

4-19-2011

Higher Education Faculty's Attitudes toward White Privilege

Rebecca Ann Burns

University of Missouri-St. Louis, rabd4f@mail.umsl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://irl.umsl.edu/thesis>

Recommended Citation

Burns, Rebecca Ann, "Higher Education Faculty's Attitudes toward White Privilege" (2011). *Theses*. 72.
<http://irl.umsl.edu/thesis/72>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Works at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact marvinh@umsl.edu.

Higher Education Faculty's Attitudes toward White Privilege

Rebecca A. Burns

M.S.W., Social Work, Washington University in St. Louis, 2009

B.A.S., Human Services, Washburn University, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri – St. Louis in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Education in Adult and Higher Education

May 2011

Advisory Committee

E. Paulette Isaac-Savage, Ed.D.
Chairperson

Angela Coker, Ph.D.

Pi-Chi Han, Ed.D.

Abstract

This study was completed between the months of March 2011 and April 2011, and focused on White privilege attitudes among both part- and full-time faculty members in a College of Education at a metropolitan university in the Midwestern United States. Specifically, it answered the following question: What is the relationship between the participants' demographic characteristics and their White privilege attitudes? Eighty-four White, Caucasian, or European American faculty members were selected for this study, and a total of 17 faculty members participated in the study. Two survey instruments were administered. The first was a demographic survey that obtained information, which included: age; gender; race / ethnicity; highest level of education completed; current area of residence; level of exposure to people of color; and number of multicultural courses, workshops, and conference sessions attended in the last five years in which White privilege was discussed. The second survey instrument administered was the White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS), which measures White privilege from three distinct dimensions: affective; behavioral; and cognitive (Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009).

The results of this study suggest that younger faculty members may experience greater remorse associated with White privilege. Additionally, younger faculty may also experience greater affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions to their exposure to White privilege, as opposed to older faculty. The data also indicates that faculty members who had completed a Doctor of Philosophy Degree may have a greater understanding of the potential costs of addressing their White privilege on both personal and professional levels. Faculty who live in suburban settings may experience the least amount of remorse associated with White privilege. Finally, the study concludes that the demographics of faculty members may impact their remorse associated with White privilege. This study is important for the following reasons: (a) it uncovers the attitudes White faculty hold with regards to White privilege; (b) the results may drive faculty members toward an increase in self-awareness; and (c) the results of this research may encourage higher education programs to supplement their curriculum with classes or workshops which introduce aspiring faculty members to White privilege and its effects in educational settings.

Introduction

I first became introduced to the concept of White privilege in a United States history course I was taking during my freshman year of college. In this course, the professor presented his students with several writings from Native American leaders to their various tribes. This was the first time in which I could remember actually reading literature directly from Native peoples and not merely written about them. Most, if not all of the literature I had been exposed to in my educational career, up to that point, that focused on the experiences of people of color had been written by White writers about people of color. Therefore, I found this experience of reading actual writings from Native American leaders particularly intriguing, as it reflected the viewpoints of these leaders, while demonstrating their cultural backgrounds and traditions.

It was also in this course that I was exposed to the cruelty of many of White America's heroes toward people of color. For example, I learned of Andrew Jackson's treatment of Native Americans and his support of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 (Baptiste & Araujo, 2004). Once exposed to this information, I immediately thought about U.S. currency and how Andrew Jackson is forever immortalized on the twenty dollar bill – a symbol of excellence – yet somehow his actions against people of color have been overlooked by White American society. I remember feeling cheated by my elementary and secondary education because it was not until I reached adulthood that I was presented with a more comprehensive understanding of American history.

In the years following, I have taken many classes devoted to recognizing cultural diversity and building the skills necessary to become a more culturally competent professional. These courses have continuously brought awareness to the unique

experiences that people of color and other minority populations have in their higher education programs. I became aware of the hostility that many White professionals in higher education have toward people of color and the resulting consequences experienced by people of color. It was not until I was introduced to Peggy McIntosh's article, *White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack* (2007), that I fully comprehended how different my experiences had been in higher education. I do not have to think about how my White race impacts me on a daily basis because my racial identity is considered the "norm" in both higher education institutions and in the larger American society. As a result, I realized that not only was I not provided with a comprehensive educational experience in elementary and secondary education, but that the very institution that had introduced me to the concept of White privilege and its impact on education – the university setting – was also creating environments that perpetuated White privilege in academia. As a White graduate student in the Adult and Higher Education degree program, I realized that it is my responsibility to educate and bring awareness to the role that White privilege plays in higher education institutions.

Background

Since our society has become more diverse, many higher education institutions have made concerted efforts to increase diversity on their campuses. This includes recruiting students and hiring faculty from underrepresented groups (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009). Despite these efforts, some faculty members of color at predominately white institutions (PWI) do not feel welcomed on campuses (Diggs et al.; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009). In addition, students of color on the same campuses often feel isolated, because they do not see faculty who reflect them

(Jayakumar et al.). Furthermore, White faculty members may be unaware of the concept of White privilege, the benefits associated with White privilege, and how it may impact their classroom and campus environments (Hays, Chang, Decker, 2003). Much of the literature on White privilege in higher education has focused on students' attitudes toward White privilege (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Heinze, 2008; Kernahan & Davis, 2007; Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; Spanierman, Poteat, Wang, & Oh, 2008). The purpose of this research, then, was to examine White faculty's attitudes toward White privilege. Specifically, this study answered the following question: What is the relationship between the participants' demographic characteristics and their White privilege attitudes?

