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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to measure levels of aggression in selected segments of the black population. Subjects were undergraduate and graduate students at Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Subjects classified themselves into groups according to the term they used for their racial membership: Negro, black, or Afro-American. These three experimental groups averaged twenty-one years of age. An additional group, all self-classified as Negroes, were public school teachers who averaged thirty-five years of age.

An experimental confederate was used as the "other subject" in the procedure. Both subjects were instructed to draw a house and identify themselves on the drawing according to sex, age, race, and occupation. They exchanged drawings through a panel (there was no direct contact of any kind between the real subject and the confederate) and rated each other's drawing by dialing the amount of electric shock they thought the other subject should receive for his drawing.

Independent variables were the self-assigned racial group of the subject, age of the subject, and race of the confederate, either white or black. The confederate used a standard stimulus drawing for all subjects and this drawing elicited the following behaviors:
Blacks were significantly more aggressive than Negroes—they directed higher levels of shock at the confederate—regardless of the race of the confederate (p.<.001).

A scarcity of Afro-Americans resulted in getting data only in terms of the white confederate. Contrary to expectations, their level of aggression was the lowest of the three young groups.

The younger subjects (blacks and Negroes) aggressed at a significantly higher level against a white than against a black (p.<.025).

The older group exhibited racially differentiated aggression in the opposite direction from the younger groups: they aggressed at a significantly higher level against a black than against a white (p.<.005). Further, their aggression against a black was significantly higher than the other group's (p.<.005) and their aggression against a white was significantly lower (p.<.05).

In the second part of the procedure, each subject was informed that the "other subject" had decided to give him a shock of either 3 or 7 (possible range of 0 to 10) for his drawing and that he could now change the level of shock he had decided to give the other subject if he wished. Two-thirds of the subjects made no change. In this response to aggression section, neither racial group membership of the subjects nor race of the confederate was of significant effect. The level of aggression threatened by the confederate

viii
was the only significant effect on the subjects' response to aggression (p. < .01).

The study provided empirical data in support of several hypothesized group qualities and relationships and suggested several questions for further research. Questions raised included comparisons with white subjects in this procedure, the effects of the older group's professional status upon their aggressive behavior, and the current significance of the Afro-American label.
DIFFERENTIAL LEVELS OF AGGRESSION AND PREJUDICE IN SELECTED BLACK POPULATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Frustration and aggression have been major components of the human condition since the Beginning. Had Eve not instilled in Adam a state of frustration, it seems certain that he would have ignored the apple and we all would have been spared a great deal of trouble.

For something that has been around for so long, and known to be around, amazingly little is known about the operation of frustration and aggression. Two lengthy lists of philosophers, theologians, and psychologists, among others, could be compiled with the division being simply whether or not the particular theorist believed that Man is inherently aggressive or forced into it by circumstances.

Studies of frustration and aggression have been uniformly circumscribed. Frustration has been induced in the laboratory and provision made for the expression of aggression; social occasions, such as wars or riots, have presented themselves for review; but what of the so-called condition of man? What about the person who can be defendably classified as a frustrated individual?

Frustration can be induced in the laboratory but such
frustration is, by definition, transient and artificial. It would seem to be desirable to study a person who brings his frustration into the laboratory with him.

It was the purpose of the present study to investigate the frustrated condition—a condition of years' duration, not a condition of the experimental moment. This condition was investigated in terms of its relationship with the tendency to respond with overt aggression when offered both the opportunity and a relevant target.

**Frustration and aggression**

Probably the best known theoretical formulation in the general area of aggression is the frustration-aggression hypothesis formulated by Dollard, Miller, Doob, Mowrer, and Sears (1939). This hypothesis states that the "occurrence of aggression always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, that the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression."

This initial promulgation of the hypothesis raised rather a furor in the field and led its authors to issue a statement of explanation and defense (Miller, 1941). In their defense, they state that the wording of the hypothesis was perhaps unfortunate and the fact that it was stated on the first page of the book led reviewers and others to ignore the qualifications set forth in the rest of the book. They stated that they did not intend to imply that frustration could have no consequences other than aggression and that
the reader must make a distinction between instigation to aggression and the actual occurrence of aggression.

Miller rephrased the hypothesis to read, in its second part, "frustration produces instigations to a number of different types of response, one of which is an instigation to some form of aggression."

A derivative of the rephrased hypothesis is that instigation to aggression may occupy any of a number of positions in the hierarchy of responses aroused by the specific situation, and that, therefore, the expression of overt aggression in such situations will be subject to the same principles which govern the selection of any response from any given hierarchy of responses.

A review of the literature in the general area of aggression makes evident the fact that the term aggression is often used to describe behaviors more properly labeled as anger or hostility. Aggression, anger, and hostility can be usefully categorized as, respectively, an instrumental response that administers punishment; an emotional reaction with prominent autonomic components; and a negative attitude, with attitude defined in terms of implicit verbal responses (Buss, 1961).

Aggression, therefore, should have two characteristics: the delivery of noxious stimuli, and an interpersonal context. Thus aggression may be defined as a response that delivers a noxious stimulus to another organism (Buss, 1961).
At this early point in the present discussion, it is possible to state an hypothesis which will serve to foreshadow the direction of argument: a frustrated individual will be motivated toward aggressive responses. Further, this motivation or readiness to respond in an aggressive manner will be dependent upon such variables as personality (including self-concept), source of frustration, and availability of alternate responses.

If frustration is the antecedent condition for aggression, it is necessary that some consideration be given the definitive criteria and varieties of frustration.

Frustration is often conceived of in terms of barriers or the blocking of a chain of instrumental responses. The most thorough and extensive work done in this area was undertaken for the purpose of selection of qualified personnel by the OSS during the Second World War (OSS Assessment Staff, 1948). A typical study was the assignment of a candidate to the job of building a small structure with the assistance of two subordinates. The two subordinates assisted the candidate in such fashion that it was impossible for him to complete the assigned task. Some candidates become sufficiently enraged (frustrated) that they struck the subordinate (delivery of noxious stimulus).

