of a problem than it actually tends to be in other settings. It is also feasible that this course module on racism may have contributed to this apparent change in the students' perspectives.

This racism course module appeared to have little or no impact on whether students of color viewed their behavior to be affected by racism. In contrast, the White students were more likely to agree with this statement at the end of the semester during the delayed posttest. Although this change in attitude may reflect "sleeper" effects (McGregor, 1993), it may have resulted from our campus-wide efforts to reduce racism. On the other hand, these data suggest that attendance in the recitation portion of the course module facilitated this specific type of attitude change. Acceptance of the idea that other people may view one as racist seemed to occur for the White students, remaining stable until the end of the semester. A similar change occurred for the students of color immediately following the racism module in the course, yet this change in attitude did not appear to persist until the time of the delayed posttest, perhaps because it was contradicted by their subsequent experiences on campus.

Acknowledgement of personal privileges based on ethnicity occurred for the White students, persisting throughout the semester. The students of color showed no such change in attitude. The portion of the course module that seemed most effective in this context was the large lecture presentation, with the relevant change in attitude apparent at the time of the delayed posttest. Agreement with the statement that Whites, in general, are privileged in today's society, increased and then remained stable for the White students, with no comparable change in attitude for the students of color. It is interesting that the White students agreed more with this general statement about the existence of White privileges in today's U.S. society than the statement that they, as White individuals, personally benefited from these privileges, thereby revealing a self-serving bias (see e.g., Nurmi, 1992, regarding "self-serving biases"). It is not clear whether the students of color would have shown a similar tendency (i.e., the wording in Item 5 of the questionnaire referred only to White privileges).

When asked about the likelihood that they would join student organizations or participate in events related to racism, both the students of color and the White students indicated that they were less likely to do this at the end of the semester. A reasonable explanation

of this finding is that, at the end of the semester, students had busy schedules and concerns about final exams that precluded participation in events related to social activism. Future evaluations of this course module on racism should include a question about students' willingness to participate in social activism at the time of the initial pretest, despite concerns about questionnaire length. From a psychological perspective, it is interesting that students' reports of attitude change resulting from this course module on racism were not related to their actual levels of attitude change as assessed by the first five items on the questionnaires. This finding is consistent with much of the published literature (e.g., Gibbons, 1983) suggesting that we are often unaware of the factors that influence our views and perspectives.

Examination of student attendance showed that this course module directly impacted White students' views on racism and suggested that the lecture and recitations had differential effects on students' perspectives. Participation in either the large lecture or the recitation appeared to increase the likelihood that students would agree that White privileges exist today and that they themselves benefited from these privileges, but this effect was not apparent until the end of the semester at the time of the delayed posttest. If students missed the recitation but were present for the large lecture, then they were significantly more likely to agree that they themselves benefited from White privileges, again for the delayed posttest at the end of the semester. This latter finding seems counterintuitive because the information on White privileges was presented in recitations. Yet it is feasible that attendance at the large lecture enhanced the credibility of the course materials that had to be obtained from classmates when students missed their recitations and/or that subsequently encountering the quiz questions on racism facilitated attitude change. Attendance in the large lecture also appeared to increase the likelihood of students saying that they would join a club or attend an event related to reducing racism, whereas attendance in the recitations increased the likelihood that students would say that their own behavior was affected by racism, with each of these effects apparent during the delayed posttest at the end of the semester. Therefore, this course module on racism can be

viewed as a unit that should be presented as a whole to students to achieve its full impact. In future classes, incentives will be offered for attending and participating in each portion of this course module. I believe that it was the combined efforts of the TAs and myself that contributed to our students' changes in perspectives and that this course module should be viewed as part of an even greater constellation of antiracism efforts across our entire campus.

To conclude, the racism course module presented here appeared to have some of the desired effects on undergraduate views about racism. These data reveal changes in student attitudes regarding the existence of racism in modern U.S. society as well as the impact of racism on the lives of both White students and students of color. On the other hand, it does not seem appropriate to describe this course module as highly effective and we certainly cannot view it as a real cure for racism on college campuses. Examination of the mean response values for White students in Table 1 are disappointing when compared to the full range of possible levels of agreement with the various statements in the questionnaire. For example, Items 1 and 5 involved general statements about racism in society that did not address the students' own experiences and achievements. The mean responses for these questions ranged from 5.31 to 7.39 points, based on a scale with a maximum of 10 points. Responses to the remaining three items on this questionnaire that dealt with more personal experiences related to racism ranged from 1.01 to 4.06 points for White students, so that all of the mean responses were close to the low values (i.e., disagreement) on this scale. It would appear that, although the course module was effective in changing White students' attitudes about racism, some of these changes can best be described as a shift from "strongly disagreeing" with each statement to still "disagreeing" but slightly less so. On the other hand, antiracism training is an important aspect of any introductory psychology course and we should probably celebrate any measurable success in this context. A relentless optimism can help fuel our ongoing efforts in the struggle against racism. Personally, I find it helpful to remember the words of one student in Millstein's (1997, p. 500) course on racism, "If my steps are halting, that's fine, shuffling is still movement."