White privilege is described within the literature as the unearned benefits White individuals in the United States receive solely on the basis of their race (Manglitz, 2008; Pinterits et al., 2009). Examples of such privilege include, but are not limited to experiencing one's racial identity as the accepted norm; feeling superior to others based on one's race; and the capacity to ignore race or racism when one chooses to do so (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). Not only are these advantages experienced by White individuals, but the privilege extends to institutions and impacts the ways in which Whites benefit in a variety of institutionalized systems: the legal system, the housing market, the media, and in the workforce (Ancis & Szymanski). Because Whites experience this privilege on both individual and societal levels, they begin to feel entitled to having such advantages, and as a result, many Whites work to protect their privilege by "aggressing against perceived threats to the racial status quo" (Helms, 1995, p. 188). Thus, White privilege

perpetuates the very racial inequalities that have existed for generations (Ancis & Szymanski).

Research studies in the literature focus primarily on White privilege awareness and attitudes among university students (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Heinze, 2008; Kernahan & Davis, 2007; Pinterits et al., 2009; Spanierman et al., 2008). To the researcher's knowledge, there are limited studies which focus on the White privilege attitudes among faculty at PWI. It is important to assess these attitudes in educators, as faculty may use their position in the classroom to bring awareness to and work toward ending White privilege (Manglitz, 2003). However, without assessing faculty's attitudes toward White privilege, educators may create classroom environments that perpetuate White privilege and isolate their students of color (Manglitz).

In addition, studies have shown that introducing the concept of White privilege into multicultural education curricula increases the likelihood that participants will experience individual-level and collective guilt regarding racial inequalities (Kernahan & Davis, 2007; Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Spanierman et al., 2008). One study conducted by Powell, Branscombe, and Schmitt, suggested that focusing multicultural education on the disadvantages experienced by African Americans may actually encourage Whites to maintain their innocence in terms of racial inequality and, as a result of this, it may actually promote more racist beliefs among Whites toward African Americans. In contrast, as a result of learning about White privilege, White participants may become increasingly aware of the unjustified advantages they receive on the basis of their race, and therefore, experience a greater level of personal responsibility in promoting racial equality (Kernahan & Davis; Powell et al.). This guilt leads participants

to support efforts that work toward healing the harm caused by racism as well as support policies that eradicate institutional racism (Powell et al.).

Finally, those faculty members that face oppression in other aspects of their lives (i.e., women faculty experiencing male privilege) may have a heightened awareness of the existence of White privilege (Neville, Lilly, Lee, Duran, & Browne, 2000). Because women face institutional discrimination as a result of sexism, women faculty members may demonstrate “stronger negative feelings about White privilege and greater willingness to disrupt such privilege” (Pinterits et al., 2009, p. 427), than that of their male counterparts.

Literature Review

This next section will cover the impact of White privilege on higher education institutions and will identify how White privilege attitudes are defined within the context of this study.

White Privilege and Its Impact on Higher Education

As previously stated, one consequence of White privilege is that Whites are seen as the norm in American society, which is also true for higher education institutions in the United States. Throughout the course of American history and continued on today, White privilege has had and continues to have a profound impact on the curriculum taught and the instructional methods used in higher education classes (Manglitz, 2003). First, because there is a disproportionately larger number of Whites as faculty and administrators in higher education, Whites are given more authority to dictate curricula implemented in such institutions (Diggs et al., 2009). Research on academic and social outcomes among college students concludes “that faculty are the greatest socializing

agents on campus” (Rankin & Reason, 2005, p.58), therefore, indicating the tremendous influence faculty members and an underrepresentation of faculty of color have on the experiences of their students. Likewise, many of the theories and practices associated with adult education inevitably amplify the underlying belief that the White racial identity is the norm and that anyone else is seen as “‘other’ (which often results in a view of the ‘other’ as inferior, at risk, or somehow deficient)” (Manglitz, 2003, p. 121). Such theories and practices include those that “stress individualism, linear thinking, and Anglo European values of self-sufficiency [that] have been generalized to all adults as ‘universal’” (Johnson-Bailey, 2001, p. 92).

In addition, because White faculty members are more inclined to view their students from a White perspective, they may have a biased understanding of their students’ academic performance by comparing them with the White standards that the faculty members hold (Manglitz, 2003). Therefore, White identity, both that of the professor’s and of the students’, not only represents the norm in higher education, but it also symbolizes competence, intellect, and authority (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998). This is further demonstrated through the experiences of students of color who may feel that they are expected to prove themselves academically to their White professors (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998). White faculty members are also more likely to have adopted a White worldview, which may be represented in the material presented to their students (Manglitz). The information given in the classroom may be skewed to favor Whites and their understanding of historical and current events, which limits the quality of education for all students, both White and those of color. Finally, studies have shown that White helping professionals, which includes White instructors and educators may

have a distorted view of the culturally diverse individuals with whom they work, and therefore, have difficulty establishing a trusting, helping relationship with these students (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Gushue, 2007). This results in a potential strain in the professor-learner relationship (Manglitz).