A modified form of barrier is delay. Traffic jams often engender strong feelings of frustration and strong
urges to deliver noxious stimuli to someone or something.

A common form of frustration is failure. Commonly the individual is informed, overtly or covertly, that he does not measure up or has failed to achieve some standard of performance on a given task (Lindzey and Riecken, 1951; Buss, Durkee, and Baer, 1956; McClelland and Apicella, 1945; Pepitone and Walpizeski, 1960). An experiment by Epstein and Taylor (1967) using a putative competition in reaction time indicated that successive defeats elicited strong aggressive responses of both instrumental and verbal varieties.

Another means to block an instrumental response and thus induce frustration is by means of conflict (Brown and Farber, 1951). Incompatible responses and approach-avoidance situations are common sources of conflict. Buss stated, however, that such conflicts are rarely followed by aggression (1961).

The withholding of a promised reward is an effective cause of frustration. Amsel (1958) has defined extinction as "frustrative non-reward."

That these cited conditions are indicative of frustration seems clear. That an overt, aggressive response will follow these frustrations is not clear at all. "There is... nothing to imply that aggression, for instance, will occur more frequently than withdrawal, or withdrawal more frequently than, say, primitivation," (Brown and Farber, 1951).
Brown and Farber's statement follows from the revised frustration-aggression hypothesis; that frustration leads to the instigation of a number of different types of response, of which overt aggression may be only one, or even altogether absent.

There has been a good deal of speculation and some research on variables which may determine whether aggression or some other response will follow frustration. Dollard et al. (1939) suggested that the intensity and/or frequency of aggression varies with the strength of the frustration. Strength of frustration can be viewed as determined by the strength of the response tendency being blocked. Two studies which investigated this hypothesized relationship supported the hypothesis (Doob and Sears, 1939; Allison and Hunt, 1959).

The goal-gradient hypothesis suggests that the closer the organism is to the goal, the more frustration that will result from blocking completion of the response. If response strength is greater as the goal is approached (e.g., the rat runs faster) blocking the response should result in higher response strength available to all potential responses, including aggression.

A second variable affecting strength of frustration is the extent to which the response tendency is blocked. Hovland and Sears (1940) offered data to support this contention by correlating cotton prices with lynchings in the
South. Their thesis was that lower cotton prices would block many facets of the general response tendency to consume by making them economically impossible. Their positive results were later shown to be statistical artifacts (Mintz, 1946). Mintz re-examined the data and concluded that there was no demonstrated relationship between physical violence and economic privation. Recent events in the ghettos of this country suggest that even though Hovland and Sears may have selected their data and statistical methodology poorly, their hypothesis is far from a dead issue.

Arbitrary barriers to desired responses are often cited as prime causes of frustration and there are several studies which support this contention (Allison and Hunt, 1959; Cohen, 1955; Lee, 1955).

The focus of this selective review has not been to support or reject any of the specific hypotheses offered relating to frustration and aggression but rather to examine those variables which have been considered to be directly related to the topic.

Social frustration

Having defined aggression as a response directed against another organism, it follows that aggression is a social enterprise. It seems reasonable, too, to state that for the most
part frustration has its source in other people. We may often remark upon the "perversity of inanimate objects," but most frustration still seems to be interpersonal, or even intergroup. At any rate, this last variety of frustration was the focus of attention in this study.

Many personality theorists have used as the nucleus of their theories, or as the final goal of personality function, the concept of self-actualization. This concept is prominent in the formulations of Jung, Maslow, Rogers, and Goldstein. Specific terms used by these and other theorists may differ from "self-actualization" but the principle is the same. If frustration is taken as the interference or blocking of instrumental responses, the responses which should be the most frustrating to have blocked are those which serve the self-actualizing process.

This blocking or interference with self-actualization can and does take place at any level from the dyad to nations or groups of nations. Nations very often provide beautiful examples of the operation of the frustration-aggression hypothesis; a drawback being that such interactions are as yet not amenable to experimental control.

If such blocking or interference generates feelings of frustration, the hypothesis states that aggressive behavior has a certain probability; the probability depending upon
the structure of the response hierarchy at that particular time. A factor which has been suggested to have a prominent part in the likelihood of overt aggressive behavior is fear of reprisal (Berkowitz, 1962).

Cantril (1941) considered this variable in a study of lynchings in Leesville, Texas, in 1930. He reported that Negroes in the community, by striving for increased social status, and by competing with whites for jobs, presumably threatened, and hence frustrated, the dominant group. This is not at all an unusual situation. Yet it is rare that aggressive behavior in the form of lynch mobs occurs in this setting. The reason for the behavior in Leesville, Cantril offered, was that, for various reasons, the whites saw themselves as having more power than the blacks and as being relatively invulnerable to any dangers associated with attacking them. To support his contention with a negative case, Cantril offered the example of the famed Orson Welles 1938 "Invasion from Mars" broadcast (1958). Those who accepted the broadcast at face value were obviously threatened, but they did not attack—they fled. This dichotomy of response is recognized in the oft cited principle of "fight-or-flight."

Social groups, then, perceive threat or frustration frequently as having its source in other social groups and will respond with aggressive behavior if their perception of the circumstances permits.
Social aggression may operate on a rather subtle level through the use of stereotypes. Stereotypes operate at their simplest level through the use of names or labels. One categorizes a person differentially by referring to him as an Italian or a "dago;" a Negro or a "nigger;" a Jew or a "kike;" and so on through almost every ethnic group.

Such labeling will have some influence upon the behavior of the person using the term and the person to whom it is applied. These terms also serve to actually be behavior; use one of these pejorative terms to a person belonging to the particular group and you have fulfilled the present definition of aggressive behavior, i.e. you have applied a noxious stimulus to another organism.

