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ABSTRACT

The present research was concerned with examining the presence of anger in black subjects and determining if and how the experience of anger influences their perceptions of other blacks as well as whites.

The hypotheses underlying the present research were: (1) Blacks who inhibit anger (anger inhibited) would exhibit a greater likelihood of viewing whites positively while viewing blacks in a more negative fashion; (2) Blacks who express anger (anger expressed) would exhibit a greater likelihood of viewing blacks more positively while viewing whites in a more negative fashion; (3) Differences were anticipated in the ratings of black vis-a-vis white subjects and these differences were examined.

Subjects were 55 students drawn from the following sources: 28 (16 females, 12 males) white students from University of Central Florida psychology classes; 27 (19 females, 8 males) black students were obtained through the University of Central Florida Office of Minority Affairs. The mean age for black subjects was 20.0, while the mean age for whites was 25.5. The Anger Self Report (A.S.R.) was used to delineate 12 black and 14 white subjects who tend to inhibit anger from 15 black and 14 white subjects whose tendencies are toward the expression of anger. Blacks and whites, in separated groups, then viewed and rated 50 photographs depicting blacks and whites on eight personality dimensions.
The analysis of the data showed that black anger expressers do, in fact, rate blacks significantly higher than whites. On the other hand, anger inhibited blacks and whites showed no preference when presented with an identical stimulus situation. White anger expressers also showed no preference.
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INTRODUCTION

Ideally, as a scientific discipline, psychology seeks to discover universal principles of human psychological functioning. The assumption underlying this rigorous endeavor is that universals, in fact, do exist although they often elude empirical analysis and confirmations. The basic treatise is that human behavior in its varied and complex manifestations follows a lawful, predictable pattern that is theoretically discernible to the astute researcher, armed with sufficient knowledge, proper technique and an accessible, representative sample of the population under investigation. Confronted with a task of such magnitude and scope, psychology—young, relative to other scientific disciplines—has essentially succeeded in providing a basic framework for the prediction and explanation of human behavior. However, a review of the literature reveals that studies involving an examination of human behavior within a psychological context have traditionally focused on white middle-class populations. The exclusion of blacks and other minorities in the research has resulted in establishing the white middle-class as the norm by which the larger, more diverse, population is viewed.

In the limited number of studies where blacks have been included, researchers historically have focused on identifying specific traits and attributes that genetically differentiate blacks from the white reference group. This tendency is particularly striking in studies investigating intelligence and personality differences between blacks
and whites. In terms of intelligence comparisons, Wilcox (1971) asserts that in the psychological investigation of black Americans, no problem has attracted so much attention as the question of the inherent intellectual superiority of whites. Baughman (1971), reviewing the research on IQ differences, observed that many studies, particularly those of Jensen (1969), have shown that the measured intelligence of black samples average 15 points below the mean of white samples, prompting some researchers to posit a genetic explanation for the differences. However, in response to the genetic position, embodied primarily in the formulations of Jensen, the Council of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (cited in Baughman, 1971) stated that despite marked differences in intelligence test scores, "there is little definitive evidence that leads to a conclusion that such differences are innate" (p. 1039). Furthermore, a "more accurate understanding of the contribution of heredity to intelligence will be possible only when social conditions for all races are equal and when this situation has existed for several generations" (p. 1039). Recognizing the findings of both sides of the nature versus nurture controversy, Karon (1975) summarized the data on intelligence test scores "...One cannot conclude that there is no difference due to heredity factors between groups, but only that there has been no (empirically) demonstrated hereditary difference whereas there has been demonstrated an environmentally-based difference of considerable magnitude" (p. 50). Similar to the research on IQ differences, Karon also found that most research on black versus white personality differences, especially the earlier studies, were
intent on finding differences that primarily were innate. For example, Bender (1939), in a study of black children, hypothesized that characteristic traits such as laziness and the ability to dance were reflective of localized brain impulse tendencies.

Likewise, in commenting on black-white personality traits, Franz Boaz (cited in Myrdal, 1944) reasoned that "it does not seem probable that minds of races which show variation in physical structure should act in the same way" (p. 146). In response to the negative model of black psychological functioning implied by studies on black-white intelligence and personality differences, a number of black researchers recognized the need to explore the social history of blacks as contributors to observed differences, while controlling what is known today as the "human equation," i.e., experimental bias. As early as the 1930s and 1940s, black researchers (Clark & Clark, 1939; Bayton & Muldrow, 1944; Jenkins, 1936; and Canady, 1937) were initiating some of the first objective studies assessing the self attitudinal sets and overall psychological adjustment of blacks using black experimenters and subjects. These studies later provided the groundwork for what is known today as the Psychology of the Black Experience. Contemporary social scientists, (Pugh, 1972; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Karon, 1975) building on these earlier formulations, now contend that American blacks, as a result of their historical and cultural experience in American society, have developed an adaptive psychological makeup that is unique in the sense that it does not occur identically in the white population at large. It is this history that, to a significant degree,
influences the manner in which black Americans perceive themselves and others. Pugh (1972) and Grier and Cobbs (1968) assert that there is no Black Psychology per se, that embodies its own specific set of psychological principles. However, they maintain that American blacks have unique historical experiences and there are psychological effects that are specific to these experiences. According to Pugh, whites in America have traditionally related to blacks from a role of assumed superiority, while blacks, fearing reprisals for attempting to challenge the status quo, related to whites from a position of adaptive inferiority. Pugh defines adaptive inferiority as a defense mechanism that develops under conditions of extreme stress which allows the individual to function without significant personality decompensation. Under conditions where survival depended on acquiescence, this mechanism served to reduce the impact of an individual's inner conflicts and frustrations engendered by oppressive conditions (i.e., control anger). Personality theory, particularly the formulations of Carl Rogers (1961), illustrates how this defense mechanism operates from a theoretical standpoint. According to Rogers, the healthy, fully functioning personality is characterized by a state of congruence, which means there is little discrepancy between an individual's real self, perceived self and ideal self. If these divisions are not aligned properly, relative to each other, the overall efficiency of the personality is impaired, sometimes to a serious degree. To restore some measure of congruence or consonance, the individual may employ passive, defensive maneuvers, as in the case of adaptive inferiority. Psychologically though, this
alternative is palliative and may result in the individual's accepting inferiority as proper and legitimate. Therefore, if one is, in reality, inferior, domination by one's superior is more easily rationalized and tolerated; psychic conflict is minimized and anxiety is reduced. In addition, complacency and apathy are reinforced, as is the pattern of assumed superiority manifested by many whites (Pugh, 1972). The overall process becomes one of mutual reinforcement wherein complimentary patterns of behavior reinforce each other. This process, according to Pugh (1972), viewed over the course of 300 years, illustrates the interaction of history and personality in explaining the unique psycho-social milieu that influences the way blacks perceive themselves as well as their perceptions of whites. Similarly, acknowledging the occurrence of adaptive inferiority as a product of oppression, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) in their classic psychoanalytic study of the effects of oppression on black subjects also found that intense hostility or aggressive inclinations were represented as "universal traits." Equally conspicuous for all subjects was their inability to give free rein to assertive or aggressive drives. Referring to the high frequency of mutilation responses given by all subjects to Rorschach protocols, the authors concluded that the responses reflected the subject's feeling of disintegration by an onslaught of forces which he could not ward off. The expected aggression resulting from such an "onslaught" tends to be handled by submissive resignation, (Pugh's adaptive inferiority), denial, intellectualization, aloofness, impersonalization, or periodic outbursts of anger. Although adaptive in
the sense that they reduce conflict associated with control or expression of aggression, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) claim that when followed habitually, these defense mechanisms have the effect of distorting reality while constricting the individual's capacity for emotional expression. Paralleling the formulations of Kardiner and Ovesey, Karon (1975) investigated the effect of discrimination on the personality structure of blacks growing up in the United States.