Several research studies have been conducted on the educational experiences held by White college students and by students of color (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998; Johnson-Bailey, et al., 2009; Rankin & Reason, 2005). One such study concluded that on the same campus, students of color identified experiencing harassment “that interferes with learning, at higher rates than White students” (Rankin & Reason, 2005, p. 43). In this same study, although Whites and students of color identified approximately the same rates of racial harassment on their campus, Whites reported the campus climate as less racist and more accepting than did the students of color, and Whites were also more likely to report that the campus climate was consistently improving (Rankin & Reason). Campus climate has been linked to students’ educational achievement, social interactions (Rankin & Reason), participation in classroom discussion, and retention rates (Johnson-Bailey et al.). The results of this study indicate the presence of White privilege on university and college campuses in contemporary American society (Rankin & Reason).

Peggy McIntosh (2007), identifies multiple illustrations of the benefits she receives as a result of White privilege. Several of these advantages can be directly related to higher education classrooms. For example, McIntosh identifies how Whites “can be fairly sure of having [their] voice[s] heard in a group in which [they are] the only member[s] of [their] race” (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998, p. 390). This indicates that regardless of the presence of or lack of other White students in a given classroom, a

single White student will almost always feel that he or she can express his or her viewpoint without being overlooked or undervalued by the other members of the class. In addition, McIntosh further demonstrates White privilege in higher education classrooms by acknowledging that Whites are “never asked to speak for all the people of [their] racial group” (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998, p. 390). However, many times, people of color are expected to educate their peers on the experiences of their own racial groups. In addition, students of color are frequently represented as the “token” of that particular population group (i.e., the “token” Black man of the class). White professors also stereotype people of color in this regard. According to previous research conducted in the field of higher education, many Black college students indicated that they felt that their “White college professors stereotyped them as one-dimensional representatives of their race, often calling on them to serve as racial representatives or spokespersons” (Johnson-Bailey et al., 2009, p. 182).

White Privilege Attitudes

White Privilege attitudes are characterized by the “strong affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions” (Pinterits et al., 2009, p. 417), experienced when a White individual becomes aware of the White privilege from which he or she has benefitted (Breckler, 1984). The affective dimensions of White privilege attitudes involve the emotional responses of the individual, and can include: anxiety; remorse; shame; irritation; and rage (Pinterits et al.). The cognitive dimensions experienced by an individual who is introduced to White privilege include: minimization of the experiences of people of color; justification for racism or for one’s own racist actions; as well as acknowledging one’s own responsibility in eliminating White privilege and racism (Pinterits et al.).

Finally, the behavioral dimensions of White privilege attitudes include such acts as avoiding discussions regarding White privilege, or committing to the discontinuance of White privilege and its benefits (Pinterits et al.).

Perspectives / Theoretical Framework

When examining the concept of White privilege as it relates to higher education, it is critical to have a theoretical understanding of the development of White racial identity. Janet E. Helms' (1995) White Racial Identity Model creates a framework in which to further comprehend the process through which Whites gain awareness of and overcome the consequences of racism and White privilege.

White Racial Identity Model – Helms

Helm's (1995) defines White Americans as “those Americans who self-identify or are commonly identified as belonging exclusively to the White racial group regardless of the continental source (e.g., Europe, Asia) of that racial ancestry” (p. 188). According to Helm's (1995) White Racial Identity Model, Whites progress through six statuses in their quest toward achieving a White identity void of racism. The stage in which a White individual finds himself or herself may influence the attitudes he or she holds with regard to White privilege. The first status in White racial identity is deemed the *contact stage* (Gushue & Constantine, 2007; Helms, 1995; Heinze, 2008; Parks, 2006). While in this status, Whites are unaware of racism and White privilege, and seldom describe themselves as being White (Gushue & Constantine; Helms; Parks). In the second stage, identified as *disintegration*, Whites first recognize their association with the dominant race or ethnic group and become aware of racism (Gushue & Constantine; Helms; Swim & Miller, 1999). The *reintegration*, or third stage is demonstrated by Whites idealizing

White values, and distancing themselves from those who do not identify as White (Gushue & Constantine; Helms).

Unlike the previous statuses, Whites in the *pseudoindependence* stage start to acknowledge the benefits they have experienced as a result of White privilege; however, they may also hold onto their previous conceived notions about people of color (Gushue & Constantine, 2007; Helms, 1995). The fifth status is called the *immersion / emersion stage* (Gushue & Constantine; Helms; Parks, 2006; Swim & Miller, 1999). Those who fall within this status, begin seeking a nonracist understanding of their Whiteness, and begin taking steps toward social justice (Gushue & Constantine; Helms; Parks). The final stage in Helm's White Racial Identity Model is the *autonomy* status (Gushue & Constantine; Helms; Heinze, 2008; Parks). Whites in this status are characterized by having a positive view of their Whiteness, while valuing the cultural perspectives of others (Gushue & Constantine; Helms). They aim to eliminate racial inequalities and forfeit any benefits they have received as a result of White privilege (Gushue & Constantine; Helms).

Methodology

This study focused on White privilege attitudes held among both White part- and full-time faculty members in a College of Education at a metropolitan university in the Midwestern United States. The data involving this study consist of primary data collected between March 24, 2011 and April 8, 2011. These data were collected through the administration of a demographic survey and the White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS) survey developed by Dr. E. Janie Pinterits (2009).

Participants

The 84 faculty members selected for this study were notified of the study through their campus mail, and were given the opportunity to complete the survey instruments via mail or online through www.surveymonkey.com. Eighteen of these faculty members agreed to participate in this study; however, only 17 participants qualified for this study as a result of one participant not submitting both survey instruments.