These labels can serve in another manner. When a soldier in Caesar's legions said "I am a Roman," he was making an announcement designed to convey much more than simply his place of birth. Affixing a valued and self-chosen label to oneself often is used as a source of pride, confidence, identity, or, in short, some aspect of self-actualization. This is the overtly expressed purpose in the use of such terms as "black" and "Afro-American" in the present civil rights movements.

Labels can also function as symbols in the fullest sense of the term. A person who scrawls "dirty Jew" on a board fence has, in his own mind, aggressed, and, for the
moment, has probably relieved some increment of his frustrated. At another level, it is possible to express frustration through aggression directed at a possession or production of a member of a despised group or of a person felt to represent that group.

Any attempt to investigate social frustration and aggression encounters several important problems in procedure. Self-report is notoriously unreliable as a means of assessing group prejudices or even group membership if there are no overt, unmistakable criteria. A laboratory induced (or supposedly induced) state of frustration carries with it very little assurance of generalizability to other situations. The operation of stereotypes and labels is frequently covert and confounding. The list could be extended considerably.

Notably lacking in the literature are studies which consider frustration solely as a function of group membership and the resulting aggressive behavior toward members of other groups solely in terms of their group membership. An objective investigation of the behavioral consequences of the use of group labels in terms of the frustration-aggression hypothesis has not been reported.

Summary and statement of the problem

In its final form, the frustration-aggression hypothesis states that frustration produces tendencies toward the overt expression of aggressive responses if competing
responses are absent and the opportunity for such overt behavior is present.

The relevance of the previous discussion will be more readily demonstrated if the problem to be investigated is first described briefly.

The last fifteen years have seen the veritable snowballing of the civil rights movement. Starting with the initial Supreme Court decisions concerning school segregation, the scope of the aspirations and achievements of the movement has increased at an increasing rate. Rioting and other forms of violent, aggressive behavior have given rise to apprehension in both black and white populations. Comments on this are often couched in terms of revolution. Crane Brinton in his *The Anatomy of Revolution* (1957), studied four revolutions, from the English Rebellion of 1640 to the Russian Revolution of 1917. From his studies he derived his now well-known theory that revolutions stem from hope not despair, from promises of progress rather than from continuous oppression.

Using Brinton's theory as a framework, those variables discussed earlier gain broader meaning. Brinton's theory for instance, can be regarded as a restatement of the principle of the goal-gradient. Factors contributing to frustration—barriers, delay, failure, withholding of rewards—constitute the recent history of the civil rights movement. This is reflected in the war cry of the militants, "freedom now."

The arbitrary nature of racial discrimination is doubtless a source of frustration to those who are the target of
discrimination. Probably the only thing more frustrating than arbitrary barriers are those formed through caprice. It seems likely that, from an individual's emotional point of view, the color of one's skin must often appear as sheer capriciousness on Nature's part.

The withholding of a promised reward is of relevance; from the Negro's point of view, nothing ever seems to improve as much or as fast as his government, his leaders, and the white folks tell him it will.

Approach-avoidance conflicts have entered the picture in a rather fascinating manner as a source of frustration. In earlier years, the goal was for full and equal participation in the dominant--white--culture of the country. During the last several years, some blacks are advocating that the white culture is to be avoided and the black man should look to Africa for his culture, or at the least, to his own culture as it has developed in this country (the desire of some whites to partake of the black culture by doing such things as eating "soul food" is a bemusing social feature).

Labels play a prominent part in this area. "Negro" is resented by many as the white man's term. "Colored" seems to be valued in almost the same way as "nigger," which creates some very real, though covert, interpersonal problems for older, "polite" whites. "Black" seems to be the preferred label, or at least does not seem to be rejected or resented. "Afro-American" is the term which would seem to
reflect black pride and the strongest degree of resentment or frustration with the white American culture. The rules of the various usages are not yet fixed and it is common to observe a Negro (black? black person? Afro-American?) speaking and evidencing confusion or inconsistency in the labels he uses. See Figures 1, 2, and 3.

That the black population is frustrated appears to be an hypothesis approaching a truism. A major social concern today is the likelihood of this frustration's producing aggressive behavior. Relevant questions include: If frustration instigates a hierarchy of responses, where does aggression rank in this hierarchy? Are people who reject "Negro" as the "white man's word" more prone to aggression? Does the self-designation "Afro-American" signify higher levels of frustration and a relatively high placement of aggression in the response hierarchy? If the black person is assured of freedom from retaliation, will he aggress more readily and strongly against a white, or a black? Does a black person's self-appellation of "Negro" indicate that he is deferent to the white and is likely to aggress more against a black man than against a white?

Additional questions may be derived from the above by adding the prefatory phrase "in the face of more-or-less arbitrary or capricious aggression - . "

In a consideration of response to aggression, it may be of significant import to consider the source of that
DEAR MISS VANDERBILT: I notice that
in your column you occasionally use the word
Negro, capitalizing it as is the current prac-
tice. I am confused on whether or not this is
the proper term or if we should now use the
word ‘black’ and if it should be capitalized. I
don’t understand why suddenly the word
‘black’ is being used and the word ‘Negro,’
which newspapers and other publications have
been educated to capitalize, seems to be in
the discard. I am a public speaker, and in
addressing audiences I want to be certain
that I am not insulting any member of an
ethnic group. Which is the proper term to use
in writing and in speaking? — M.H., Kansas
City, Mo.

This is a very good question and one that I
have taken up with a number of people who
should know the answer. One, a New York
City commissioner, said that there is confu-
sion in the matter among members of his
race themselves, but broadly speaking he
finds that the young do not like the word Negro
and prefer black (not capitalized — in
juxtaposition to whites, browns, yellows and
reds) or Afro-Americans. The word “colored”
seems to be in disapproval, he says, but
when he addresses professional groups he
frequently uses the word Negro together with
the expression “black.” Interestingly enough,
he pointed out, when he was a child the word
“black” was one of opprobrium, but that the
current “black is beautiful” campaign has
caused an about-face in the use of this termin-
ology, particularly, as he pointed out, among
the very young.