In an effort to demonstrate that the traits identified were reflective of oppressive conditions rather than genetic factors, he hypothesized that Northern whites would differ from Southern blacks on the same characteristics that differentiate Northern blacks from Southern blacks and in the same direction. This, he concluded, would demonstrate the selective effect of America's caste sanctions. States were delegated to the North or South categories based on geographical locale and the presence or absence of a history of laws on miscegenation and segregation. Using a pilot study involving 148 Northern whites and 51 Southern blacks, Karon found that extreme response reflected in discriminant scores obtained from the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test (PAT), differentiated Northern whites from Southern blacks on eleven personality characteristics. Later, using 52 Northern blacks and 51 Southern blacks, Karon found that the means of these two samples differed in the same direction observed in the pilot study. Because the samples were drawn from populations which may have different variances (Northern blacks versus Southern blacks) the significance of the difference between the means was tested using Welch's modification of the $t$ test. This analysis yielded a $t$ of 2.62
Thus the obtained difference between the two sample means was significant at the .01 level.

In elaborating on the eleven personality characteristics posited to reflect the effect of oppression, Karon found that six of them were directly concerned with the area of anger and aggression (i.e., "people are angry with me," "people will go out of their way to make trouble for me"). Four dealt with the defense mechanism denial. The ideas found to be the most distressing and therefore denied were: (1) Someone is making trouble for you; (2) A physical fight; (3) Being angry in response to provocation; (4) Being angry without provocation. In explaining the significance of "anger without provocation," Karon posits that this reflects that internalized anger has "finally burst through," prompting the individual to sense that he has lost control. Karon insists that this is very frightening to an individual who knows that the overt expression of anger has traditionally resulted in painful retaliation. Overall, the results obtained by Karon (1975) parallel the observations of others (Cayton, 1955; Dai, 1948; Powdermaker, 1943; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; and Grier & Cobbs, 1968); that is, ... "high aggression which is consciously suppressed, plus a fear of losing control over one's anger, are the two personality traits which characterized the effects of living as the inferior caste in a caste situation" (p. 163-164). Thus far, the research examining the psychological experience of blacks has provided a profile that may be viewed as essentially pathological in the sense that it reflects the overuse of marginally effective defense mechanisms. As an alternative to this pathological view, Grier and Cobbs (1968) propose the implementation of the black norm in assessing
the presence of true pathology. In a discourse on mental illness, the authors point out, as Karon demonstrated earlier, that blacks develop more than whites the character traits traditionally viewed as pathological. Moreover, they conclude that blacks are angry. However, unlike the pathological mechanisms hypothesized by some (Karon, 1975; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951), Grier and Cobbs (1968) contended that devices such as "cultural paranoia" and cultural anti-socialism are necessary for surviving in a hostile environment that has been traditionally threatening and hostile. Viewed in this context, anger, mistrust, preoccupation with perceived attack, sadness and an intimacy with misery are "normal" responses developed in response to a peculiar environment and are no more pathological than "hunter's cunning" or a "banker's prudence." According to the authors, blacks must develop traits that traditionally have been viewed as pathological if they are to survive in a threatening environment. Therefore, before assessing whether an individual black manifests true pathology, the clinician and experimenter is cautioned to take into account what is common or typical for the individual living in an environment controlled by whites. As a rule of thumb, the authors suggest that the clinician/experimenter... "first sum all that represents illness and then subtract the black norm. What remains is illness and a proper subject for therapeutic endeavor" (p. 149-150). Even so, at present no definitive evidence exists empirically supporting the non-pathological nature of adaptive mechanisms. In responding to the psychological effects of oppression, Thomas Edwards (cited in Pugh, 1972) argues that all blacks who have grown up
in the United States have different amounts and different kinds of scar tissue hypothesized by Pugh (1972), Karon, (1975) and Kardiner and Ovesey (1951). He also maintains that it is doubtful that any American black is totally free from this scarring, although each person adapts individually as a result of his unique personality structure and the severity of oppressive experiences. He agrees with Pugh (1972) in stating that the overall response repertoire is generally shaped and limited by the caste sanctions experienced while growing up black in American society. American society however, is quite diverse with differences in experiences, perception and attitudes occurring as a function of two variables: (1) The geographical region targeted (i.e., Northern versus Southern); and (2) Class. Crain (cited in Pugh, 1972), in attempting to assess the differential effects of segregation on self-esteem and aggression found that Southern blacks had lower self-esteem than Southern or Northern whites. However, Northern blacks, experiencing less segregation, did not typically acquiesce and "identify with the aggressor" as did their Southern counterparts. Instead of internalizing feelings of worthlessness engendered by oppressive conditions, the Northern subjects were more prone to externalizing their feelings, often in unrestrained rage. Even so, they tended to be on the average, less happy as determined by the Gilford-Zimmerman Temperament Scale than their white counterparts, more fatalistic regarding their future and had greater difficulty dealing with aggression, which is supported by the research of Karon (1975), Kardiner and Ovesey (1951), Dai (1948) and Powdermaker (1943).
Although the research cited thus far has not dealt specifically with class, (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951 excluded), a number of researchers (Freeman, Armor, Ross, & Pettigrew, 1966; Karon, 1975) have addressed the attitudes and experiences of blacks occupying different positions in the social order. Kardiner and Ovesey mirroring the position of others, hypothesized that class distinction among blacks essentially follows the same patterns observed in the larger, white population, but with two exceptions: (1) the augmentation of status by association with the white world; and (2) the importance of skin color. According to the authors, the criteria by which both groups establish distinction consist of: (1) occupation and steadiness of job; (2) education; (3) family organization; and (4) housing, furnishings and appearance of comfort and convenience. The two exceptions represent traditional pathways to greater mobility in a social system where the resources necessary for such mobility have been historically restricted or denied altogether. Using structured schedules, Freeman et al. (1966) attempted to analyze the association between skin color and socio-psychological measures among middle-class Midwestern black residents. They found that light skin color was consistently associated with higher class status. Similarly, using Semantic Differential Scores, Williams (1961) found highly significant differences in the connotative meanings of five race-related color names (Black, Brown, Red, Yellow and White). Group preferences were reflected in the overall rank order of the colors which were rated on the dimensions of overall evaluation, activity and potency. The subjects were white students in the South and Midwest
and Southern black students. On the evaluation dimension, both groups "evaluated" black as "bad," while white was viewed as "good," although black students gave a less negative rating to the color black. On the potency dimension, black was viewed as "strong," whereas white was viewed as "weak." On the activity dimension, both groups viewed white as "more active" and black as "more passive." Summarizing the results of both studies, it would appear that skin color continues to exert some influence on blacks' perceptions of other blacks and whites. The latter study was limited in that colors were arbitrarily selected to represent actual variations in human skin color. To date, no empirical evidence exists which supports a substantial relationship between color preferences and racial attitudes.