The 84 faculty members asked to participate in this study were chosen through purposive and convenience sampling methods. The participants were faculty members in the College of Education, which is the department in which the researcher is currently enrolled. Therefore, these faculty members were accessible to the researcher. The researcher contacted the departments within the College of Education to obtain permission to survey the participants and to attain a list of White part- and full-time faculty members.

Instruments

Two survey instruments were used to collect data for this study: (a) the WPAS; and (b) a demographic survey (Pinterits et al., 2009). The 28-item WPAS utilized a 6-point Likert-scale for participant's responses, which ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The scale is divided into four subscales, which measure the participant's: (a) commitment to confronting White privilege; (b) acknowledgement of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege; (c) awareness of White privilege; and (d) remorse as a result of experiencing White privilege. The first subscale is indicative of the behavioral dimension of White privilege attitudes (e.g., "I take action against White privilege with people I know."). The second and third subscales describe

the cognitive dimension of White privilege attitudes (e.g., “I worry about what giving up some White privileges might mean for me,” and “Our social structure system promotes White privilege.”). Finally, the fourth subscale in the WPAS identifies the affective dimension of White privilege attitudes (e.g., “I feel awful about White privilege.”) (Pinterits et al., 2009). In order to further analyze the data, the researcher also combined the subscales to create a White privilege attitudes score.

Participants selected for this study also completed a demographic survey (see Appendix C) which measured such variables as age, race/ethnicity, highest level of education completed, area in which one resides (e.g., rural, suburban, or urban settings), level of exposure to and experiences with people of diverse races / ethnic backgrounds (e.g., no significant exposure, limited exposure, moderate exposure, in-depth experience, or interactions on a regular basis), and the number of multicultural courses, workshops, and conferences in which the participant attended in the last five years in which White privilege was discussed (Pinterits et al., 2009).

Data Analysis

The outcome variables associated with this study consist of the four subscales present in the WPAS and a variable created by combining the four subscales into a separate variable. Descriptions of these variables are provided in detail below.

Commitment to Confronting White Privilege

The participants’ commitment to confronting White privilege is an index generated as a combination of the statements measuring their commitment to confronting White privilege. The lowest possible value, 12, for this variable, indicates that a participant has the lowest reported levels of commitment to confronting White privilege.

Conversely, the highest possible value, 72, for this variable, indicates that the participant has the highest reported levels of commitment to confronting White privilege (Pinterits et al., 2009).

Anticipated Costs Associated With Addressing White Privilege

The participants' acknowledgement of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege is an index generated as a combination of the statements measuring their acknowledgement of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege (Pinterits et al., 2009). The lowest possible value, 6, for this variable, indicates that the participant has the lowest reported levels of acknowledgement of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege. In contrast, 36, the highest possible value for this variable, indicates that the participant has the highest reported levels of acknowledgment of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege (Pinterits et al., 2009).

White Privilege Awareness

The participants' White privilege awareness is an index generated as a combination of the statements measuring their White privilege awareness. The lowest possible value for this variable, 4, indicates that the participant has the lowest reported levels of White privilege awareness. In contrast, the highest possible value for this variable, which is a value of 24, indicates that the participant has the highest reported levels of White privilege awareness (Pinterits et al., 2009).

White Privilege Remorse

The participants' White privilege remorse is an index generated as a combination of the statements measuring their White privilege remorse. The lowest possible value for

this variable, 6, indicates that the participant has the lowest reported levels of White privilege remorse. In contrast, 36, the highest possible value for this variable, indicates that the participant has the highest reported levels of White privilege remorse (Pinterits et al., 2009).

White Privilege Attitudes

Participants' White privilege attitudes is an index generated as a combination of the four subscales present on the WPAS (e.g., commitment to confronting White privilege, acknowledgement of anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, White privilege awareness, and White privilege remorse).

The lowest possible value for White privilege attitudes, 28, indicates that the participant has the lowest reported levels of commitment to confronting White privilege, lowest reported levels of acknowledgement in regards to the anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, lowest reported levels of White privilege awareness, and lowest reported remorse associated with his or her experience with White privilege.

The highest possible value for White privilege attitudes, which is a value of 168, however, indicates that the participant has the highest reported levels of commitment to confronting White privilege, highest reported levels of acknowledgement in regards to the anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, highest reported levels of White privilege awareness, and highest reported remorse associated with his or her experience with White privilege.

Results

The researcher utilized Stata 9.0 statistical software in order to analyze the data collected for this study. The results are discussed below.

Univariate Analyses

These descriptive analyses were used to answer the following research question: What are the characteristics of the participants in this study? The mean, standard deviation, minimum values, and maximum values were reported for the continuous variable. The frequency and percentage were reported for the categorical variables. Demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. The faculty members have a mean age of 53.5 years with a standard deviation of 11.8. The youngest participant is 36 years old, and the oldest is 74 years old. Ten of the participants were men, which account for 58.8% of the population, and seven (41.2%) were women. Twelve (70.6%) of the participants completed their Doctor of Philosophy degree. Only five of the 17 part- and full-time faculty members (29.4%) that participated in the study hold Doctor of Education degrees. In terms of area of residence in which the participants live, the majority (64.7%) lived in suburban communities. When the faculty members were asked about how they would describe their level of experience with or exposure to people of other races and / or ethnic backgrounds than their own, five faculty members (29.4%) reported “moderate exposure.” In addition, two part- and full-time faculty members (11.8%) reported having an “in-depth experience” with people of color. Over half of the participants (52.9%) reported having interactions with people of color “on a regular basis.” Finally, participants were asked to write the number of courses, workshops, and conference sessions they have attended within the last five years in which White privilege was discussed. The least number of courses, workshops, and conference sessions reported was zero, and the greatest number was 200.