My friend, Dorothy Maynor, director of the
Harlem School of the Arts, says that her own
preference is for Negro, as Negroes are of all
shades, not necessarily black.

The term with which I feel most comfort-
able, I must admit, is Negro, which by dic-
tionary definition (French, Spanish, Latin)
means black. It seems to me that in good
modern journalism the term Negro is still
more common than the word “black” and I
am not at all sure about what the general
status of the word “colored” actually is. The
NAACP has not changed its name. Post
cards, please, to me in care of this news-
paper.

Young Negroes Like
‘Black’ Racial Tag

ATLANTA, Ga. (AP) — Young Wright of Savannah said she be-
black people did not choose the bleeds some young people worry
name “Negro” and would too much about “what we are
fer to be called “Black American,” and not enough about
cans” or “Afro-Americans,” del-
mates to an NAACP convention) “We can call ourselves any-
here said.

The word ‘Negro’ carries no
history because that was the
name given to us by white men
when they brought us to this
country from Africa,” said And-
rew Small of Winston-Salem,
N. C. “We didn’t choose the
name Negro.”

Small said the term ‘black’
gives “you a sense of pride, a
sense of tradition.”

Small’s remarks came at the
final session Saturday of the 300 Negroes now hold public of-
youth and college division of the fice in the deep South.

National Association for the Ad-
ancement of Colored People
tions to a dozen public officials.

One of the reasons young peo-
group, urged them “not to get
people object to the word “Negro” like white folks.
is that “too many bigots can’t
Let me warn you,” she said,
pronounce it,” said Curtis Coop-
er of Savannah. “And that’s
do your job, but if you don’t
when I’m apt to lose my cool.”

However, Mrs. Mercedes In.

Figure 1

Statements on racial nomenclature appearing in
GUEST EDITORIAL
"The Colored University"
By Mark X

Today in America, people of African descent can be characterized as colored, Negro, and Black. The colored man is mindless: in fact, he isn't even a man. He's a puppet controlled entirely by whitey. On the other hand, there's the Negro. The Negro has a mind but sometimes refuses to use it. In most cases Negroes recognize that in order to defeat the system they have to re-shape their minds, goals, and programs. When a Negro discovers where it really is, he awakens one morning black.

If we really look at these true definitions, we can readily and intelligently recognize Southern University as a "tomming" colored school. It's a shame that a school with nearly nine thousand blacks (in skin color only) doesn't have a Black Studies Program. Even our enemy is making it mandatory to study YOU. Southern has never functioned as a Black university. It has misused and disrupted the minds of black students since its founding.

This school is run by an administration composed of colored bourgeoises who don't even know what being Negro is.

The function of the university is to help shape and refine the minds of its students. The university is supposed to do this by administering courses relevant to the needs of its students. Southern has ceased to do this. For instance, if there's a brother or a sister in the process of doing student teaching, you ask them both who is Eldridge Cleaver or Huey P. Newton. The brother has that "who in the hell are you talking about" look on his face; the sister looks as if you have asked her to go an orgy. These type of people will be teaching my children and your children, if we don't put an immediate end to it.

Students. I think to lay the blame entirely on the administration is absurd — even though they can change it if they really wanted to. You, as a student, have failed humanity. You went along with everything the administration dished out. San Francisco State and Berkeley are revolutionary campuses, with Black Studies Program and Black Student Union. These campuses are predominantly white and here you are, nearly all Black and don't have anything. I mean anything! I sometimes wonder if you students are ever colored. Are you living or are you dead?

The university should be the instrument of the students, controlled by the students, not by a bunch of Pinnocios.

If the university does not live up to this philosophy, it is the duty of the students to do away with it by any means necessary!
For his own part, the Negro's affection for himself has probably never been higher. If they have failed to make a case for separation, the generation of militant leaders fathered by Malcolm X and brought to flower by Stokely Carmichael have turned Negroes on to blackness with electrifying impact. What do members of the race prefer to be called? "Black" is still not the first choice—Negro remains the most popular—but it has had a great vogue among the Northern city-dwellers, the young and the relatively affluent. The current standings in the game of the names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like most</th>
<th>Like least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORED PEOPLE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRO-AMERICAN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T CARE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
aggression. In the present context, will a white aggressor evoke a different response than a black aggressor?

Hypotheses to be tested

In these hypotheses, and throughout the rest of this paper, "Negro," "black," and "Afro-American" are distinctive terms and refer to the experimental groups.

1. When given an opportunity to make an aggressive response in a situation with minimal cues, it is hypothesized that:
   a. Regardless of the race of the target, blacks and Afro-Americans will be more aggressive than Negroes.
   b. Negroes, blacks, and Afro-Americans will respond with a low level of aggression to a person identified as a male, twenty year old, black student.
   c. When the stimulus is a male, twenty year old, white student, Negroes will respond with the same low level of aggression; blacks and Afro-Americans will respond at a significantly higher level.

2. When confronted with an aggressive stimulus of a low-to-moderate level, it is hypothesized that:
   a. If the source of aggression is black, all three experimental groups will respond with aggression not significantly different from that received.
   b. If the source of aggression is white, Negroes will respond with aggression equal to or only slightly higher than that received; blacks and Afro-Americans will respond with a significantly higher level of
aggression than that received.

3. When confronted with an aggressive stimulus of a high level, it is hypothesized that:
   a. When the source of aggression is black, Negroes will slightly exceed it.
   b. When the source of aggression is white, Negroes will not match it; blacks and Afro-Americans will exceed it by a significant amount.
METHODLOGY

The methodology of this study comprised selection and classification of subjects, experimental procedure, codification of the data, and statistical analysis of the data.