Commenting on the relationship between skin color and class, Karon (1975) argues that skin color, once a major determinant of status among blacks has decreased in importance, while education and the stability of the family have increased in importance as determinants of class designation. Interestingly, when such traditional pathways lead to upward mobility, conflict does not necessarily abate. For example, Bayton and Muldrow (1944) in examining the self-concepts of light-skinned black males found that these males had more difficulty in their self-esteem than did darker-skinned black males, who were seen to have better personal relationships and perceived as friendlier than lighter-skinned males. The investigators posited that lighter-skinned males occupy a psychologically marginal status due to their association with whites and their greater social mobility which makes them more responsive to skin cues emanating from other blacks.
In terms of idealization of the white middle-class norm, Baughman (1971) claims that a black person struggling to approximate middle-class status or even one who ultimately achieves it must "still confront the fact that much of his experience is going to be affected by his color and that racial identity goes with him no matter what socio-economic level he manages to achieve" (p. 4). Similarly, commenting on the effect of America's middle-class orientation on blacks, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) point out that the ideals of middle-class and upper-class blacks are higher than those observed in the lower classes.

Due to the fact that the potential for achieving these ideals is greater also, these blacks tend to drive themselves harder and make greater demands on themselves for accomplishment. Thus, making it even more difficult to accept the lower status inherent in being black. Expanding on this concept, Karon (1975) claims that the "middle-class black has the same aspirations as do middle-class whites but these aspirations conflict with the existing pattern of discrimination" (p. 34). The fear of engendering or justifying social discrimination leads to a restriction and denial of aggression and the adoption of stringent standards of personal conduct and morality which is by far, less tolerant of deviant behavior than those imposed by his white counterparts. This stringent adoption of white middle-class mores, when viewed in the context of Grier and Cobbs' (1968) black norm, puts the middle-class black at odds with the majority of blacks who disproportionately fall within the lower classes and who, therefore,
manifest "adaptive" behaviors that are deviant from the white middle-class norm.

To re-emphasize, the idealization of middle-class norms at some level is inevitable for all blacks regardless of class designation. As stated by Kardiner & Ovesey (1951), the values prized by American society are: (1) Success, measured in one's ability to command goods and services through enterprise or good luck; (2) Liberty; and (3) Fair play, reflected in the high value of honest competitiveness. Blacks, as Americans, are directly influenced by the institutional and integrative system that affects the larger white population. To date, research indicates that the black American attempts to internalize the universalistic achievement orientation (middle-class value system) of American society. However, in light of a history of slavery and discrimination, the idealization of this achievement orientation has necessitated a unique adaptation that involves learning to live with frustration and anger.

The present research was concerned with examining the presence of anger in black subjects and determining if and how the experience of anger influences their perceptions of other blacks as well as whites.