Table 1*Demographic Characteristics of Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty*

Categorical Variables	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	10	58.8
Female	7	41.2
Education		
Doctor of Philosophy Degree	12	70.6
Doctor of Education Degree	5	29.4
Area of Residence		
Rural Setting	2	11.8
Suburban Setting	11	64.7
Urban Setting	4	23.5
Level of Exposure		
Limited Exposure	1	5.9
Moderate Exposure	5	29.4
In-Depth Exposure	2	11.8
Interactions on a Regular Basis	9	52.9
Number of Courses, Workshops, and Conference Sessions Attended		
0	3	20.0
1	1	6.7
2	2	13.3
3	4	26.7
10	2	13.3
15	1	6.7
30	1	6.7
200	1	6.7

*N = 17

Bivariate Analysis

Correlations were conducted to determine if there is a relationship between participants' demographic characteristics and their White privilege attitudes. Only those relationships with statistical significance have been reported in the tables below. As Table 2 illustrates, there was a statistically significant relationship between the age of the faculty member and his or her reported remorse associated with White privilege. The age of the faculty member was significantly associated with a decrease in White privilege remorse. In addition, the results from Table 3 indicate that faculty members who

Table 2

An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Age and Their White Privilege Remorse

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	210.7	1	210.7
Residual	555.1	15	38.0
Total	765.8	16	47.9

Note: [N = 17, F(1, 15) = 5.69, R-squared = 0.2751, b = -0.31, t = -2.39, p < 0.05]

obtained a Doctor of Philosophy Degree had higher acknowledgement of the anticipated costs of addressing their White privilege. Table 4 shows that faculty members who live in urban settings had the highest mean scores of remorse associated with White privilege. Conversely, faculty members who live in suburban settings had the lowest mean scores of remorse associated with White privilege. Finally, in viewing Table 5, it can be concluded that the age of the faculty member was significantly associated with a decrease in White

privilege attitudes. It is interesting to note that gender did not have a systematic relationship with White privilege attitudes, as concluded in other research studies (Neville et al., 2000; Pinterits et al., 2009, p. 427).

Table 3

An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Highest Level of Education Completed and Their Acknowledgement of the Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege

Variable	Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege		
	Mean	SD	Frequency
Education			
Doctor of Philosophy Degree	16.7	5.4	12
Doctor of Education Degree	10.8	2.5	5

Note: [N = 17, p < 0.05]

Table 4

An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Area of Residence and Their White Privilege Remorse

Variable	White Privilege Remorse		
	Mean	SD	Frequency
Area of Residence			
Rural Setting	60.5	3.5	2
Suburban Setting	51.6	12.4	11
Urban Setting	69.3	3.1	4

Note: [N = 17, p < 0.05]

Table 5*An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Age and Their White Privilege Attitudes*

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	2579.2	1	2579.2
Residual	5863.7	15	390.9
Total	8442.9	16	527.7

Note: [N = 17, F(1, 15) = 6.60, R-squared = 0.3055, b = -1.1, t = -2.57, p < 0.05]

Additional correlations were conducted to determine if there is a relationship between any of the four WPAS subscales (e.g., commitment to confronting White privilege, acknowledgement of the anticipated costs associated with addressing White privilege, awareness of White privilege, and remorse as a result of experiencing White privilege) as well as a relationship between the four WPAS subscales and the created variable, White privilege attitudes. The results from Table 6 indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between the participants' commitment to confronting White privilege and their White privilege awareness. The participants' commitment to confronting White privilege accounted for 75% of the total variation in the White privilege awareness subscale.

As Table 7 illustrates, there is a systematic relationship between the participants' commitment to confronting White privilege and their White privilege remorse. The participants' commitment to confronting White privilege predicted 26% of the total variance in the White privilege remorse subscale. Finally, there is a statistically significant relationship between the faculty members' White privilege awareness and

their White privilege remorse (Table 8). The participants' White privilege awareness accounts for 34% of the variation in the White privilege remorse subscale.

Table 6

An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Commitment to Confronting White Privilege and Their White Privilege Awareness

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	1893.1	1	1893.1
Residual	621.4	15	41.4
Total	2514.5	16	157.2

Note: [N = 17, F(1, 15) = 45.70, R-squared = 0.7529, p < 0.001]

Table 7

An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Commitment to Confronting White Privilege and Their White Privilege Remorse

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	647.9	1	647.9
Residual	1866.6	15	124.4
Total	2514.5	16	157.2

Note: [N = 17, F(1, 15) = 5.21, R-squared = 0.2577, p < 0.05]

Table 8*An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' White Privilege Awareness and Their White Privilege Remorse*

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	115.7	1	115.7
Residual	228.8	15	15.3
Total	344.5	16	21.5

Note: [N = 17, F(1, 15) = 7.59, R-squared = 0.3359, p < 0.05]

Multivariate Analysis

Regression analyses were employed in order to answer the primary research question: What is the relationship between the participants' demographic characteristics and their White privilege attitudes? There was only one statistically significant relationship between the participants' demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, education completed, area of residence, level of exposure to people of color, and multicultural education) and their White privilege attitudes, represented in the subscale White privilege remorse (Table 9). These demographic variables predicted 75% of the total variation in the White privilege remorse subscale. However, when the entire model of demographic variables was applied to the created variable, White privilege attitudes, this relationship was not statistically significant, as depicted in Table 10.