Selection and classification of subjects

Subjects for the study were drawn on a census basis from psychology and mathematics classes at Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A volunteer basis was not used. Unless a subject refused to take part in the study, the total male population of each class was used. There were no refusals.

The population of subjects was divided into the three experimental groups. This division was accomplished by subject self-classification. As part of the experimental procedure, subjects were asked to supply four items of personal data: sex, age, race, and occupation. Sex and occupation (student) were, of course, known. Age was not at first believed a significant source of variance. Subjects were therefore assigned to experimental groups on the basis of their response to the race item. Three groups were therefore composed of self-proclaimed Negroes, blacks, and Afro-Americans. Subjects who classified themselves as belonging to some other racial group were not used in the study. For
instance, three subjects, surprisingly enough, said that their race was "colored."

**Experimental procedure**

The experimental procedure utilized the equipment and setup shown in Figure 4. This arrangement was designed to eliminate various possible sources of extraneous or error variance in the procedure. There was no visual contact or verbal interchange between subjects and experimental assistant. The exchange of materials was accomplished by means of the "blind" slots in the panel between subject and assistant.

Because of the danger of experimenter's verbal behavior contaminating the procedure (Rosenthal, 1968) and, more specifically, to eliminate differential effects of supra-segmental phonemes, all instructions to subjects during the procedure were by means of a pre-recorded tape.

Subject was brought into the room, informed that the "other subject" was already present behind the panel, and asked to sit down. Experimenter sat at end of table and started the taped instructions:

"Both of you are about to take part in a study of artistic judgment. Please listen carefully to the instructions and follow them to the best of your ability. Please do not say anything, either to the other subject or to the person conducting the experiment.

"One of you will be Subject A and the other will be
Figure 4

Experimental equipment and setup.
Subject B. Please take one of these two cards." Two cards are offered, face down, to the subject. He picks one, the other is handed to assistant. Both cards were labeled "A"--the subject was always Subject A.

"Please place your cards face up at this end of the table so that they can be seen.... You're Subject A and you're Subject B." Experimenter points to each in turn. "Now please take a sheet of paper and draw a house. You can make your picture as plain or as fancy as you like. Just draw a picture of a house." Tape is stopped while subject completes his drawing.

"Both finished? Good.

"So that each of you will have some idea about the person whose drawing you will be rating, please fill out the blanks at the top of the paper as they apply to you." Tape is stopped while this is done. The form of these blanks can be seen in Figure 5.

"Both finished? Good.

"Now take your drawing and push it through the slot on your right." Tape stopped. "Look at the drawing you have received, read the information on it, judge how much you like or dislike the drawing. Study it for a few seconds but don't say anything." Five second pause. "Place your left hand on the copper surface on your left." A mild shock is administered to the subject by means of a battery and coil apparatus of the type found in practical joke devices. Every subject
Figure 5
Stimulus drawing.
received the same drawing to rate. The independent variable was that one copy of the drawing had the race item filled in "black" and another "white." Figure 5 is the stimulus drawing that was used.

"You will both notice that the dial in front of you is set at a value of one. That is the intensity of the shock which you have just felt in your hand. This is the way you are going to rate the drawing you are judging. If you like the drawing very much you can set the shock intensity at maybe 1 or 2—you might set the shock at zero if you have no criticism of the drawing at all. The less you like the drawing, or the more you dislike it, the higher you can set the shock, up to a maximum of 10, which is very painful. Please set the dial at the level of shock you feel the other subject should receive for his drawing—a low shock if you like the drawing, a higher one if you don't like the drawing." The subject sets his dial and the setting is noted.

This initial setting of the dial by the subject is the first body of data dealt with. It is a measure of an aggressive response made to a standardized stimulus with the only variable (in the stimulus) being the purported race of the assistant.

"All right, both of you have your dials set. So far you have both been doing exactly the same thing. Now you will each do something a little different. Subject B, take this blank card and on it write the number of the shock you
have decided to give Subject A for his drawing. Place the card in the small slot right in front of you." The number of Subject B's shock setting will appear in a small window directly in front of the subject. This number will be, randomly, either 3 or 7.

"Subject A, you see in the window the intensity of the shock that Subject B thinks you deserve for your drawing. This is set now, and he cannot change it. However, now that you see how much shock he has decided to give you, you can change the amount of shock you think he should get, if you want to." The new, or retained, setting of subject's dial is recorded and the procedure is at an end.

Since the procedure was somewhat deceptive, any questions subjects had about the procedure (there were very few) were answered. Later, they were informed that Subject B was a confederate, that the shock settings were determined in advance and had nothing to do with the quality of the subject's drawing.

Codification of the data

There were four items of data for each subject: the self-applied label of race membership, the race label under which the assistant functioned, and the two settings of the "aggression dial" by the subject. The dial had been modified such that the assistant could read the subject's dial settings from the back and record them directly on the subject's drawing.
Statistical analysis of the data

The data were analyzed by means of analyses of variance using the procedures of Myers (1966). Initial settings of the dial, subjects' rating of the drawing, were analyzed by means of a double-entry table, with the two variables being subject-group and race of the assistant.

The second set of data, subjects' amount of change in the dial settings, was entered in a three way table, the added variable being the aggressive stimulus supplied by the assistant; a threatened shock of 3 or 7.
RESULTS

As the half-way point in the data collection was reached, two qualities of the data became manifest: Afro-Americans were relatively uncommon, and the Negroes were supplying very inconsistent data.

A black student was asked about the shortage of Afro-Americans and he said that he was not at all surprised; that the experimental form asked for "race." He said that "race" is black, "nationality" is Afro-American. This seemed to be reasonable and logical—even if it did not account for those few who said their "race" was Afro-American. A black professor at the university said that the Afro-Americans all left school in the summer to go off and study guerrilla warfare. At any rate, they were scarce. At this point in the study, four Afro-Americans had been through the procedure and, by chance, three of them had interacted with a "white" assistant. It was decided that as, and if, Afro-Americans presented themselves in the study, the assistant would always be "white."