The hypotheses underlying the present research were: (1) Blacks who inhibit anger (anger inhibited) would exhibit a greater likelihood of viewing whites positively while viewing blacks in a more negative fashion; (2) Blacks who express anger (anger expressed) would exhibit a greater likelihood of viewing blacks more positively while viewing...
whites in a more negative fashion; (3) Differences were anticipated in the ratings of black vis-a-vis white subjects and these differences were examined.
METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 55 students drawn from the following sources: 28 (16 females, 12 males) white students from University of Central Florida Psychology classes; 27 (19 females, 8 males) black students were obtained through the University of Central Florida Office of Minority Affairs.

The mean age for black subjects was 20.0, while the mean for whites was 25.5. The Anger Self Report (A.S.R.) which has been demonstrated to differentiate covert from overt anger was used to delineate 12 black and 14 white subjects who tend to inhibit anger from 15 black and 14 white subjects whose tendencies are toward the expression of anger.

Instruments

The Anger Self Report (A.S.R., see Appendix 1), an 89-item Likert questionnaire which yields a total score in addition to the following subscores was used: (a) Awareness of anger; (b) General expression of anger; (c) Physical aggression; (d) Verbal aggression, (e) Guilt; (f) Condemnation of anger; and (g) Mistrust and Suspicion. Although 89 items appeared in the original questionnaire, an extensive item analysis led to the retention of 64 items. Eighty-nine items still appear on the questionnaire, however only 64 items are scored. Also, inasmuch as the present study focused on the expression or inhibition of anger, only six subscores were relevant to the purposes of this study: (1) awareness of anger; (2) total expression of anger; (3) condemnation
of anger; (4) physical expression; (5) verbal expression; and (6) mistrust/suspicion. Only these subscores were delineated from the A.S.R.

Validity and reliability for the A.S.R. yields significant reliability and validity coefficients beyond the .05 level. Validity studies for the A.S.R. used samples of 82 psychiatric patients and 67 college students. In the patient sample A.S.R. scores were correlated with psychiatrist's ratings on the Problem Appraisals Scale (P.A.S.). Later, a multi-trait, multi-method of analysis for these correlations yielded substantial convergent and discriminant validities for the A.S.R. scales (e.g., the highest correlation, .41, for the physical expression scale was with ratings of assaultive acts on the P.A.S.). For the student sample, the A.S.R. scores were correlated with six ratings made by students living near each subject (Zelin, Adler, & Myerson, 1972).

In terms of reliability, Zelin et al. (1972) reported that the reliabilities of the A.S.R. subscales and their intercorrelations indicate significant reliable variance which lead the researchers to conclude that profiles based on the eight subscores could be employed in making predictions about individuals.

Fifty 8 x 10 inch achromatic glossy prints depicting 20 blacks, 20 whites and a combined total of 10 Hispanics and Orientals were randomly selected from a pool of 3,000 "mug shot" type prints from the library of a local newspaper. These prints depicted males and females of varying ages. The photos were projected onto a 40 x 40
inch daylight screen using a Vu-Lyte III Opaque Projector, Model No. 12300.

An information sheet detailing general demographic data as well as the subject's perception of his skin color and the degree of discrimination that he experiences was used (see Appendix 2). This information provided supplemental data that aided in the interpretation of the results.

An answer booklet consisting of 50 items corresponding to the 50 photos viewed by each subject was provided. Each item was comprised of the following Likert response dimensions: (a) This person is warm and affectionate; (b) This person is probably middle-class; (c) This person looks honest; (d) This person looks intelligent; (e) This person has assertive tendencies; (f) This is probably a very sincere person; (g) This person is definitely attractive; and (h) This person is probably open and non-judgmental (see Appendix 3).

Procedure

Students were given the Information and Consent Form telling of the confidentiality of their participation and their right to withdraw (see Appendix 4). Signatures from each student were requested on the forms which were collected prior to the initiation of the formal experimental procedure.

Subjects then received a brief orientation thanking them for their participation and detailing the present study's "attempt to examine if and how an individual's personal appearance influences how he or she is perceived by others." During the orientation, subjects were
assigned a number that was listed on all subsequent answer sheets provided (blacks were given even numbers, whereas whites were assigned odd numbers). Subjects were asked to enter M for male or F for female on the upper left-hand corner of all answer sheets. No names or other identification were recorded. Subjects interested in reviewing the results of the research were informed verbally and via the information sheet that a copy of the thesis could be obtained in bound form in the University of Central Florida's library under the author's name.

Subjects were told that the A.S.R., information sheet and the ratings of photos would be group administered in one session. Instructions for the A.S.R. were read verbatim from the Anger Self Report form (see Appendix 1). Due to scheduling difficulties, blacks were tested in the University Cafeteria, whereas whites were tested in the General Classroom Building one week later. Although the design originally called for 15 subjects per group, the data for five subjects were eliminated. Three black subjects did not complete the rating of photos section, whereas two subjects classified as "white" listed Hispanic as their race classification, which eliminated them from the white group.

Presentation of 50 photographs followed. The photos were projected onto a 40 x 40 inch screen using a Vu-Lyte Opaque Projector. Subjects simultaneously rated the 50 photos on the Likert dimensions. Subjects rated each photo and recorded their responses in the provided answer booklet, therein providing an overall rating score for each photo (see Appendix 3). Subjects were given 30 seconds to rate each
photo. The overall rating for each photo was summed by race designation for 50 photos viewed. In this manner, each subject within each group yielded three total scores, reflecting his overall rating of blacks, whites and others depicted in the photos. The total scores reflecting ratings of photos depicting blacks, whites and others were obtained by dividing the three total rating scores by the total number of ratings completed for each of the three race designations. Subjects had to complete at least 90 percent of the ratings in order to have their data included in the statistical analyses.
RESULTS

The analyses of the data were done on an Apple II Plus computer using the GANOVA statistical software package (Brecht & Woodward, 1983). The experimental design was a 3-way ANOVA with an Unequal N and fixed effects. There were two between group factors (race and anger) and one within group factor (photos). The analyses of the data showed no systematic variation in the dependent measure (ratings in eight personality dimensions) as a direct function of the photos viewed or the subject's race and anger classifications, $F(2, 102) = 0.7, p = .93; F(1, 51) = 2.8, p = .14; \text{ and } F(1, 51) = .33, p = .57$, respectively. In addition to the absence of major effects, no three-way interaction was noted, $F(2, 102) = .79, p = .46$. Similarly, no race x anger or anger x photos viewed interaction was observed, $F(1, 51) = .87, p = .36$, and $F(2, 102) = .69, p = .51$. There was, however, a significant interaction between the race of the respondent and the photographs viewed, $F(2, 102) = 5.2, p = .001$ (see Table 1).