Table 9***An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Demographics and Their White Privilege Remorse***

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	427.0	6	71.2
Residual	145.9	8	18.2
Total	572.9	14	40.9

Note: [N = 15, F(6,8) = 3.90, R-squared = 0.7454, p < 0.05]

Variable	Coefficient	t	P> t 	[95% Conf. Interval]
Age	-0.44	-3.21	0.01	-0.76, -0.12
Gender	-2.15	-0.76	0.47	-8.66, 4.36
Level of Education	2.38	0.85	0.42	-4.10, 8.85
Area of Residence	-2.20	-0.86	0.41	-8.06, 3.66
Level of Exposure to People of Color	2.03	1.79	0.11	-0.59, 4.66
Multicultural Education	-0.07	-2.58	0.03	-0.13, -0.01

Table 10***An Analysis of the Relationship between the Participants' Demographics and Their White Privilege Attitudes***

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares
Model	2235.3	6	372.6
Residual	915.3	8	114.0
Total	3147.6	14	224.8

Note: [N = 15, F(6,8) = 3.27, R-squared = 0.7102, p > 0.05]

Discussion

The findings provide a glimpse into White faculty members' attitudes about White privilege. The results from this study suggest that younger faculty members may experience greater remorse associated with White privilege. Additionally, younger faculty members may also experience greater affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions to their exposure to White privilege, as opposed to older faculty members. These results may be consequences of the variation in each generation's understanding and acknowledgement of White privilege. Because older faculty members may have lived and received their education during historical times in which the segregation of Whites and people of color and additional discrimination against people of color was promoted and encouraged, they not be as familiar with the ways in which they benefit from White privilege, as are younger faculty members.

An interesting result from this study is that faculty members who have completed a Doctor of Philosophy Degree may have a greater understanding of the potential costs of addressing their White privilege on both personal and professional levels. It is plausible

that the varying courses required for these two different degree programs may have contributed to this result. At this point, it is unclear as to what specifically caused this relationship between a participant's level of education completed and his or her acknowledgement of the potential costs of addressing his or her White privilege.

In addition, the results from this study indicate that part- and full-time faculty members who live in suburban settings may experience the least amount of remorse associated with White privilege. In contemplation over this result, it is possible that those living in suburban settings may have moved to suburban areas in response to the concept of "White flight," which illustrates Whites leaving urban areas once these places of residence become more racially diverse (Crowder & South, 2008). If this result is, in fact, related to the "White flight" phenomenon, and suburban participants report the lowest levels of White privilege remorse, perhaps these participants are less aware of how their White privilege has impacted residential environments and their role in perpetuating its impact. However, further studies must be conducted in order to draw such a conclusion.

Finally, the results of this study conclude that demographic characteristics of faculty members (e.g., age, gender, education completed, area of residence, level of exposure to people of color, and multicultural education) may impact their remorse associated with White privilege. The White privilege remorse subscale specifically measures the affective reactions (e.g., guilt, shame, et cetera.) experienced by those participating in this study. Although, the demographic characteristics did not show a systematic relationship with the combined White privilege attitudes, White privilege remorse may be unique within the WPAS because it addresses those affective reactions

experienced by the participants, as opposed to the more measurable cognitive and behavioral reactions.

Implications

This study demonstrates how bivariate and multivariate analyses can be used in order to gain a greater understanding of the relationship between a White part- or full-time faculty member's demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, level of education, area of residence, level exposure to people of color, and multicultural education) and his or her attitudes toward White privilege. These analyses not only provided this understanding, but they also gave insight into the ways in which certain demographic characteristics may relate to specific White privilege attitudes (e.g., commitment to confronting White privilege, acknowledgement of the anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, White privilege awareness, and White privilege remorse).

This research is an important contribution to the literature regarding White privilege and higher education. First, it uncovers the attitudes White faculty members hold with regards to White privilege. Much of the literature on White privilege attitudes in higher education has focused on college students. However, it is equally important to focus on the White privilege attitudes held by faculty members, as it may directly impact their practice and their ability to have authentic relationships with their students of color (Heinze, 2008). The very interactions faculty members have with their students may be dependent upon the attitudes they have toward White privilege (Heinze).

In addition, this study may drive faculty members toward an increase in self-awareness. This opportunity for self-awareness is a critical element in becoming a culturally competent practitioner (Pinterits, 2009). Without an examination of these

attitudes and an increased level of self-awareness, White faculty members may continue to perpetuate the very dynamics of power and privilege pervading U.S. society, in their classrooms (Heinze, 2008).

Finally, the results from this research may encourage adult and higher education programs to supplement their staff members' orientation curriculum with classes or workshops which introduce aspiring faculty members and other adult educators to White privilege and its effects in educational settings. This study may provide an opportunity for open dialogue among faculty members regarding their need for greater awareness of White privilege. An increase in such training may result in greater motivation among White faculty members and adult educators to "become involved in antiracism and social justice work" (Pinterits et al., 2009, p. 426).