The second quality of the data proved to be more serendipity than problem. Initially, the total male population of a given class was included in the study, the plan being to discard from the study those who did not "fit" because of age or other factors. It became apparent, however, that the Negroes were arrayed in two rather discrete groups: those
from 17 to 26 years of age, and those from 29 to 44. When the Negro group was divided into these two groups, a pattern seemed to be present in the data. For the remainder of the study subjects were classified in one of four groups: young Negroes (17-26), older Negroes (29-44), blacks, and Afro-Americans. No older blacks or Afro-Americans were encountered.

As mentioned earlier, the study was divided into two parts: the initial judgment of the drawing (first setting of the shock dial), and the revised judgment or second setting of the dial (response to aggression).

The initial responses of all subjects are presented in Table 1 according to experimental group and the racial identification of the experimental assistant. The relevant statistical quantities are presented in Table 2.

The data of Table 1 were analyzed by means of a double-entry table analysis of variance, the results of which comprise Table 3. Because of lack of interaction with a black assistant, the Afro-American data were omitted from this analysis.

The reader will have noticed that the raw data occur in unequal cells. The cells are not only unequal, they are disproportional. Since unequal cells were felt to be a possible weakness of the study, the data were analyzed repeatedly by various methods to evaluate any effect of inequality and disproportionality. Patterson's method (1946) was used
### TABLE 1

**INITIAL DIAL SETTING OF ALL SUBJECTS**

A **SUPPOSED RATING OF THE ARTISTIC MERIT OF A DRAWING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>BLACK ASST.</th>
<th>WHITE ASST.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>BLACK ASST.</th>
<th>WHITE ASST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Negro</td>
<td>2 1 1 5</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
<td>Older Negro</td>
<td>7 3 2 10</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
<td>1 3 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 5 3 3</td>
<td>2 5 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 5 3 3</td>
<td>1 3 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 0 5</td>
<td>0 4 7 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>0 3 5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFRO-AMERICAN**

| Older Negro         | 3 2 0       | 2 0 0       |
|                     | 2 0         | 3 0         |
|                     | 8 1 7       | 5 1 2       |
|                     | 3 2 0       | 2 0 0       |

N= 96
### TABLE 2
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND VALUES USED IN DATA-ANALYSIS FOR THE FOUR EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YOUNG NEGRO</th>
<th>OLDER NEGRO</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>AFRO-AMERICAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣX</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΣX)^2</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣX^2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σx^2</td>
<td>67.24</td>
<td>33.43</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>3.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-W ass't.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0092</td>
<td>.0092</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>8.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>336.29</td>
<td>4.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>439.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to adjust the means—first for the groups, then for the race of the assistant. From Myers (1966), the methods of unweighted means and expected cell frequencies were both applied. All methods confirmed the original analysis of variance.

It is often of value to depict data graphically to prevent a very significant interaction effect from obscuring what is actually happening within a set of data. This is done in Figure 6. The writer realizes that the blackness or whiteness of the assistant does not form a continuous variable and the linear chart is not intended to convey such an error, but simply to make the data clearer.

As can be seen from the chart, the impression that might have been conveyed by the analysis of variance that the race of the assistant is of no effect is not true.

It may be noted that the Afro-American data are included in the chart.

The chart clearly indicates those differences which should be subjected to statistical test.

Specific hypotheses and relationships were investigated by the procedures proposed by Scheffe (1959). Tukey's method is not applicable because of the unequal n's.

Each of the three experimental groups was tested for a differential response according to the race of the assistant. The F-ratios were:

- Young Negro  \( F = 2.396 \) \( \text{df} = 1,33 \) \( .05 = 4.17 \)
- Older Negro  \( F = 13.749^{**} \) \( \text{df} = 1,18 \) \( .005 = 10.22 \)
- Black  \( F = 1.264 \) \( \text{df} = 1,29 \) \( .05 = 4.18 \)
Mean initial dial settings.

Figure 6
These F-ratios indicated that only the older Negro group responded significantly to racial differences in the "other subject." However, if the responses of all the young subjects, Negro and black, are considered, F = 3.544* with df = 3,62 which is significant at the .025 level (F = 3.34).

The chart shows the opposite direction of the "prejudice slope" for the young Negro and older Negro groups. The differences at each "end" of the lines were tested and yielded these results:

White assistant F = 4.857* df = 1,22 .05 = 4.30
Black assistant F = 11.095** df = 1,29 .005 = 9.23

The same comparison was made for the young Negro and black groups:

White assistant F = 2.175 df = 1,26 .05 = 4.22
Black assistant F = 4.418* df = 1,36 .05 = 4.17

This comparison was not made for the black and older Negro groups since the two groups are not comparable, differing on two significant variables, racial label and age.

The test for the difference in general level of aggression between Negroes (young) and blacks gave these results:

Black-Negro F = 6.201*** df = 3,62 .001 = 6.17

The data obtained from the ten Afro-Americans were analyzed by means of a seven group simple analysis of variance. This analysis will not be presented. It can be seen from the chart that none of the hypotheses relating to Afro-Americans were supported.
The second part of the experimental procedure began when the subject was told that his drawing had been rated in the same manner as he had rated the drawing he had received, and was shown the level of shock the "other subject" had decided to administer to him, either 3 or 7.

Subjects' responses were examined in terms of change of dial setting. Of the eighty-six subjects, fifty-eight did not move the dial at all. Their responses are recorded as zero and are included in the analysis. The data are presented in Table 4. The integers refer to the difference between the initial and response-to-aggression settings of the dial. These data were tested by a three way analysis of variance, the summary of which is Table 5.