Specific planned comparisons performed on the data produced by white anger expressers and anger inhibitors respectively, yielded no significant differences on the dependent measure, $F(1, 51) = 1.3, p = .261$ and $F(1, 51) = .004, p = .908$. Planned comparisons performed on the data produced by black anger expressers and inhibitors showed systematic variation in the ratings of the photos by black anger expressers. Anger expressers rated blacks higher than whites on the personality
dimensions, $F(1,51)=6.53$, $p=.01$. No significant variation was observed in the ratings of photos by black anger inhibitors, $F(1,51)=.10$, $p=.75$. For a summary of the planned comparisons for the black sample see Tables 2 and 3.

The data were analyzed for each of the A.S.R. subscales.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that the four groups differed on total expression of anger, $F(3,51)=44.83$, $p<.001$. The posteriori comparison of means using Scheffe's method (cited in Winer, 1973) showed that black anger expressers were higher than black anger inhibitors and white anger inhibitors on the total expression subscale of the Anger Self Report (A.S.R.), $F(3,51)=72.1$, $p<.001$ and $F(3,51)=63.5$, $p<.001$ respectively. White anger expressers were also higher than black anger inhibitors and white anger inhibitors on total expression, $F(3,51)=80.1$, $p<.001$ and $F(3,51)=71.8$, $p<.001$, respectively. Black and white anger expressers did not differ on total expression, $F(3,51)=.47$, $p>.05$ whereas black inhibitors did not differ significantly from white anger inhibitors, $F(3,51)=.67$, $p>.05$. Finally as a group, blacks did not differ from whites on total expression of anger, $t=.37$, $p>.05$.

A one-way ANOVA revealed that the four groups differed on awareness of anger, $F(3,51)=3.69$, $p<.05$. A multiple comparison using Scheffe's method revealed that only the comparison involving black anger inhibitors and white anger expressers were higher on awareness than black anger inhibitors $F(3,51)=10.6$, $p<.05$. Due to the fact that the Scheffe
procedure is more rigorous than other procedures, and usually leads to fewer significant results, a t test was used to compare anger inhibited blacks with black anger expressers. Similarly, blacks as a group were compared with the white sample. Anger inhibited blacks were found to be lower on awareness than black anger expressers, $t=2.25$, $p<.05$, whereas no difference was observed between blacks and whites overall on the awareness subscale, $t=1.46$, $p>.05$.

A one-way ANOVA showed that the four groups did not differ on the physical expression of anger subscale, $F(3,51)=.57$, $p>.01$.

On the verbal expression of anger dimension, the analysis of variance revealed that the four groups differed significantly, $F(3,51)=9.4$, $p<.01$. The posteriori comparison of means using Scheffe's method revealed that black anger expressers were higher on the verbal dimension than black anger inhibitors $F(3,51)=14.5$, $p<.01$, and white anger inhibitors $F(3,51)=10.5$, $p<.05$. Black anger inhibitors did not differ from white anger inhibitors on the verbal expression dimension $F(3,51)=.46$, $p>.01$. White anger expressers did not differ from black anger expressers, $F(3,51)=.25$, $p>.01$, however, their scores were significantly higher than white anger inhibitors, $F(3,51)=12.5$, $p<.01$ and black anger inhibitors, $F(3,51)=17.8$, $p<.01$ on total expression. Finally, a two-way group comparison using a t test revealed that, overall, blacks and whites did not differ on verbal expression of anger, $t=.45$, $p>.05$.

Comparison of the four groups revealed no significant variation in condemnation of anger scores, $F(3,51)=1.26$, $p>.01$. 
On the mistrust/suspicion dimension, the analysis of variance showed that the four groups differed significantly, $F(3,51)=4.9$, $p<.01$. The posteriori analysis revealed that the comparison involving black expressers and white inhibitors reached significance. All other pair comparisons were non-significant. Black expressers were higher on the mistrust/suspicion subscale than anger inhibited whites, $F(3,51)=14.29$, $p<.01$. Finally as a group, blacks were higher than whites on the mistrust/suspicion dimension, $t=2.54$, $p<.02$. 
DISCUSSION

The present research was concerned with examining the presence of anger in blacks, and in doing so, sought to determine if and how the presence of anger influenced their subsequent perception of other blacks as well as whites. The research was initiated with the purpose of expanding on the postulations of Grier and Cobbs (1968), Karon (1975), and other social scientists (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Powdernaker, 1943; Dai, 1948) who stated that anger was the most prominent by-product of growing up black in America's caste system. Acknowledging the plausibility of anger as a ubiquitous human phenomenon, the present study sought to ascertain the role that anger plays in the lives of black Americans. If, in fact, ..."All blacks are angry" as black psychiatrists Grier and Cobbs (1968) reason quite effectively, what, if any influence does this phenomenon exert on black perceptions of other blacks as well as whites. Anger, however, is a complex human phenomenon, whose manifestation can be overt or covert. Viewing anger within the context of the black experience in American society, it becomes apparent that, historically for the purpose of survival, blacks have traditionally adopted what Pugh (1972) labels adaptive inferiority. As stated in the introduction, this mechanism develops under extreme stress to inner conflicts (particularly anger) engendered by oppression. By accepting inferiority as proper and legitimate, an individual is able to maintain some measure of personality integration in the face of
frustrating circumstances. Acknowledging the continued presence of adaptive inferiority in many blacks, the present study investigated the differential effects of anger inhibition versus anger expression on black perceptions of blacks and whites.