NOTE

1. The same general pattern holds true when the data from all students are examined. In this context, mean responses for the students of color were higher for every item on the questionnaire than those of the White students, except for a single item on the immediate posttest (i.e., Item 4: for students of color, $M = 3.28$, $SD = 2.70$, $n = 50$; for White students, $M = 4.37$, $SD = 2.65$, $n = 316$).

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (1998). *APA online: Support of the goals of the 2001 World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance*. Retrieved August 5, 2003, from http://www.apa.org/pi/racismresolution.html

Beane, M. K. (1990). *Affect in the classroom: Toward democracy, dignity, and diversity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bischoping, K., Dodds, C., Jama, M., Johnson, C., Kalmin, A., & Reid, K. (2001). Talking about silence: Reflections on "race" in a university course on genocide. *Reflective Practice, 2*, 155-169.

Blum, L. (1999). What is "racism" in antiracist education? *Teachers College Record, 100*, 860-880.

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

Gibbons, F. X. (1983). Self-attention and self-report: The "veridicality" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality, 51*, 517-542.

Jones-Hudson, V. D. (2003). Building a multicultural community: One department's transformation. In P. Bronstein & K. Quina (Eds.), *Teaching gender and multicultural awareness: Resources for the psychology classroom* (pp. 315-323). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Khan, S. R. (1999). Teaching an undergraduate course on the psychology of racism. *Teaching of Psychology, 26*, 28-33.

Kim, L. M. (2001). I was [so] busy fighting racism that I didn't even know I was oppressed as a woman!: Challenges, changes, and empowerment in teaching about women of color. *NWSA Journal, 13*, 98-111.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*, 133-146.

Lawrence, S. M., & Tatum, B. D. (1997). Teachers in transition: The impact of antiracist professional development on classroom practice [Electronic version]. *Teachers College Record, 99*, 162-178.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2000). Framing Whiteness: Working through the tension in introducing Whiteness to educators. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 3*, 271-292.

Locke, D. C., & Kiselica, M. S. (1999). Pedagogy of possibilities: Teaching about racism in multicultural counseling courses. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 80-87.

McGregor, J. (1993). Effectiveness of role-playing and antiracist teaching in reducing student prejudice. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*, 215-226.

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.

Millstein, K. H. (1997). The taping project: A method for self-evaluation and information consciousness in racism courses. *Journal of Social Work Education, 33*, 491-506.

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.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Nurmi, J. (1992). Cross-cultural differences in self-serving bias: Responses to the Attributional Style Questionnaire by American and Finnish students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*, 69-76.

Peters, W. (Producer, Director). (1985). *A class divided* [Videotape]. Yale University Films for Frontline, produced for the Documentary Consortium by WGBH, Boston. (Available from PBS Home Video Catalogue Mail Order Center, P. O. Box 751089, Charlotte, NC 28275-1089)

Puente, A. E. (1993). Toward a psychology of variance: Increasing the presence and understanding of ethnic minorities in psychology. In T. L. McGovern (Ed.), *Handbook for enhancing undergraduate education in psychology* (pp. 71-92). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Singh, B. R. (2001). Citizenship education and the challenge of racism, discrimination and disadvantage. *Contemporary Politics, 7*, 299-318.

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.

Tatum, B. D. (1999a). It's not so black and white. *Instructor-Intermediate, 108*, 29-31.

Tatum, B. D. (1999b, September). When you're called a racist. *Education Digest, 65*(1), 29-32.

Vora, E., & Vora, J. A. (2002). Undoing racism in America: Help from a Black church. *Journal of Black Studies, 32*, 389-404.

Wolfe, C. T., & Spencer, S. J. (1996). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their overt and subtle influence in the classroom. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 176-185.

Young, G. (2003). Dealing with difficult classroom dialogue. In P. Bronstein & K. Quina (Eds.), *Teaching gender and multicultural awareness: Resources for the psychology classroom* (pp. 315-323). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Su L. Boatright-Horowitz, Ph.D., received her doctoral degree in 1991 in biopsychology and joined the Psychology Department at the University of Rhode Island during the following year. She is currently serving as the director of the undergraduate program in psychology, conducting research in a variety of fields, including undergraduate teaching and programming.