The negative SS is not an error of calculation. It is doubtless a function of the unequal cells. However, because of the small magnitude of the distortion and the unequivocal statement of Table 5, these data were not subjected to a correction for unequal cells.
### TABLE 4

**SUBJECTS' DIAL CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO DIFFERENT LEVELS AND SOURCES OF AGGRESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIMULUS</th>
<th>YOUNG NEGRO</th>
<th>OLDER NEGRO</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO DIFFERENT LEVELS AND SOURCES OF AGGRESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.736</td>
<td>35.736</td>
<td>7.525**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x B-W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x 3-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.370</td>
<td>4.685</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-W x 3-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.644</td>
<td>-.644</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x B-W x 3-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.595</td>
<td>2.298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>351.425</td>
<td>4.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The three part hypothesis tested by the first part of the experimental procedure was:

1. When given an opportunity to make an aggressive response in a situation with minimal cues:
   a. Regardless of the race of the target, blacks and Afro-Americans will be more aggressive than Negroes.
   b. Negroes, blacks and Afro-Americans will respond with a low level of aggression to a person identified as a male, twenty year old, black student.
   c. When the stimulus is a male, twenty year old, white student, Negroes will respond with the same low level of aggression; blacks and Afro-Americans will respond at a significantly higher level.

These hypotheses were conceived with the intention of all subjects being of so-called "college age" and will be discussed, initially, in those terms.

Hypothesis 1-a

The black group clearly confirmed this hypothesis (p.< .001). They exhibited a higher level of aggression than did the young Negro group regardless of the race of the assistant. It would appear that the speculations being published currently are correct; people who refer to themselves as black are more aggressive. For reasons previously cited,
there are no data for Afro-Americans interacting with the black assistant. However, from the data provided by Afro-Americans with the white assistant, it seems certain that the hypothesis that Afro-Americans are more aggressive than Negroes would not have been supported.

Hypothesis 1-b

This hypothesis was confirmed by the young Negroes; their average dial setting was 1.5, the lowest average of any group for the black assistant. The black group also supported this hypothesis if the effect of their overall higher level of aggression is taken into account. That is, although the blacks aggressed at a significantly higher level (p.<.05) against the black assistant than did the young Negroes, their average setting was lower for the black than for the white assistant. This is, however, argumentative; although the black group's mean aggressive response to the black was lower than to the white, the difference was not significant.

Hypothesis 1-c

The F-ratios obtained indicated that the young Negro group supported the hypothesis; although they set the dial higher for a white, the difference was not significant. The black group did not support their section of the hypothesis for the same reason; although their setting for white was higher, it was not significantly so. The Afro-Americans clearly disconfirmed; their average aggression to the white
was lower than both other groups.

The findings of the previous paragraph, however, are reversed if combined data are used. Young subjects (Negroes and blacks) did aggress against the white assistant at a significantly higher level (p.<.025). It would appear that, in this instance, the number of subjects is too small to reveal a significant difference for each group independently.

The data to this point, then, indicate that the young subjects exhibited aggressive behavior which reveals a pronounced racial prejudice. The only change in the stimulus situation to which they responded was the one word on the drawing they judged; the "other subject" was "black" or "white." In addition, black subjects, regardless of the race of the assistant, were more aggressive than Negro subjects of the same age.

The older Negro group

The older Negro group provided the most interesting, if unplanned, data of this study. As the reader will have observed, this group was radically different from the younger groups.

The mean age for this group was 35.1 years. The young Negroes averaged 21.3 years of age and the blacks and Afro-Americans, 20.4 years.

This older group was composed of teachers, principals, and persons who were teaching and seeking to "certify" through additional course work.
The data indicate an extreme racial prejudice in this group. Their differential response to the black-white assistant was very significant ($p < .005$); they aggressed against a black at a level significantly higher than young Negroes ($p < .005$), and their level of aggression against a white was significantly lower ($p < .05$). In short, the older Negro group and the younger Negro group differed in every way possible within the experimental context, quantitatively and qualitatively.

In terms of the frustration-aggression hypothesis, what do the data from these groups mean? Some aspects of the data seem clear. "Black is beautiful" evidences a rejection of "Negro" and all it has stood for—a frustration with things the way they are. The black seems to be more aware of the world, what is in it, and what is wrong with it. Brinton's theory seems relevant; the goal gradient is operating. The black is highly sensitive to social change and, especially, the promise of social change. The data are clear that the black is more aggressive than the Negro. The data also provide evidence, not conclusive by any means, that this higher level of aggression is a generalized aspect of his condition. The black does not show as strong a tendency to differentiate between a white and black target or source of aggression. The young Negro, on the other hand, although frustrated, does not seem to be as aware, even of his own frustration. In speaking with students at Southern
University, it is evident that there are two rather distinct groups: those who are rather passive and blame everything on the white folks, and those who are at least as critical of Negroes as they are of whites. These last seem to be more interested in change than in who is responsible for the status quo.

But what of the older Negro? From the level of shock directed against the twenty year old black student, one gets some little appreciation of the slogan, "Don't trust anyone over 30." There are several possible explanations of the older group's data. From one philosophical framework, their reluctance or refusal to aggress against a white defines a well-conditioned "good ol' nigger." A more sociological viewpoint would suggest that these men have achieved some standing in their sub-culture, being teachers, and are intolerant or contemptuous of those Negroes who haven't or, more to the point, are likely to challenge their position in the near future. Age, it has been said, resists and resents change. Would the older Negroes have aggressed as much against a twenty year old Negro as they did against a twenty year old black? These men are aware, certainly, of the black movement. When they received the drawing labeled black, did it remind them that they had written Negro, that they represent the "old order?" This conceivably could have aroused frustration, even guilt, and stimulated a strong aggression
against the source of the accusation.

The partial data from Afro-Americans are not easy to account for. It was hypothesized that this group would be at least as aggressive as the blacks. The data, of course, contradict this. This name or label situation is in a very fluid state. It seems possible that those who early embraced Afro-American have moved on to black, leaving behind a small number with the Afro-American label but not what it was supposed to signify. Maybe as the student cited earlier said, race is black, nationality is Afro-American. Maybe those who answered Afro-American to race are those who, in the black vernacular, "don't know where it's at."

Several things are evident. The self-chosen and applied racial labels do mean something. To an extent, a bearer of one label will exhibit behavior different from that of one who uses another label. Evident also is the much proclaimed "generation gap." The targets and levels of aggression are different. Why they are different is speculative, but they are different.

Response to aggression

The data from this portion of the procedure are of such nature that there is no need to consider the stated hypotheses singly; all the hypotheses were stated in terms of group membership and source of aggression. Analysis of the data indicates that these variables were of no significant effect.
The level of expected aggression, however, was significant (p.<.01). These results can be summed up simply by saying that aggression begets aggression. Statistically and philosophically, this is satisfying. However, two-thirds of the subjects made a zero response to both levels of aggression. Does this mean that aggression begets aggression, but only in one-third of this population? It may.

This part of the procedure was designed to elicit the type of response which was made by one-third of the subjects. The fact that two-thirds of the subjects made no retaliatory response to arbitrary and capricious aggression seems very deserving of further investigation. Is the black (generic term) population accustomed to making no response to aggression, regardless of a black or white source? A group of white subjects might reveal significant differences in the two populations’ response to aggression.

An uncontrolled, though constant, variable

There is one additional factor in the experimental situation which must be considered. The person conducting the procedure was in all instances the same person, and he was white. Could this be a significant factor in the overtly expressed aggression of the subjects? To be significant, it would seem that the subjects would have had to respond to the experimenter and the situation with either hostility or deference. With the young subjects, if the response were one of hostility, the process could have been
"the experimenter is white, the other subject is white, I'm going to shock him good just to show that white doesn't scare me." If so, the process and the overt experimental behavior amount to the same thing. If the effect was one of deference to the white, then the "true" results would have been more marked than they are. Admittedly, this would not apply when the assistant was black. Perhaps the subjects inhibited aggression against the black assistant because of the presence of the white experimenter? This really does not seem very likely and, with the older group, it would seem necessary to reverse the entire argument. Delk (1967) studied a similar situation in which he had Southern University students mete out jail sentences to felons differentiated only by whether they were white or Negro. He found that the use of a black experimenter made no significant difference in this task or in another, perceptual, experiment. A study done recently at Southern along similar parameters and using a Negro experimenter got similar results (Sterling, 1969).

It is not possible to demonstrate that the race of the experimenter in the present study was of no effect, but the null hypothesis seems more tenable than any other. In any event, this factor was a constant and the groups did behave differently.
Critique and indications for further research

The first portion of the study appears to have achieved its object; the procedure provided fairly stable measures of differential levels of aggression. However, several permutations of variables warrant exploration. What is the effect of age of the assistant? Would a forty or fifty year old assistant evoke different responses from the older Negro group? From the young group? An obvious question is the pattern of aggression in white university students. What about black students who have chosen to go to a white rather than to a black university? Suppose the assistant was identified as "colored?" The occupation and status of the older Negroes was doubtless important. For that matter, college students are not the most representative sample of young blacks.

The second part of the procedure may well have several covert contaminants. The house drawing task was selected with the hope that the subjects' drawings would somehow "drop out" of the situation and leave only an aggression-counter-aggression interaction. Many subjects may have perceived the assistant's shock-rating of their drawing as an honest evaluation. It was evident that many subjects perceived the situation exactly as it was intended--an aggressive interaction. But what of the two-thirds of the subjects who made no counter-aggressive response? This may or may not be a valid measure of this population's response to aggression.

The subjects were told that Subject B's shock-rating was
fixed and could not be changed in order that the subject could aggress without fear of retaliation. Did the subjects believe this? Even the most naive subject knows that an experimenter can change the rules at any time. What is needed is a procedure that is unmistakably an exercise of aggression and counter-aggression without any "justifying" context.
SUMMARY

The study was designed to measure levels of aggression in selected segments of the black population. Subjects classified themselves into groups according to the term they used for their racial membership: Negro, black, or Afro-American. These three experimental groups averaged twenty-one years of age. An additional group was composed of male teachers all of whom referred to themselves as Negroes and averaged thirty-five years of age.

An experimental confederate was used as the "other subject" in the procedure. Both subjects were instructed to draw a house and identify themselves on the drawing according to sex, age, race, and occupation. They exchanged drawings through a panel (there was no direct contact of any kind between the real subject and the confederate) and "rated" each other's drawing by dialing the amount of electric shock they thought the other subject should receive for his drawing.

Independent variables were self-assigned racial group of the subject, age of the subject, and race of the confederate, either white or black.

The confederate always used the same drawing and this drawing elicited the following behaviors.
Blacks were significantly more aggressive than Negroes regardless of the race of the confederate (p.<.001).

The younger subjects (blacks and Negroes) aggressed at a significantly higher level against a white than against a black (p.<.025).

The older subjects exhibited racially prejudiced aggression in the opposite direction from the younger groups: they aggressed at a significantly higher level against a black than against a white (p.<.005). Further, their aggression against a black was significantly higher than the other groups' (p.<.005) and their aggression against a white was significantly lower (p.<.05).

A scarcity of Afro-Americans dictated that they only interact with the white confederate. Surprisingly, their level of aggression was the lowest of the three young groups.

In the second part of the procedure, each subject was informed that the "other subject" had decided to give him a shock of either 3 or 7 for his drawing and that he could now change the level of shock he had decided to give the other subject, if he wanted to. Two-thirds of the subjects made no change. In this response to aggression section, it was found that racial group membership and race of the confederate had no significant effect. The level of aggression threatened by the confederate was the only significant effect on the subjects' response to aggression (p.<.01).

The study provided empirical verification of suspected
group qualities and relationships and suggested several questions for further research. Questions raised included comparisons with white subjects in this procedure, the effect of the older group's professional status, and the current significance of the Afro-American label.
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