Interestingly, when compared with whites on total expression, blacks overall did not differ appreciably from the white sample. Even so, black anger expressers paralleled white anger expressers on total expression, yet both differed significantly from black and white anger inhibitors. Similarly, black anger inhibitors did not differ appreciably from white anger inhibitors on total expression. Essentially, an identical pattern was observed, black anger expressers as predicted, rated blacks higher than whites on the eight personality dimensions. Thus, it can be concluded that for black anger expressers, the manner of expression mediates the perceptual process involved in the rating of photographs. Black anger inhibitors, on the other hand, did not respond to the photographs as predicted. That is, anger inhibited blacks paralleled white anger expressers and inhibitors who showed no preference in their ratings of the photographs.

The fact that black anger inhibitors were lower than black anger expressers on awareness demonstrates that not only were black anger inhibitors less likely to act on their feelings of anger (i.e., lower total expression scores) they were also less likely to be aware that they were angry. According to Zelin et al. (1972), low awareness indicates that the respondent is actively suppressing, repressing and denying anger. This phenomenon observed in black anger inhibitors
lends support to the formulations of Powdermaker (1943) who would probably see the low expression and awareness scores as reflecting the respondent's attempt to deny the presence of hostile impulses. The denial of hostile impulses by black inhibitors possibly sheds light on another dimension that delineates black anger expressers from black anger inhibitors. Although blacks and whites did not differ appreciably on the verbal expression dimension, black anger expressers (who did not differ from white expressers) were higher on verbal expression than black and white inhibitors. Apparently, based on their awareness and total expression scores, black anger inhibitors had less anger to express. Even so, black anger inhibitors were more likely to verbalize anger than their inhibited white counterparts. Both inhibited groups verbalized less anger than white expressers.

In terms of mistrust/suspicion, blacks as would be predicted by Grier and Cobbs (1968) were more mistrustful/suspicious than their white counterparts. This subscale relates highly with suspicion and feelings of persecution. According to Grier and Cobbs (1968) blacks must cushion themselves against "cheating, slander, humiliation, and outright mistreatment by the official representatives of society" (p. 149-150). The authors state further this "cultural paranoia" evidenced by black Americans is an adaptive mechanism "developed in response to a peculiar situation [oppressive conditions]" and is no more maladaptive than the "compulsive manner in which a diver checks his equipment" or "a pilot his parachute" (p. 149-150).
Thus far, the analyses of the data suggest that blacks do not differ from whites on total expression, awareness, physical expression or verbal expression. However, the data suggest that black expressers are: (1) Higher on total expression than anger inhibited blacks; (2) More aware of their anger than anger inhibited blacks; (3) More likely to verbalize their anger than anger inhibited blacks; and (4) More likely to view whites negatively vis-a-vis blacks. If, in fact, anger does mediate their perception of other blacks and whites as hypothesized in this experiment, it would appear reasonable to assume that black anger inhibitors despite being mistrustful/suspicious (i.e., suspicious/persecuted) would be less likely to view whites in a negative manner. This is due primarily to the fact that anger inhibitors apparently feel that they have less to be angry for. Black expressers on the other hand, appear to be not only aware that they are angry, but are more likely to express this anger in an overt manner. Interestingly, in addition to being more likely to verbalize anger, two-thirds of the black anger expressed group admitted to being discriminated against, at least "sometimes." Conversely, a clear reversal was observed in the responses of two-thirds of the black anger inhibited group who reported that they "never" or "almost never" experience discrimination. Overall, 70 percent of the black sample admitted to being discriminated against at least "sometimes," compared to 46 percent for the white sample. Based on the data reviewed thus far, it appears reasonable that black inhibitors who deny feelings of anger would also deny experiences with discrimination. Inasmuch as 70 percent of the black anger expressers and inhibitors were born and reared in the Deep South, the differences in perception of
discrimination most likely reflects that anger inhibitors attempt to remain unaffected by denying that they ever experience discrimination. This conclusion takes into account the historical prevalence of discriminatory practices in the South. Up to this point, the data have produced a clear dichotomy, separating blacks on the anger dimension. Moreover, the delineation of blacks in anger-expressed and anger-inhibited categories appears to be related to the differential ratings of photos. For black anger inhibitors the question remains, ... What accounts for their perceptions and essentially neutral rating of the photographs? Similarly, why did their responses differ from black anger expressers while paralleling the responses of white anger inhibitors and expressers (i.e., no preference)? Apparently, overt or covert anger does not influence the rating of photos when viewed by whites in the manner observed in black subjects. To date, several researchers (Karon, 1975; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Powdermaker, 1943) have posited that anger plays a central role in the dynamic structure of black psychological functioning. Viewed in the context of these formulations, black inhibitors who were low on awareness and verbal expression were apparently successful in suppressing hostile impulses (engendered by oppressive conditions) that would presumably be directed toward the safest target (i.e., photos depicting blacks). Instead, these respondents neutralized the "racially potent" situation by showing no preference. Earlier, it was shown that these inhibitors tended to deny experiences with discrimination. Moreover, three of the original anger inhibitors did not complete the photo
rating section, despite completing the Anger Self Report. All three protocols were eliminated prior to the statistical analyses. It is possible that these anger inhibitors were unable to "neutralize" the situation and therefore refused to complete the task. Finally, it is presumable that the presence of a black experimenter served to inhibit negative responding to the photos by the anger inhibited black group and the white sample. Conversely, the black anger expressers who tended to be high on awareness and verbal expression were less likely to neutralize the "racially potent" situation, therein giving free rein to their hostile impulses. Those blacks who admit to being discriminated against, apparently directed their anger toward the photos depicting whites. Also, as with the white sample and black inhibitors it is possible that the presence of a black experimenter influenced their subsequent rating of photos. That is, it is plausible that the presence of a black experimenter facilitated the uninhibited expression of hostility reflected in the personality ratings.