Limitations of This Study

In spite of the study's multiple contributions to the field of White privilege and its impact on higher education, this study presents several limitations. The first limitation is the use of non-probability rather than random sampling in recruiting participants. The data received from the respondents are beneficial to those participating in the study; however, unlike with random sampling, data collected from the purposive and convenience sampling techniques cannot be generalized to White faculty members across disciplines at this university. In addition, the small sample size further prohibits any generalization of the determined results to the faculty at large. There were only 17 participants in this study, and the analyses would be far more beneficial if more part- and full-time faculty members in multiple departments in the university participated in similar future studies.

A third limitation of this study is that there was no systematic definition of White privilege provided to its participants. Therefore, those who responded to the survey instruments were encouraged to use their own definition of White privilege, which may have been significantly different from the researcher's definition of White privilege. This lack of clarity could have resulted in skewed data, as respondents were reporting from their own unique definitions of White privilege.

A final limitation of this study is that of the potential for social desirability bias among the participants. Because these participants were part- and full-time faculty members within the College of Education, and because the researcher is a current graduate student in the same College, participants may have felt a desire to report higher White privilege attitude scores than what they would have reported under other circumstances. In addition, due to the limited number of White part- and full-time faculty members in each department, participants may have felt that their responses could have been traced back to them, in spite of the confidential nature of this study.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. E. Janie Pinterits for providing me with the WPAS and for all the work that she has conducted in regards to White privilege. I also want to thank Dr. E. Paulette Isaac-Savage for her constant encouragement, guidance, and supervision on this project. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Angela Coker and Dr. Pi-Chi Han for their ongoing assistance and support of this work. Without each of them, the completion of this project would not be possible.

References

- Ancis, J.R., & Szymanski, D.M. (2001). Awareness of White privilege among white counseling trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29, 548-569. Retrieved from <http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/gtx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A76551257&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=morenetumsl&version=1.0>
- Baptiste, H.P., & Araujo, B. (2004 Spring). American presidents and their attitudes, beliefs, and actions surrounding education and multiculturalism: A series of research studies in educational policy: Second installment: Examining Presidents Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, & Dwight D. Eisenhower. *Multicultural Education*, 11(3), 36-42. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?recid=0bc05f7a67b1790e84725fc4f0ee8301ef26a848a651cf85e18805975ab2aa85fb4afd424a17c00f&fmt=H>
- Breckler, S.J. (1984). Empirical validation of affect, behavior, and cognition as distinct components of attitude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1191-1205. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1191
- Crowder, K., & South, S.J. (2008 October). Spatial dynamics of White flight: The effects of local and extralocal racial conditions on neighborhood out-migration. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 792-812. doi: 10.1177/000312240807300505
- Diggs, G.A., Garrison-Wade, D.F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009 November). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review*, 41, 312-333. doi: 10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y
- Gushue, G.V., & Constantine, M.G. (2007 June). Color-blind racial attitudes and White racial identity attitudes in psychology trainees. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 321-328. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.321
- Hays, D.G., Chang, C.Y., & Decker, S.L. (2003 December). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 134-145. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?recid=0bc05f7a67b1790e84725fc4f0ee8301751ae232ffe014628635ce852ad8ee8b9df8d13d53be6e3a&fmt=H>
- Heinze, P. (2008 Fall). Let's talk about race, baby: How a white professor teaches white students about White privilege and racism. *Multicultural Education*, 16(1), 2-11. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?recid=0bc05f7a67b1790e84725fc4f0ee83017a94e255ac87eb7f07034cbc2067d3ba279421e9a8980b73&fmt=H>

- Helms, J. (1995). An update of Helm's White and people of color racial identity models. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jayakumar, U.M., Howard, T.C., Allen, W.R., & Han, J.C. (2009 September/October). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 538-563. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?recid=0bc05f7a67b1790e84725fc4f0ee8301727c252d1fd13405efc3baa941660539793764172a5439f5&fmt=H>
- Johnson-Bailey, J., & Cervero, R.M. (1998 November/December). Power dynamics in teaching and learning practices: An examination of two adult education classrooms. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 17, 389-399. doi: 10.1080/0260137980170605
- Johnson-Bailey, J. (2001 January/April). The road less walked: A retrospective of race and ethnicity in adult education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20, 89-99. doi: 10.1080/02601370010008237
- Johnson-Bailey, J., Valentine, T., Cervero, R.M., & Bowles, T.A. (2009 March/April). Rooted in the soil: The social experiences of Black graduate students at a southern research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 178-203. Retrieved from http://csaweb105v.csa.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/ids70/view_record.php?id=2&recnum=0&log=from_res&SID=c8629mss3juc5vqp0n2srqhtj4&mark_id=search%3A2%3A28%2C0%2C10
- Kernahan, C., & Davis, T. (2007 Winter). Changing perspective: How learning about racism influences student awareness and emotion. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34, 49-52. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3401_12
- Manglitz, E. (2003 February). Challenging White privilege in adult education: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53, 119-134. doi: 10.1177/0741713602238907
- McIntosh, P. (2007). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (6th ed., pp. 98-105). Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Neville, H.A., Lilly, R.L., Lee, R.M., Duran, G., & Browne, L. (2000 January). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 59-70. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