Earlier in the discussion it was mentioned that black anger expressers were higher than black inhibitors on verbal expression of anger. Although the rating of photos did not involve a verbal component, intuitively it appears reasonable to assume that verbal expression can be extended to include negative ratings expressed in a written mode. This assumption is substantiated by observation made during the administration with blacks. During the rating of photos, the respondents were obviously affected (i.e., "shocked") by the photos as evidenced by responses made early in the administration.
Several subjects responded, "He's a redneck" or "He's definitely with the Klan" when presented with photos depicting whites. Although these remarks ceased after specific instructions from the experimenter, it was obvious that for many subjects the photos elicited hostile feelings. In fact, a discernible tension pervaded the room throughout the procedure. Based on the analysis of the total expression and verbal expression subtests, it is probable that these subjects were anger expressers who also were high on verbal expression. Since black anger inhibitors attended this session and heard the above mentioned remarks, it is possible that their ratings were inhibited.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to ascertain the differential effects of anger on the perceptions of black subjects viewing photos depicting blacks and whites. The central hypotheses were that: (1) Black anger expressers would be more likely to rate blacks higher than whites on the eight dimensions and (2) Black anger inhibitors would be more likely to view whites more positively than blacks on the same dimensions. The data show conclusively that black anger expressers do, in fact, rate blacks higher than whites. On the other hand, anger inhibited blacks show no preference when presented with an identical stimulus situation. In an attempt to explain these differences it was posited that anger inhibited blacks were successful in suppressing their hostile impulses therein neutralizing a potentially anxiety-provoking situation. This neutrality was presumably exacerbated by (1) The presence of a black experimenter and (2) The presence of fellow subjects who openly express anger toward whites. Although the results are significant in that they corroborate, empirically, theories seeking to explain the role that anger plays in the daily lives of black Americans, it also illuminates the complexity of human psychological functioning. Viewed in this context, it is imperative that further research follow. Questions remain as to the influence of the experimenter's race on a subject's response to a racially potent stimulus situation. Also, a more accurate means of assessing a subject's perception of experiences with
discrimination is needed to aid in the determination of relationships between prior discrimination and current level of anger expression. Presently, discrimination and pervasive anger are realities for black Americans. The full psychological consequences of both are still being determined. Yet, the overt manifestation of anger is still viewed as a legal, rather than mental health issue by the official representatives of our society. Hopefully, continued research in this area will illuminate and demonstrate empirically, what many social scientists know intuitively, that is, that a clear relationship exists between a history of experiences with discrimination and high levels of anger in black Americans.
TABLE 1

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE SUMMARIES FOR RACE, ANGER, AND PHOTOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN SUBJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE (A)</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGER (B)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN (ERROR)</td>
<td>258.30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN SUBJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOS (C)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN (ERROR)</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001
### Table 2

**Analysis of Variance: Ratings of Blacks and Whites by Black Anger Expressers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Var. Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 6.53 \quad p = .01 \]
TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: RATINGS OF BLACKS AND WHITES BY BLACK ANGER INHIBITORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VAR. EST. (M.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = .10  p = .75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>BLACKS</th>
<th>WHITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK ANGER EXPRESSERS</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK ANGER INHIBITORS</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE ANGER EXPRESSERS</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE ANGER INHIBITORS</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

MEAN ANGER SELF REPORT (A.S.R.) SUBSCORES FOR ANGER INHIBITED AND UNINHIBITED BLACKS AND WHITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>TOTAL EXP.</th>
<th>AWARENESS</th>
<th>PHYSICAL</th>
<th>VERBAL</th>
<th>MISTRUST/SUS.</th>
<th>CONDEMN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK ANGER EXPRESSERS</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK ANGER INHIBITORS</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE ANGER EXPRESSERS</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE ANGER INHIBITORS</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1: ANGER SELF REPORT

NUMBER

SEX

ANGER SELF REPORT FORM

We would like you to consider carefully the following statements and indicate as accurately as you can how it applies to you. There are no right or wrong answers, we just want to know how you feel.

Please mark next to each statement according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement by using the following scale:

1 slight agreement  -1 slight disagreement
2 moderate agreement  -2 moderate disagreement
3 strong agreement  -3 strong disagreement

Mark all statements!

If a statement is unclear to you place an "X" next to it in the margin but mark it anyway. If a statement somehow does not apply to you, place a "?" next to it in the margin but mark it anyway.

Please begin.
1. I get mad easily.
2. I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.
3. It makes me annoyed to have people ask my advice or otherwise interrupt me when I am working on something important.
4. People are only interested in you for what they can get.
5. I seldom strike back, even if someone hits me first.
6. People will hurt you if you don't watch out.
7. I would be pleased if I never got angry.
8. Students are justified in feeling angry about conditions in the universities.
9. I never feel hate towards members of my family.
10. Often people are friendly when they want something but drop you when they no longer need you.
11. No one wants to hurt me.
12. People should never get angry.
13. Some of the people closest to me take secret satisfaction in my misfortunes.
14. It's right for people to express themselves when they are mad.
15. Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.
16. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
17. I felt angry when I felt my folks were unreasonable about making me obey.
18. If I do something mean to somebody, I can't stop thinking about it for days.
19. Even when my anger is aroused, I don't use strong language.
20. If I am mad, I really let people know it.
21. Sometimes I feel that I could injure someone.
22. I will criticize someone to his face if he deserves it.
23. When someone plays a trick on me, I feel sorry and try to forgive him.
24. I rarely hate myself.
25. I get into fist fights about as often as the next person.
26. People should never get irritated.
27. I find that I cannot express anger at someone until they have really hurt me badly.
28. I think I'm a pretty nice person.
29. Even when people yell at me, I don't yell back.
30. The world is a dangerous place to live in.
31. At times I have a strong urge to do something harmful or shocking.
32. I have many quarrels with members of my family.
33. I don't feel guilty when I swear under my breath.
34. Often people who are really out to get you act as nice as can be on the outside.
35. Too often I accept responsibilities for mistakes that are made.
36. I hardly ever punish myself.
37. Feeling angry is terrible.
38. I wouldn't feel ashamed if people knew I was angry.
39. I never do anything right.
40. It doesn't make me angry to have people hurry me.
41. If I don't like somebody, I will tell him so.
42. I don't deserve the hardships I've had.
43. I have physically hurt someone in a fight.
44. At times I feel like smashing things.
45. I wish I got angry less often.
46. I don't regret feeling angry.
47. Whatever else may be my faults, I never knowingly hurt another person's feelings.
48. I really wish I could be a better person.
49. It doesn't bother me very much when I hurt someone's feelings.
50. I usually am satisfied with myself.
51. I never feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
52. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I am angry.
53. I find it easy to express anger at people.
54. My parents never made me angry.
55. I can depend on people when in trouble.
56. I admire people who assert themselves.
57. Even when someone does something mean to me, I don't let him know when I'm upset.
58. At times I hurt a person I love.
59. People do not generally disappoint me.
60. My conscience would punish me if I tried to exploit someone else.
61. I hardly ever feel like swearing.
62. I couldn't hit anyone even if I were extremely angry.
63. I don't feel sorry for putting people in their place.
64. I'm just no good.
65. I would like myself better if I could get angry.
66. I never think of killing myself.
I hardly ever get angry.

Even though I disapprove of my friends' behavior, I just can't let them know.

I find it hard to think badly of anyone.

I can think of no good reason for ever hitting anyone.

When people are angry, they should let it out.

I blame myself if anything goes wrong.

I am rarely cross and grouchy.

I generally cover up my poor opinions of others.

I look up to people who say what's on their mind even though it might hurt someone.

In spite of how my parents treated me, I didn't get angry.

I could not put someone in his place even if he needed it.

It's easy for me not to fight with those I love.

When I really lose my temper, I am capable of slapping someone.

If someone annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.

Our major institutions are falling apart.

People are as thoughtful of my feelings as I am of theirs.

It's useless to get angry.

Generally you can depend on people to help you.

If I dislike somebody, I let him know.

If someone crosses me, I tend to get back at him.

I think little of people who get angry.

I often feel disaster is just around the corner.

Generally speaking, people aren't angry.
APPENDIX 2: INFORMATION SHEET

(1) Date of Birth:

(2) Sex: Male    Female (please circle one)

(3) Race:

(4) Religious Training:

(5) Place of Birth:  City_________________; State_________________

(6) City and State where you grew up:

(7) Number of Siblings:
    (7a) Number of half brothers and sisters:
    (7b) Number of step brothers and sisters:

(8) Parents' Place of Birth (city and state):
    (8a) Natural father______________; Stepfather______________
    (8b) Natural mother______________; Stepmother______________

(9) Please specify your relationship to the individual(s) who raised you (e.g., daughter, granddaughter) if the person(s) listed here is different from the "Parents" listed above please specify their place of birth _______________. Also, please use the person(s) who raised you as the "Parents" for questions 10, 11, 12.

(10) Parents' combined present income range (please circle one):
    $ 0 - 5,000    $25,001 - 30,000
    $5,001 - 10,000 $30,001 - 35,000
    $10,001 - 15,000 $35,001 - 40,000
    $15,001 - 20,000 $40,001 - 45,000
    $20,001 - 25,000 $45,001 - 50,000
    $50,001 and above

(11) Parents' social status: Lower, Middle, Upper (please circle one)

(12) Most Assertive Parent: Mother or Father (please circle one)

(13) Your skin color: (a) Very dark (b) Dark (c) Brown (d) Light (e) Very light (please circle one)

(14) Frequency of Discrimination Experienced: (a) Never (b) Almost never (c) Sometimes (d) Often (e) Frequently (f) Always (please circle one)
APPENDIX 3: ANSWER SHEET

Circle one number for each statement according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement by using the following scale. Please complete the entire series (a – h) for each photograph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) This person is warm and affectionate</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) This person is probably middle-class</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) This person looks honest</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) This person looks intelligent</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) This person has assertive tendencies</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) This is probably a very sincere person</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) This person is definitely attractive</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) This person is probably open and non-judgmental</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: Statements (a – h) were provided to subjects in a 5" x 8½" printed answer booklet and were repeated for each of the 50 photographs.]
Experimental research is an empirical process wherein the influence of specified variables is examined. Psychological research is particularly important in that it seeks to aid in the prediction and explanation of human behavior. In order to prepare psychologists for the dual role of clinician/researcher it is necessary that they have first had experience in the conceptualization, design and implementation of experimental research. This present study is an attempt to examine how an individual's personal appearance influences how he or she is perceived by others. As a subject, your participation will involve two phases. In phase I, which takes approximately 30 minutes, you will be asked to provide some information about yourself (i.e. demographic information). You will also be asked to complete a brief rating instrument which assesses your feelings about anger. During phase II, which takes approximately one hour, you will be asked to rate photographs of males and females on eight personality dimensions (e.g. "This person has assertive tendencies"). Your participation, which aids in the training of a master's level psychologist is greatly appreciated.
Feedback on the results of the study can be obtained in book form in the U.C.F. library under the author's name.

SUBJECT'S NAME (Please print)__________________________

Consent:

It is hereby acknowledged that the experimental process in which the above named person participates is part of the training of a U.C.F. graduate student who is completing the thesis requirement for a master's degree in Clinical Psychology. During the orientation procedure, each participant will be assigned a number that will be listed on all subsequent answer sheets. No names or other identifying information is being recorded. In this manner, not even the experimenter will be able to match names with individual responses to the experimental situation. The following signature authorizes the experimenter to administer the measures necessary for the completion of this project. Authorization may be revoked at any time by verbal request, and it is understood that I may refuse to answer any question or terminate participation at any time without penalty.

____________________________________________________
Subject's signature Date

____________________________________________________
Experimenter's signature Date
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