- Parks, M.W. (2006). I am from a very small town: Social reconstructionism and multicultural education. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 8(2), 46-50. doi: 10.1207/s15327892mcp0802_8
- Pinterits, E.J., Poteat, V.P., & Spanierman, L.B. (2009 July). The White Privilege Attitudes Scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56, 417-429. doi: 10.1037/a0016274
- Powell, A.A., Branscombe, N.R., & Schmitt, M.T. (2005 April). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 508-521. Retrieved from <http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/gtx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC- Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A155917000&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=morenetumsl&version=1.0>
- Rankin, S.R., & Reason, R.D. (2005 January/February). Differing perceptions: How students of color and White students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 43-61. Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.umsl.edu/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v046/46.1rankin.html
- Spanierman, L.B., Poteat, V.P., Wang, Y.-F., & Oh, E. (2008 January). Psychosocial costs of racism to white counselors: Predicting various dimensions of multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55, 75-88. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.75
- Swim, J.K., & Miller, D.L. (1999 April). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 500-514. Retrieved from <http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/gtx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC- Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A54369378&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=morenetumsl&version=1.0>

APPENDIX A



March 24, 2011

College of Education
 Division of Educational Leadership
 and Policy Studies
 One University Boulevard
 St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4400
 Telephone: 314-516-5944
 Fax: 314-516-5942

Dear UMSL Faculty Member in the College of Education:

My name is Rebecca Burns, and I am a graduate student in the Adult and Higher Education degree program at the University of Missouri - St. Louis. I am collaborating with Dr. E. Paulette Isaac-Savage, Chair, Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, in order to conduct my thesis project entitled, *Education Professors' / Instructors' Attitudes toward White Privilege*.

The purpose of my research is to contribute to the studies regarding White Privilege in educational settings. This study is unique in that it focuses on white privilege attitudes among both part-time and full-time faculty members in the College of Education at UMSL.

In order to collect data for this project, I am writing to request your participation in this project. Your participation will include the completion of both the demographic survey and the White Privilege Attitude Scale (WPAS), developed by Dr. E. Janie Pinterits. The deadline for your submission of completed surveys is by **Friday, April 8, 2011**.

You will have the option of completing these survey instruments either on paper or online. The process will take approximately 20 minutes.

1. If you choose to complete the hard-copy paper version of the survey instruments, you will write directly on these instruments, which have been placed in your office mailbox. Once you have completed the surveys, you will need to place them in the envelopes provided for you. These envelopes indicate that they are to be returned to Rebecca Burns, MSC 366.
2. If you choose to complete the online version of the survey instruments, you will need to go to the following links and follow the instructions provided: 1) <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/2W32HX7>, for the demographic survey; and 2) <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/2QT3S8K>, for the WPAS. Once you have completed these surveys, you will need to click on the submit button on the screen. The results of these surveys will be sent to me via www.surveymonkey.com.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may contact me at (785) 554-8570 or rabd4f@umsl.edu. You can also contact my thesis Faculty Advisor, Dr. E. Paulette Isaac at (314) 516-5941 or EPisaac@umsl.edu.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this information to you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca A. Burns

APPENDIX B

Information Sheet for Participation
in Research Activities

College of Education

Division of Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies

One University Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4400
Telephone: 314-516-5944
Fax: 314-516-5942

HSC Approval Number ____110315B____

1. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Rebecca Burns, Adult and Higher Education Graduate Student, and supervised by Dr. E. Paulette Isaac-Savage, Chair, Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. The purpose of this research is to contribute to the studies regarding White Privilege in educational settings. This study is unique in that it focuses on white privilege attitudes among both part-time and full-time faculty members in the College of Education at UMSL.
 2. a) Your participation will involve:
 - Completing both a demographic survey and the White Privilege Attitude Scale (WPAS) developed by Dr. E. Janie Pinterits.
 - You will have approximately two weeks to complete these two instruments, and they are to be submitted to Rebecca Burns (a return envelope will be provided) via campus mail (Millennium Student Center 366) or submitted online by clicking the submit option following your completion of these instruments.
- Approximately 100 subjects may be involved in this research.
- b) The amount of time involved in your participation will be approximately 20 minutes.
3. There may be certain risks or discomforts associated with this research. They include uncomfortable feelings associated with questions regarding your experiences with or perceptions of white privilege.
 4. There are no direct benefits for you participating in this study. However, your participation will contribute to the knowledge about attitudes white Americans have toward white privilege.
 5. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.
 6. By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.
 7. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may contact the Investigator, Rebecca Burns at (785) 554-8570 or rabd4f@umsl.edu, or the Faculty Advisor, Dr. E. Paulette Isaac-Savage at (314) 516-5941 or EPisaac@umsl.edu. You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration at 516-5897.

Signature of Investigator or Designee

Date

Investigator/Designee Printed Name

APPENDIX C

Attitudes toward White Privilege – Demographic Survey

1. Please write your age in the space provided: _____

* Please circle only one answer that applies to you for questions #2 - 6.

2. What is your gender?

- | | |
|-----------|----------------|
| a) Male | c) Transgender |
| b) Female | |

3. What is your race / ethnicity?

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| a) Asian / Asian American | d) Hispanic / Latino(a) |
| b) Black / African American | e) Native American / Alaskan Native |
| c) White / White American, Not Hispanic | f) Other |

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a) Master's degree | c) Doctor of Education degree |
| b) Doctor of Philosophy degree | |

5. Where do you currently reside?

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| a) Rural setting | c) Urban setting |
| b) Suburban setting | |

6. How would you describe your level of exposure to and experience with people of other races and / or ethnic backgrounds than your own?

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| a) No significant exposure | d) In-depth experience |
| b) Limited exposure | e) Interactions on a regular basis |
| c) Moderate exposure | |

7. Please write the number of multicultural courses, workshops, and conference sessions you have attended within the past five years in which White privilege was discussed:
