

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 374

UD 012 200

## TITLE

Extract of Hearings Before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, Second Session on H.R. 17846 and Other Related Bills. Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. Hearings Held in Washington, D.C., June 8, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 29, 30; July 1, 6, 7, 8, 16; and September 23, 1970.

## INSTITUTION

Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

## PUB DATE

70

## NOTE

104p.

## EDRS PRICE

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58

## DESCRIPTORS

Academic Ability; Academic Achievement; Academic Aptitude; \*Child Development; Child Psychology; Cognitive Tests; Compensatory Education; Culturally Disadvantaged; \*Educationally Disadvantaged; \*Elementary School Students; Genetics; Intelligence Differences; Intelligence Factors; Intelligence Level; Intelligence Quotient; \*Intelligence Tests; \*Negro Students; Psychological Tests; Racial Differences

## ABSTRACT

In these hearings, the following witnesses presented testimony: Dr. Henry E. Garrett, Chairman, Psychology Department (Emeritus), Columbia University; Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, Professor of Educational Psychology, University of California at Berkeley; Dr. Frank C. J. McGurk, Professor of Psychology, University of Montevallo; Dr. R. Travis Osborne, Professor of Psychology, University of Georgia; Mr. Archie Sabin, Statistician; Dr. William Shockley, Professor of Engineering Science, Stanford University; and, Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag, Professor of Social Philosophy, New York University. (Several published articles, part of the original transcript of these hearings, have not been reproduced.) (SB)

4  
ED 061 374

# EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970

## EXTRACT OF HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

### GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

### H.R. 17846 and Related Bills

BILLS TO ASSIST SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO MEET SPECIAL PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO DESEGREGATION IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO IMPROVE EDUCATION IN RACIALLY IMPACTED AREAS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 8, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 29, 30; JULY 1, 6, 7, 8, 16; AND SEPTEMBER 23, 1970.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

(Not Printed at Government Expense)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1970

410-015 O

UD012200

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon  
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey  
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania  
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois  
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey  
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana  
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan  
HUGH L. CAREY, New York  
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California  
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine  
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii  
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York  
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington  
PHILLIP BURTON, California  
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania  
LOUIS STOKES, Ohio  
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri  
ADAM C. POWELL, New York

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota  
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio  
ALPHONZO BELL, California  
OGDEN R. REID, New York  
JOHN N. ERLBORN, Illinois  
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa  
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon  
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan  
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin  
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas  
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana  
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho  
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina

## GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois, *Chairman*

HUGH L. CAREY, New York  
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan  
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington  
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan  
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine  
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii

ALPHONZO BELL, California  
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota  
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon  
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania  
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina

(II)

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>STATEMENT OF—</b>	
DR. HENRY E. GARRETT, Chairman, psychology department (emeritus), Columbia University .....	374
DR. ARTHUR R. JENSEN, professor of educational psychology, University of California at Berkeley .....	334
DR. FRANK C. J. MCGURK, professor of psychology, University of Montevallo .....	450
DR. R. TRAVIS OSBORNE, professor of psychology, University of Georgia .....	457
MR. ARCHIE SABIN, statistician .....	371
DR. WILLIAM SHOCKLEY, professor of engineering science, Stanford University .....	436
DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG, professor of social philosophy, New York University .....	343

## EXHIBITS

Chapter XI, Summary and Conclusions, <i>The Testing of Negro Intelligence</i> , Shuey, A.M., Social Science Press, New York, 1966 .....	332
Mean Scores of 12th Grade Classes on 19 Selected Project TALENT Tests (Schools Grouped by Education Regions and Per Cent of Negroes in Enrollment), G. R. Burket, <i>et al.</i> , <i>Project TALENT</i> (A Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare) .....	413-414
Table 68, California Achievement Test Grade Placement at Each Grade Level and Figure 2, IQ Distribution of Negro and Normative Sample, "A Normative Sample of Intelligence and Achievement of Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States," <i>Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development</i> , Serial No. 90, 1963/Vol. 28, No. 6 (A Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare) .....	415-416
"Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," Lesser & Stodolsky, <i>Harvard Educational Review</i> , Vol. 37, 1967, No. 4 .....	417-422
"Genetics and Intelligence," Henry E. Garrett, <i>The Mankind Quarterly</i> , April-June, 1964 .....	434
"Racial Difference in School Achievement," R. T. Osborne, <i>Mankind Monographs</i> , November, 1962 .....	462

## EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
Washington, D.C.

The General Subcommittee on Education met at 10:15 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Roman C. Pucinski (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Pucinski, Quie, and Dellenback.

Staff members present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Charles W. Radcliffe, minority counsel for education; and Alexandra Kislak, clerk.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The committee will come to order.

We are anticipating the arrival of our other members very shortly. I think in order to expedite the hearing we will proceed at this time.

We are very pleased to have with us this morning Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, a professor at the University of California, and Dr. Ernest van den Haag, a professor at New York University. Congressman John Ashbrook has requested that both these gentlemen be permitted to testify on H.R. 17846, the Emergency School Aid Act.

We are indeed very grateful to both you gentlemen. This legislation for the most part would affect the southern districts but it is interesting to have a spokesman from California and one from New York to give us their views on how you view this legislation.

Without question this is an extremely important bill.

I was disappointed that the Senate decided to take the route of trying to fund this legislation through a very circuitous and, in my judgment, perhaps illegal procedure of taking funds out of the poverty program and various other programs and allocating them for this specific use. There are serious doubts in my mind whether that can be done, whether it will stand up, and I am not at all impressed with the fact that some attorney in HEW has found some way to say it can be done.

It seems to me the way to go about this problem of helping schools that are being desegregated is to do it in the manner before us here now; in passing a bill that is specifically designed to meet those needs and then funding it and putting in this bill the necessary safeguards that we think we ought to have to make it an effective piece of legislation.

I am amazed to see the approach that is being used with the \$150 million. It is money that is being taken out of six different programs and then the Office of Education comes along and writes a series of guidelines for the distribution of this money to the States that are most seriously affected. I have been able to find no basis for the Office of Education's authority to write these guidelines. They are taking poverty program money and it occurs to me if they can find \$100 million of unexpended authorization in the poverty program, then what they ought to be doing is spending that \$100 million on poverty, particularly now with an unemployment rate in the country that is, as Mr. Friedman said yesterday, going to reach 6 percent or better.

In my judgment the procedure being used by the other body is totally indefensible. I am pleased to have you gentlemen here. We have said we are going to move expeditiously on these hearings and I would like to report out an authorization here as quickly as possible so we can address ourselves to the problem in an intelligent way. That is why I am moving along this morning, even though the other members are not here, because I do want to conclude these hearings and I do want to send a bill to the floor that is going to do the job in an intelligent way, instead of in the makeshift, roundabout way that the administration is proposing to do this, holding this whole thing together with scotch tape, paper clips, and rubberbands and my judgment is at some point in time it is going to be challenged and thrown out as a totally illegal operation.

I am pleased to have both you gentlemen here, to get your views on this and I am going to see whether or not we can't move along with an authorization that will at least make this program stick together.

Gentlemen, I see you both have prepared statements and I was wondering if you would have objection if we had you both testify at the same time and then perhaps we can save time, unless you would rather testify separately.

I think it makes for a much more interesting hearing if we do it as a panel.

Why don't we start with Dr. Jensen? You have a prepared statement. Your entire statement will go into the record at this point and then you can proceed in anyway you wish, sir. You can read the statement, summarize it or whatever you prefer.

**STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR R. JENSEN, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY**

Dr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I first wish to thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my views regarding parts of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Jensen follows:)

**STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR R. JENSEN, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Arthur R. Jensen and I am Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of California at Berkeley. I hold a B.A. degree from the University of California, an M.A. from San Diego State College, and a Ph. D. degree from Columbia University. In 1956-58, I was a United States Public Health Service Research Fellow in Psychology at the Psychiatric Institute, University of London. In 1961-62, I was a Research Associate at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research and in 1964-65 a Guggenheim Fellow at the Institute of Psychiatry at the University of London. In 1966-67, I was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science at Stanford. I am a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the Psychonomics Society.

I am co-editor of a text on "Social Class, Race and Psychological Development," published in 1968 and the author of the article entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?," published in 1969 in the *Harvard Educational Review*. I wrote an article on the "Heritability of Intelligence," published in *Engineering and Science* in April, 1970, and have more recently prepared a research resume entitled "Parent and Teacher Attitudes Toward



Integration and Busing" for the California Advisory Counsel on Education and Research of the California Teachers Association.

I am currently in the course of publishing a comprehensive review on the subject of "Can We and Should We Study Race Differences?"

I appear before you today for the purpose of raising what appears to me to be an essential preliminary inquiry to the Committee's approval of the present form of H.R. 17846, the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. That inquiry relates to the truth or falsity as a scientific matter of the basic factual assumption underlying this bill.

On May 21, President Nixon submitted to the Congress a special message on aid to schools and recommended this legislation. There he stated:

"It is clear that racial isolation ordinarily has an adverse effect on education."

That premise supports the present declaration of purpose in Section 2 of H.R. 17846—to prevent racial isolation in schools so as to improve the quality of education. I do not believe that this premise alone can be regarded as adequate justification for this bill. Recent comprehensive reviews of research on the effects of the racial composition of schools and classes in public schools come to conclusions which are highly ambiguous and inconclusive regarding the causal relationship between racial composition of the student body and scholastic performance. Most of the research on this subject to date has been too inadequate statistically and methodologically to allow any firm conclusion one way or the other regarding the effects of a school's racial composition on achievement. I refer you to a thorough review of this research by Nancy H. St. John of Harvard University; it appears in the February, 1970, issue of the *Review of Educational Research*, a publication of the American Educational Research Association. Her review supports my conclusion, which is that we have no scientifically or statistically substantial conclusions at this time.

I personally favor racial integration and I hopefully believe it is coming about. As an educator, I am concerned that it come about in such a way as to be of benefit to the schooling of all children. Achieving racial balance, while viewed by many of us as desirable for moral, ethical, and social reasons, will not solve existing educational problems; it will create new ones, and I am anxious that we provide the means for fully and objectively assessing them and for discovering the means of solving them. I am quite convinced on the basis of massive research evidence that the educational abilities and needs of the majority of white and Negro children are sufficiently different at this present time in our history that both groups—and particularly the more disadvantaged group—can be cheated out of the best education we now know how to provide in our schools if uniformity rather than diversity of instructional approaches becomes the rule. Diversity and desegregation need not be incompatible goals. I think both are necessary. But achieving racial balance and at the same time ignoring individual differences in children's special educational needs could be most destructive to those who are already the most disadvantaged educationally. The allocation of a school's resources for children with special educational problems cannot be influenced by race; it must be governed by individual needs.

To insure the developments of integrated education that could make it just and valid for all children, therefore, I urge that this Committee seriously consider the addition to the bill of a directive in Section 10 that a major proportion of the research funds provided for evaluation shall be used for a scientifically valid, objective examination of the educational effects of compulsory school desegregation. I further suggest that the technical requirements of the needed research are probably beyond the personnel and facilities of most school systems, and that major studies should be conducted by or in consultation with properly equipped research institutions under Federal support.

In my opinion, based upon my studies for the past 20 years and more in the field of educational psychology, I am convinced that the study of racial differences and their applicability to variations in learning and organization of the educational process are essential to any true understanding of the problems which America's schools face today in determining the future course of school integration.

## II. THE EXISTING CONTROVERSY OVER IQ AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

"I can best explain the basis of my views in this area by summarizing for the Committee some of the main points I made in the *Harvard Educational Review* article to which I have referred.

In my article, I first reviewed the conclusion of a nationwide survey and evaluation of the large, Federally funded compensatory education programs

done by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which concluded that these special programs had produced no significant improvement in the measured intelligence or scholastic performance of the disadvantaged children whose educational achievements they were specifically intended to raise. The evidence presented by the Civil Rights Commission suggests to me that merely applying more of the same approach to compensatory education on a larger scale is not likely to lead to the desired results, namely increasing the benefits of public education to the disadvantaged. The well-documented fruitlessness of these well-intentioned compensatory programs indicates the importance of now questioning the assumptions, theories, and practices on which they were based. I point out, also, that some small-scale experimental intervention programs have shown more promise of beneficial results.

"I do not advocate abandoning efforts to improve the education of the disadvantaged. I urge increased emphasis on these efforts, in the spirit of experimentation, expanding the diversity of approaches and improving the rigor of evaluation in order to boost our chances of discovering the methods that will work best.

#### *The nature of intelligence*

"In my article, I pointed out that IQ tests evolved to predict scholastic performance in largely European and North American middle-class populations around the turn of the century. They evolved to measure those abilities most relevant to the curriculum and type of instruction, which in turn were shaped by the pattern of abilities of the children the schools were then intended to serve.

"IQ or abstract reasoning ability is thus a selection of just one portion of the total spectrum of human mental abilities. This aspect of mental abilities measured by IQ tests is important to our society, but is obviously not the only set of educationally or occupationally relevant abilities. Other mental abilities have not yet been adequately measured; their distributions in various segments of the population have not been adequately determined; and their educational relevance has not been fully explored.

"I believe a much broader assessment of the spectrum of abilities and potentials, and the investigation of their utilization for educational achievement, will be an essential aspect of improving the education of children regarded as disadvantaged.

#### *Inheritance of intelligence*

"Much of my paper was a review of the methods and evidence that lead me to the conclusion that individual differences in intelligence, that is, IQ, are predominantly attributable to genetic differences, with environmental factors contributing a minor portion of the variance among individuals. The heritability of the IQ—that is, the percentage of individual differences variance attributable to genetic factors—comes out to about 80 percent, the average value obtained from all relevant studies now reported.

"These estimates of heritability are based on tests administered to European and North American populations and cannot properly be generalized to other populations. I believe we need similar heritability studies in minority populations if we are to increase our understanding of what our tests measure in these populations and how these abilities can be most effectively used in the educational process.

#### *Social class differences*

"Although the full range of IQ and other abilities is found among children in every socioeconomic stratum in our population, it is well established that IQ differs on the average among children from different social class backgrounds. The evidence, some of which I referred to in my article, indicates to me that some of this IQ difference is attributable to environmental differences and some of it is attributable to genetic differences between social classes—largely as a result of differential selection of the parent generations for different patterns of ability.

"I have not yet met or read a modern geneticist who disputes this interpretation of the evidence. In the view of geneticist C. O. Carter: "Sociologists who doubt this show more ingenuity than judgment." At least three prominent sociologists who are students of this problem—Sorokin, Bruce Eckland, and Otis Dudley Duncan—all agree that selective factors in social mobility and assortative mating have resulted in a genetic component in social class intelligence differences. As Eckland points out, this conclusion holds *within* socially defined



racial groups but cannot properly be generalized *between* racial groups, since barriers to upward mobility have undoubtedly been quite different for various racial groups.

#### *Race differences*

"I have always advocated dealing with persons as individuals, each in terms of his own merits and characteristics and am opposed to according treatment to persons solely on the basis of their race, color, national origin, or social class background. But I am also opposed to ignoring or refusing to investigate the causes of the well-established differences among racial groups in the distribution of educationally relevant traits, particularly IQ.

"I believe that the causes of observed differences in IQ and scholastic performance among different ethnic groups is, scientifically, still an open question, an important question, and a researchable one. I believe that official statements, such as 'It is a demonstrable fact that the talent pool in any one ethnic group is substantially the same as in any other ethnic groups' (U.S. Office of Education, 1966), and 'Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese, or any other group' (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1965), are without scientific merit. They lack any factual basis and must be regarded only as hypotheses.

"It would require more space than I am allotted to describe the personal and professional consequences of challenging this prevailing hypothesis of genetic equality by suggesting alternative hypotheses that invoke genetic as well as environmental factors as being among the causes of the observed differences in patterns of mental ability among racial groups.

"The fact that different racial groups in this country have widely separated geographic origins and have had quite different histories which have subjected them to different selective social and economic pressures make it highly likely that their gene pools differ for some genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, including intelligence, or abstract reasoning ability. Nearly every anatomical, physiological and biochemical system investigated shows racial differences. Why should the brain be any exception? The reasonableness of the hypothesis that there are racial differences in genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, including mental abilities, is not confined to the poorly informed, but has been expressed in writings and public statements by such eminent geneticists as K. Mather, C. D. Darlington, R. A. Fisher, and Francis Crick, to name a few.

"In my article, I indicated several lines of evidence which support my assertion that a genetic hypothesis is not unwarranted. The fact that we still have only inconclusive conclusions with respect to this hypothesis does not mean that the opposite of the hypothesis is true. Yet some social scientists speak as if this were the case and have even publicly censured me for suggesting an alternative to purely environmental hypotheses of intelligence differences. Scientific investigation proceeds most effectively by means of what Platt has called "strong inference," pitting alternative hypotheses that lead to different predictions against one another and then putting the predictions to an empirical test.

#### *Learning ability and IQ*

The article also dealt with my theory of two broad categories of mental abilities, which I call intelligence (or abstract reasoning ability) and associative learning ability. These types of ability appear to be distributed differently in various social classes and racial groups. While large racial and social class differences are found for intelligence, there are practically negligible differences among these groups in associative learning abilities, such as memory span and serial and paired-associate rote learning.

Research should be directed at delineating still other types of abilities and at discovering how the particular strengths in each individual's *pattern* of abilities can be most effectively brought to bear on school learning and on the attainment of occupational skills. By pursuing this path, I believe we can discover the means by which the reality of individual differences need not mean educational rewards for some children and utter frustration and defeat for others.

### III. THE IMPLICATIONS OF RACE DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATION

Since educators have at least officially assumed that race and social class differences in scholastic performance are not associated with any genetic differences in growth rates or patterns of mental abilities but are due entirely to

discrimination, prejudice, inequality of educational opportunity, and factors in the child's home environment and peer culture, we have collectively given little if any serious thought to whether we would do anything differently if we knew in fact that all educational differences were not due solely to these environmental factors.

There have been and still are obvious environmental inequities and injustices which have disfavored minorities, particularly Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians. Progress has been made and is continuing to be made to improve these conditions. But there is no doubt still a long way to go, and the drive toward further progress in this direction should be given top priority in our national effort.

Education is one of the chief instruments for approaching this goal. Every child should receive the best education that our current knowledge and technology can provide. This should not imply that we advocate the same methods or the same expectations for all children. There are large individual differences in rates of mental development, in patterns of ability, in drives and interests. These differences exist even among children of the same family. The good parent does his best to make the most of each child's strong points and to help him on his weak points but not make these the crux of success or failure. The school must regard each child, and the differences among children, in much the same way as a good parent should do.

I believe we need to find out the extent to which individual differences, social class differences, and race difference in rates of cognitive development and differential patterns of relative strength and weakness in various types of ability are attributable to genetically conditioned biological growth factors. The answer to this question might imply differences in our approach to improving the education of all children, particularly those we call the disadvantaged, for many of whom school is now a frustrating and unrewarding experience.

Individuals should be treated in terms of their individual characteristics and not in terms of their group membership. This is the way of a democratic society, and educationally it is the only procedure that makes any sense. Individual variations within any large socially defined group are always much greater than the average differences between groups. There is overlap between groups in the distributions of all psychological characteristics that we know anything about. But dealing with children as individuals is not the greatest problem. It is in our concern about the fact that when we do so, we have a differentiated educational program, and children of different socially identifiable groups may not be proportionately represented in different programs. This is the "hang-up" of many persons today and this is where our conceptions of equal opportunity are most likely to go awry and become misconceptions.

Group racial and social class differences are first of all individual differences, but the causes of the *group* differences may not be the same as of the *individual* differences. This is what we must find out, because the prescription of remedies for our educational ills could depend on the answer.

Let me give one quite hypothetical example. We know that among middle-class white children, learning to read by ordinary classroom instruction is related to certain psychological developmental characteristics. Educators call it "readiness." These characteristics of readiness appear at different ages for different kinds of learning, and at any given age there are considerable individual differences among children, even among siblings reared within the same family. These developmental differences, in middle-class white children, are largely conditioned by genetic factors. If we try to begin a child too early in reading instruction, he will experience much greater difficulty than if we waited until we saw more signs of "readiness." Lacking readiness, he may even become so frustrated as to "turn off" on reading, so that he will then have an emotional block toward reading later on when he should have the optimal readiness. The readiness can then not be fully tapped. The child would have been better off had we postponed reading instruction for six months or a year and occupied him during this time with other interesting activities for which he was ready. Chances are he would be a better reader at, say, 10 or 11 years of age for having started a year later, when he could catch on to reading with relative ease and avoid the unnecessary frustration. It is very doubtful in this case that some added "enrichment" to his preschool environment would have made him learn to read much more easily a year earlier. If this is largely a matter of biological maturation, then the time at which a child is taught in terms of his own schedule of development becomes important. If, on the other hand, it is largely a matter

of preschool environmental enrichment, then the thing to do is to go to work on the preschool environment so as to make all children equally ready for reading in the first grade. If a child's difficulty is the result of both factors, then a combination of both enrichment and optimal developmental sequencing should be recommended.

There is a danger that some educators' fear of being accused of racial discrimination could become so misguided as to work to the disadvantage of many minority children. Should we deny differential educational treatments to children when such treatment will maximize the benefits they receive from schooling, just because differential treatment might result in disproportionate representation of different racial groups in various programs? I have seen instances where Negro children were denied special educational facilities commonly given to white children with learning difficulties, simply because school authorities were reluctant to single out *any* Negro children, despite their obvious individual needs, to be treated any differently from the majority of youngsters in the school. There was no hesitation about singling out white children who needed special attention. Many Negro children of normal and superior scholastic potential are consigned to classes in which one-fourth to one-third of their classmates have IQs below 75, which is the usual borderline of educational mental retardation. The majority of these educationally retarded children benefit little or not at all from instruction in the normal classroom, but require special attention in smaller classes that permit a high degree of individualized and small group instruction. Their presence in regular classes creates unusual difficulties for the conscientious teacher and detracts from the optimal educational environment for children of normal ability. Yet there is reluctance to provide special classes for these educationally retarded children if they are Negro or Mexican-American. The classrooms of predominantly minority schools often have 20 to 30 percent of such children, which handicaps the teacher's efforts on behalf of her other pupils in the normal range of IQ. The more able minority children are thereby disadvantaged in the classroom in ways that are rarely imposed on white children for whom there are more diverse facilities. Differences in rates of mental development and in potentials for various types of learning will not disappear by being ignored. It is up to biologists and psychologists to discover their causes, and it is up to educators to create a diversity of instructional arrangements best suited to the full range of educational differences that we find in our population. Many environmentally caused differences can be minimized or eliminated, given the resources and the will of society. The differences that remain are a challenge for public education. The challenge will be met by making available more ways and means for children to benefit from schooling. This, I am convinced, can come about only through a greater recognition and understanding of the nature of human differences."

It is for this reason that I call upon your Committee to set aside funds under Section 10 of H.R. 17846 to investigate methods of coping educationally with individual and group variability and for an impartial, in-depth study of the effects of classroom desegregation on the educational process. I feel strongly that such basic cause-and-effect research must be done as an essential part of the task of ameliorating our nation's grave educational problems.

Dr. JENSEN. As an educational researcher, I am particularly concerned with section 10 of the bill, which deals with the evaluation and assessment of the educational outcomes of enforced integration and the achievement of racial balance in the public schools.

One of the major premises upon which the act is predicated is that racial isolation, *per se*, is detrimental to the education of minority children and that by achieving racial balance, educational achievement will be improved. This premise is a hope which I share, but it is not a proven fact. Therefore, I believe more emphasis should be placed on the research and evaluation section of the bill.

I will spell this out in a little more detail shortly.

Recent comprehensive reviews of research on the effects of racial composition of schools and classes come to conclusions which are highly ambiguous and inconclusive regarding the causal relationship between racial composition of the student body and scholastic performance.

Most of this research to date has already been quite comprehensively

reviewed by Nancy St. John of Harvard University in a lengthy article in the February 1970 issue of the *Review of Educational Research*.

Her review supports my conclusion, which is that we have no scientifically or statistically substantial conclusions at this time regarding the effect on scholastic achievement of racial composition of schools and classes.

I personally favor racial integration and I hopefully believe it is coming about. As an educator, I am concerned that it come about in such a way as to be of benefit to the schooling of all children. Achieving racial balance, while viewed by many of us as desirable for moral, ethical and social reasons, will not solve existing educational problems; it will create new ones, and I am anxious that we provide the means for fully and objectively assessing them and for discovering the means of solving them.

I am quite convinced, on the basis of massive research evidence that the educational abilities and needs of the majority of white and Negro children are sufficiently different at this present time in our history that both groups—and particularly the more disadvantaged group—can be cheated out of the best education we now know how to provide in our schools, if uniformity rather than diversity of instructional approaches becomes the rule.

In attempting to achieve racial balance in schools, I think we can predict without any doubt that there will be differing degrees of success in various programs. I think it is very essential that we have the kind of research connected with the program that will permit us to ferret out those conditions under which greater degrees of success are achieved.

To insure the development of integrated education that could make it a just and valid program for all children, therefore, I urge that this committee seriously consider the addition to the bill of a directive in section 10 that a major proportion of the research funds provided for evaluation shall be used for a scientifically valid, objective examination of the educational effects of compulsory school desegregation.

I further suggest that the technical requirements of the needed research are probably beyond the personnel and facilities of most school systems and that major studies should be conducted by, or in consultation with, properly equipped research institutions under federal support.

I believe I am probably more aware than many educators of the technical problems involved in evaluating the effects of school integration. I have been intimately connected with the evaluation of school integration in Berkeley, Calif. Berkeley, as you may know, is the first city in the United States of over 100,000 population that has had complete school desegregation by means of two-way busing in a community in which 40 percent of the children are minority children. I believe that examination of this program would be highly valuable and enlightening to the entire Nation.

The evaluation of the program is off to an excellent start in that we have probably the best baseline data prior to integration that has ever been collected in school system, and the integration program has been underway for 2 years now.



So far, there has been no real follow-up evaluation, but I would suggest that this can be done and should be done in Berkeley as well as in other places. I think the model for evaluation that has been set in Berkeley could well be applied in other places.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What have the preliminary studies shown on that experiment?

Dr. JENSEN. As I have said, there has been no real preliminary study. We spent half a year collecting baseline data in the spring of 1968. This was done under a plan that was very thoroughly worked out by a number of persons at the University of California in cooperation with the school district to design what we hoped would be the most definitive evaluation ever made of the effects of school integration. The Berkeley situation made it a "natural" for this kind of evaluation.

The community supported the integration program. The schools had prepared for it for some 5 years. This would have been an excellent opportunity to evaluate the effects. Unfortunately, the evaluation was not continued into the second year. It was not continued from the first year. All we have are these excellent baseline data.

The program was discontinued in the midst of the testing after the first year of integration, partly as a result of my controversial article in the *Harvard Educational Review*. Since I was in charge of this study for the university, certain groups in Berkeley wished the study to be discontinued. In fact, someone proposed at a school board meeting that all the data we collected the previous year be destroyed. It has not been destroyed. It is still in existence at the university. It is under analysis and always will be there as a baseline for future comparisons.

As I've said, I think it is probably the most excellent set of data ever collected in any school system.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What was it they objected to?

Dr. JENSEN. I think that they objected to the fact that in my *Harvard Educational Review* article I expressed the opinion that the question of genetic racial differences in mental abilities was still an open question scientifically; that it has not been settled; that it is an important question for future research. Because I do not take a dogmatic stand on this I think I am persona non grata to dogmatists at both extremes on this question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Did the base material you had collected in 1968 in your judgment indicate at the point that you were in this evaluation any basis to either support or refute your contentions?

Dr. JENSEN. These data would not, no, because they were not directed toward this purpose. Very special kinds of data have to be collected for the purpose of researching the question of genetic racial differences.

I believe this particular issue was a *non sequitur* with respect to the question of segregation or integration, which to me depends upon moral, ethical, and social considerations and not on whether there are or are not genetic racial differences. I don't see that genetic racial differences contradict school integration, which I favor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, the thing which I was trying to find out was why they would abruptly discontinue a research project that you, as

a director of the project, indicate had great promise as giving us some answers to this whole question.

Dr. JENSEN. I was simply told, rather apologetically by the school authorities, that since the Berkeley school system is a political unit and not a research institute, that they had to be sensitive to political considerations in the community, and therefore the study would have to be discontinued. So the university withdrew from the study at the schools' request and the schools have continued some evaluation on their own, but it has been inadequate in my opinion. No definitive reports have been made as a result.

This leads to my belief that most school systems are ill-equipped to evaluate their own programs. I think the level of technical competence in research and statistics and the computer facilities necessary for this kind of evaluation are not to be found in most school districts. It is for this reason that I call upon your committee to set aside funds under section 10 of H.R. 17846 to investigate methods of coping educationally with individual and group variability and for an impartial, in-depth study of the effects of classroom desegregation on the educational process.

I feel strongly that such basic cause-and-effect research must be done as an essential part of the tasks of ameliorating our Nation's grave educational problems.

I think that concludes the formal part of my statement. The middle section of my paper contains supporting material for the position that I am taking.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Jensen, in view of the absence of the data that you suggest is not available, what is the evaluation of this legislation before us other than the suggestion you made to spell out in section 10 a greater amount of funds for this sort of evaluation? What is your evaluation of the rest of the bill?

Dr. JENSEN. My evaluation of the bill, as I have read it, is a favorable one. I believe it should be predicated on the hope, rather than as a stated fact, that racial integration will improve scholastic achievement. I do not believe that it is wise to promise delivery of goods that we have no assurance can be delivered simply by virtue of integration itself.

I favor integration, but I think it involves problems that will have to be solved at the level of the problems themselves, and these problems cannot be solved unless they are fully assessed and comparative studies are made in various school systems where various programs are attempted to see which ones work more successfully.

I favor great diversity in attempts to solve educational problems at this particular stage of our ignorance in this field. Since compensatory education has not met the promise that had been held up for it, I think it would be a shame to put forth further promises based on research that at present is inadequate to support claims that racial desegregation by itself will have any marked educational effects on scholastic achievement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure there will be more questions as we move along.

Dr. van den Haag, your entire statement will go into the record also and we will let you proceed in any manner you wish, sir.



**STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG, PROFESSOR OF  
SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY**

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Let me express my gratitude for being given the opportunity to be heard on the very important bill before you.  
(The prepared statement of Dr. van den Haag follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG, PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY,  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Ernest van den Haag. I am a Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University, a lecturer at the New School for Social Research in psychology and sociology, and a psychoanalyst in private practice. I received an M.A. degree from the University of Iowa, and a Ph. D. degree from New York University. I also have studied in Europe, at the Sorbonne (the University of Paris), the University of Florence, and the University of Naples. I have lectured at Harvard and Yale Universities. I am a member of the Society of Applied Psychoanalysis, Fellow American Sociological Association, Royal Economic Society, and New York Academy of Sciences; I am a Guggenheim Fellow (1967).

I am the author of *Education as an Industry* and the co-author of *The Fabric of Society*. I have published nearly 70 scientific articles in my fields, appearing in professional journals and encyclopedias as well as chapters in books, e.g., "Psychoanalysis and its Discontents," appearing in *Psychoanalysis, Scientific Method and Philosophy*, and "Genuine and Spurious Integration," appearing in *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*. I have delivered the Freud Memorial Lecture to the Philadelphia Psycho-analytic Association ("Psychoanalysis and Utopia").

My work mostly concerns study of the relationship of groups. Research in the field of social dynamics analyzes the causes of the formation of groups (including classroom groups or student groups) and how group members relate to others. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

On the basis of those studies, I appear today to question the validity of the purpose which the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846, is intended to serve. Essentially the bill seeks to end what is called racial isolation—defined as more than 50% minority attendance in a single classroom. It is the purpose of the bill as expressed in Section 2 to improve the quality of education in the United States by increasing the degree of compulsory classroom integration between the races. But it is simply assumed, without actual evidence, that integration will be educationally and psychologically beneficial.

This legislation before the Committee assumes fundamentally that academically and socially effective classroom groups can be formed by putting black and white students together in larger numbers in a single classroom regardless of their wishes and that this will improve their education and decrease the differences as well as hostilities which now exist between them. Yet such an enforced congregation of two identifiable racial groups, one deprived in relation to the other, does not diminish, but rather increases the divisive forces which now exist between these students and the consequent increase in classroom tension leads to a substantial decrease in the educational accomplishment of both groups and multiplies the disciplinary problems which detract from the essential student attention required for effective study.

If such integration is compelled, as this bill proposes to do, it will injure rather than assist the future educational accomplishment of the nation's schools.

The blacks who will feel humiliated by their low performance relative to white children—be it owed to genetic, economic, subcultural or family conditions—are likely to react with redoubled hostility to white pupils, teachers and institutions—to schooling as a whole. It will be labeled "irrelevant."

II. GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY

(1) Every individual needs to identify with a particular group. Such an identification is essential for the development of personality. This is clearly expressed by Dr. Glauert A. Elmer (Michigan State College) in "Identification

as a Social Concept" (*Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1954), pp. 103-109).

"The social psychologists, however, '... should start first by relating the individual to his reference and membership groups and then proceed to the finer details of personality problems.' ... In the binding in-group formation, the real identifications of individual members are anchored in the group. A sense of solidarity is generated in them as a natural process which manifests itself in actual behavior. In other words, as a group is formed, or as individuals become members of the group, the social process of integration is taking place. Besides the individual members of the group, the integration binds the social values and goals, the psychic characteristics, and the in-group symbols with which the individual members become identified. The social identification which evolves thus constitutes the basis of the group solidarity from which results observable, measurable behavior.

"... There must be a personal consciousness of 'belonging' or 'being a part' which is reflected in the opinions and behavior of the persons concerned. Group membership identification implies not an individual's reaction toward a group, but his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

(2) Men react selectively to their fellow men. This preferential association is based upon observable differences, among them overt physical differences and similarities, which form the focal point for group orientation and group identification. Professor George A. Lundberg (University of Washington; past president of the American Sociological Association) writes in "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem" (*Modern Age*, Summer, 1958, pp. 285-297):

"... In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based on some observable differences between those whose association we seek and those whose association we avoid. The differences which are the basis of selective association are of an indefinitely large variety, of all degrees of visibility and subtlety, and vastly different in social consequences. Sex, age, marital condition, religion, socioeconomic status, color, size, shape, health, morals, birth, breeding, and B.O.—the list of differences is endless and varied, but all the items have this in common: (1) they are observable; and (2) they are *significant* differences to those who react selectively to people with the characteristics in question. It is, therefore, wholly absurd to try to ignore, deny or talk out of existence these differences just because we do not approve of some of their social results..."

Professor Lundberg with an associate also studied high school students in Seattle, Washington, to find out the determinants of their preferential associations in leadership, work, dating, and friendship. Lundberg reported in "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1952)). He found:

"... every ethnic group showed a preference for its own members in each of the four relationships covered by the question.

"... ethnocentrism or prejudice is not confined to the majority of the dominant group..."

"... A certain amount of ethnocentrism is a normal and necessary ingredient of all group life, i.e., it is the basic characteristic that differentiates one group from another and thus is fundamental to social structure. Ethnocentrism ('discrimination,' 'prejudice') is, therefore, not in itself necessarily to be regarded as a problem. It is rather a question of determining *what degree* of it (a) is functional for social survival and satisfaction under given conditions, or at least (b) is not regarded by a society as a problem in the sense of requiring community action. The amount of discrimination that has been shown to exist in the present study, for example, is not incompatible with the peaceful and efficient functioning of the institution in question..."

There are a substantial number of studies reported in social science literature which indicate that the attitudes reported in Lundberg's study of Seattle, Washington, are not confined to that particular city. Indeed, social scientists find in all areas where groups of diverse origin and appearance come into contact, some degree of race preference and selective association is manifested by the various groups.

(3) At one time it was assumed that certain areas of the world were free from race prejudice. Hawaii and Brazil were often cited as examples of interracial "alohas" where all race prejudice had disappeared. More careful students of these areas have found that despite a superficial interracial harmony, racial

preferences and prejudices are manifested in both these areas. In "Racial Attitudes in Brazil" (*American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949), pp. 402-408), Dr. Emilio Willems described color prejudice in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil, as manifested in a series of interviews carried out among middle and upper-class whites. Dr. Willems found.

"... Of the 245 advertisers, 194 were interviewed about the reasons for their unfavorable attitude toward Negro servants. In this interview, 48 were unable to give any clear answer, but they found their own attitude 'very natural.' 18 advertisers did not accept Negro servants because of presumed lack of cleanliness; 30 thought black housemaids were always thieves; 14 alleged instability and lack of assiduity; and 12 said only that they were used to white servants and therefore did not wish to engage colored ones. Seven persons precluded Negroes because of the contact they would have with their young children. There were a few other reasons, such as 'race odor,' 'bad character,' 'laziness,' 'carelessness,' and other imperfections that were ascribed to Negro servants.

"... There are many situations in social life where white people refuse to be seen with Negroes. In such public places as high-class hotels, restaurants, or casinos, fashionable clubs and dances, Negroes are not desired, and there are few whites who dare to introduce Negro friends or relatives into such places. This discrimination was strongly resented by middle-class Negroes. On the other hand, those Negroes complained bitterly of the contemptuous attitudes that middle-class mulattoes assumed toward them.

"... Yet our inquiry led to some other interesting results. In 23 out of 36 cases the questionnaires contained references to formal associations of all kinds from which Negroes were excluded. Usually these associations are clubs maintained by the upper-class families of the city. Though there does not exist any reference to Negro members in club statutes, these are rarely admitted..."

In "Stereotypes, Norms and Interracial Behavior in Sao Paulo, Brazil" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1957)), Professors Roger Bastide and Pierre van den Berghe found on the basis of a questionnaire given to 580 white students from five different teachers' colleges in Sao Paulo, Brazil, that:

"Stereotypes against Negroes and mulattoes are widespread. Seventy-five per cent of the sample accept twenty-three or more stereotypes against Negroes. No one rejects all stereotypes against Negroes... Mulattoes are judged inferior or superior to whites on the same traits as Negroes but somewhat lower percentages. The most widely accepted stereotypes are lack of hygiene (accepted by 91 per cent), physical unattractiveness (87 per cent), superstition (80 per cent), lack of financial foresight (77 per cent), lack of a morality (76 per cent), aggressiveness (73 per cent), laziness (72 per cent), lack of persistence at work (62 per cent), sexual 'perversity' (57 per cent), and exhibitionism (50 per cent)."

(4) Strong patterns of racial preference emerge in pre-school children—even as early as 2½ years of age. In "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes" (*The American Anthropologist*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (1946)), Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman investigated the age at which racial attitudes become manifest. Fifteen Negro and twelve white children, ranging in age at the beginning of the study from 2-9 to 4-4 and who attended a bi-racial nursery school were studied. Dr. Goodman noted that "awareness of one's racial identity may be regarded as one facet of that consciousness of self which is gradually achieved during the first three or four years of life," and "preliminary analysis leads to the belief that these children of approximately 3 to 4½ years were in the process of becoming aware of race differences."

The early genesis of racial attitudes has been confirmed in other studies in "well-integrated" areas where there is an absence of overt racial hostility and legal racial segregation. Drs. Catherine Landreth and Barbara C. Johnson conducted such a study in the child care centers of Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco, California, and reported in "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color" (*Child Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1, (1953)). They concluded that "patterns of response to persons of different skin color are present as early as three years and become accentuated during the succeeding two years."

Drs. Marion Radke, Gene Sutherland and Pearl Rosenberg studied the racial attitudes of children in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (*Sociometry*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1953).

They found "the white children in all the situations and at all ages (seven to thirteen years) expressed strong preference for their own racial group. This is

particularly the case when their choices between Negro and white children as friends are on an abstract or wish level."

(5) Some sociologists contend that Negroes would suffer far more from racial integration than from racial segregation. Thus Professor Ichheiser \* notes that "... if the Negroes would refuse to identify themselves consciously with the Negroes as a subgroup, then they would develop a kind of collective neurosis, as do other minorities, too; for the conscious 'we' would in case of such an attitude be persistently in conflict with the unconscious 'we,' and this inner split would inevitably reflect itself in different pathological distortions of the Negro personality."

For contrast, Allison Davis (*Racial Status and Personality Development, The Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 57, Oct. 1943) noted "... where the social group of the racially subordinate individual is highly organized and integrated, as in the Little Italies or Chinatowns, or in many Southern Negro communities, its members will usually have relatively less psychological conflict over their racial status." Similarly, Mozelle Hill ("A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in the All Negro Community in Oklahoma," *Phylon*, 1946) noted that Negroes raised and educated in an all-Negro community tend to have "a much higher regard for Negroes," and are more favorable in their expression toward their own race.

### III. "PSYCHOLOGICAL INJURY" ARGUMENT IN SUPREME COURT

As one of the main grounds for decision in the 1954 school desegregation case (*Brown v. Board of Education*), the Supreme Court of the United States asserted that (347 U.S. 483, 494) :

"To separate [children in grade and high schools] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that *may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone*. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system."

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority." (Emphasis added; footnote omitted.)

In footnote 11 of *Brown v. Board of Education, supra*, the Supreme Court quoted a number of social science materials alleged to demonstrate the psychological injury basic to its reversal of *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. Similar materials were quoted in an appendix to Appellant's Brief signed by a number of prominent social scientists.

Professor Kenneth B. Clark has testified in three of the actions that led to the *Brown* decision. His testimony is part of the record in *Brown* and also contributed importantly to the assertions of the social scientists in the appendix to Appellant's Brief and to those mentioned in footnote 11 of *Brown*. Clark maintained that he as well as others have shown the existence of psychological injury owing to segregation.

In the South Carolina case *Briggs v. Elliot* (Professor Clark employed the same method and reached the same conclusions in the Delaware and Virginia cases which are also part of the *Brown* record). Professor Clark explained that he had shown Negro and white dolls (or drawings thereof) to Negro children in a segregated public school and, having ascertained that they distinguished white from Negro people, asked them, in effect, which doll they preferred, and which one "looks like you." Ten—(later in the testimony, nine) out of sixteen Negro children picked the white doll as the one that "looked like you." Professor Clark concluded that "these children . . . have been definitely harmed in the development of their personalities." He knew, of course, that the question before the court was whether school segregation had harmed the children and testified:

\*Ichheiser, "Socio-psychological and Cultural Factors in Race Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949).



"My opinion is that a fundamental effect of segregation is basic confusion in the individuals and their concepts about themselves conflicting in their self images. That seemed to be supported by the results of these sixteen children . . . ." The syntax is obscure, but the sense is not. Professor Clark testified (1) that segregation caused the harm he found (or at least played a "fundamental role"); (2) later on that this is "consistent with previous results which we have obtained in testing over 300 children"; (3) finally, "and this result was confirmed in Clarendon County." Elsewhere Professor Clark asseverates: "Proof that state imposed segregation inflicts injuries upon the Negro had to come from the social psychologists . . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Professor Clark mentioned to the court that he had made previous experiments "consistent" with those he entered into the record. However, these previous experiments were not themselves ever entered into the record—for good reason as will be seen.

They had been published, however.<sup>2</sup> 134 Negro children in segregated schools in Arkansas and 119 Negro children in unsegregated nursery and public schools in Springfield, Massachusetts, about evenly divided by sex, were tested.<sup>3</sup>

Black and white dolls were presented, and the children were asked to indicate the "nice" and the "bad" one, as well as the one "that looks like you." Professor Clark concluded that ". . . the children in the northern mixed-school situation do not differ from children in the southern segregated schools in either their knowledge of racial differences or their racial identification,"<sup>4</sup> except that ". . . the southern children in segregated schools are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll, compared to the northern [unsegregated] children's definite preference for this doll. Although still in a minority, a higher percentage of southern children, compared to northern, prefer to play with the colored doll or think that it is a 'nice' doll."<sup>5</sup> The tables presented by Professor Clark bear out as much. Table 4,<sup>6</sup> moreover, shows that a significantly higher percentage of Negro children when asked "give me the doll that looks like you" gave the white doll in the nonsegregated schools—39 per cent as opposed to 29 per cent in the segregated schools.

Thus, Professor Clark misled the courts. His "previous results" are not "consistent" with those entered in the court record, though he assured the court that they are. Actually, his "previous results" clearly contradict those submitted in his sworn testimony. Compared, the response of Negro children in segregated and in non-segregated schools show that Negro children in *segregated* schools "are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll" and more often think of the colored dolls as "nice" or identify with them—whereas if segregation were harmful and the harm were shown by his tests, as Professor Clark asserts, the Negro children in the segregated schools would have been *more* pronounced in their preference for the white doll. If Professor Clark's tests do demonstrate any psychological injury in connection with segregation, they demonstrate that there is *more* injury to unsegregated Negro children and *less* to segregated Negro children. Yet Professor Clark told the court that his tests had shown that "segregation inflicts injuries upon the Negro." He did so by presenting only the tests with the segregated Negro children and ignoring the tests he had himself undertaken previously in desegregated and segregated schools with a far greater number of children.

#### IV. OBJECTIONS TO PROFESSOR CLARK'S EXPERIMENT

So far I have proceeded on the assumption that Clark's general method is capable of showing something about segregation. This is doubtful.

Whatever Professor Clark demonstrated about the personality of segregated Negro children could be due to general prejudice in the community rather than

<sup>1</sup> Clark, "Desegregation, an Appraisal of the Evidence," *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 4, p. 3 (1953).

<sup>2</sup> Clark, "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," *READINGS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY* (Newcomb & Hartley eds., 1947).

<sup>3</sup> The children ranged from 3 to 7 years of age; those tested in Clarendon County were between 6 to 9 years old. Professor Clark does not seem to think that the difference in average age affects the results, and I have no reason for disagreeing. But, both in view of the difference in average age, and the small size of the Clarendon group, I follow Professor Clark in comparing the two groups described in his previous tests with each other, rather than with the Clarendon group. However, since it is possible after all that the effects of segregation vary with age, and particularly with length of schooling, competent studies should take this into account.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. Cit. supra*, note 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

to segregation, or even to circumstances not affecting Negroes specifically. Professor Clark is confusing on the sources of damage, though insisting that segregation is "fundamental." Tests on white children, or on Jewish and Christian children, were not presented. Such tests would be needed to indicate whether the damage was general (there may be a general confusion of self-images in our culture, a "crisis of identity"); or restricted to minorities; or restricted to Negro children. (That whatever damage can be demonstrated by his methods is not restricted to *segregated* Negro children Professor Clark proved, if he proved anything; indeed although he misled the court on this matter, Professor Clark's tests show that segregation decreases and congregation, even when not compulsory, increases the damage to Negro children.)

However, no proof whatever was presented to indicate that preference for, or identification with, a doll different in color from oneself indicates personality disturbance. I wrote on this point:

"Suppose dark-haired white children were to identify blonde dolls as nice; or suppose, having the choice, they identified teddy bears as nice rather than any dolls. Would this prove injury owing to (nonexistent) segregation from blondes? Or communal prejudice against humans? Professor Clark's logic suggests that it would.

"Control tests—which unfortunately were not presented—might have established an alternative explanation for the identification of white with nice, and black with bad: in our own culture and in many others, including cultures where white people are unknown, black has traditionally been the color of evil, death, sorrow, and fear. People are called blackguards or blackhearted when considered evil; and children fear darkness. In these same cultures, white is the color of happiness, joy, and innocence. We need not speculate on why this is so to assert that it is a fact and that it seems utterly unlikely that it originated with segregation (though it may have contributed to it). Professor Clark's findings then can be explained without any reference to injury by segregation or by prejudice. The 'scientific' evidence for this injury is no more 'scientific' than the evidence presented in favor of racial prejudice."

I can only list some of the many other objections that could be raised against the Clark experiment. (1) The subjects were neither randomized nor stratified properly by age, sex, economic, religious, residential and other criteria; (2) No controls with white children in segregated and unsegregated environments; (3) No controls with Negro children in Negro cultures (*e.g.* Africa) which might have had the same results, thus showing that it does not depend on prejudice, let alone segregation; (4) No controls with objects other than white and black dolls; (5) No evidence presented that doll tests show any correlation with personality disturbance; (6) No evidence about the type of alleged disturbance and what it means psychiatrically.

Professor Clark has published a book since his testimony, relied on by the Supreme Court: *Prejudice and Your Child*. On page 45 ff. the following is stated with reference to the more frequent self-identification of Negro children in mixed schools with white dolls:

"On the surface, these findings might suggest that northern Negro children suffer more personality damage from racial prejudice and discrimination than southern Negro children. However, this interpretation would seem to be not only superficial but incorrect. The apparent emotional stability of the southern Negro child may be indicative only of the fact that through rigid racial segregation and isolation he has accepted as normal the fact of his inferior social status. Such an acceptance is not symptomatic of a healthy personality. The emotional turmoil revealed by some of the northern children may be interpreted as an attempt on their part to assert some positive aspect of the self."

Here Professor Clark starts by speaking of "personality damage" and ends by speaking of "emotional turmoil." Clark notwithstanding, it seems more likely that "rigid racial segregation and isolation" would make the segregated *least* aware of their status in the eyes of the group from which they are "isolated" and most likely to identify with each other.<sup>8</sup> Further, "acceptance" of an "inferior social status" by any group may be morally or politically disturbing.

<sup>7</sup> Ross and van den Haag, *The Fabric of Society* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1957), pp. 165-66.

<sup>8</sup> Certainly the theory of reference groups would lead us to believe so. See Robert K. Merton, *Social Structure and Social Theory*, p. 225 ff.



but there is no reason to consider it *per se* a symptom of either "healthy personality" or sickness. Not all members of castes below brahmins in India are sick, nor even all "untouchables." Clark here confuses his moral views with clinical evidence. There is no evidence to show that acceptance of inferior, superior or equal status is a symptom of emotional disturbance.

In his testimony, Professor Clark asserted categorically that when Negro children identify with, and prefer, white to colored dolls it means that personality damage, owing to segregation has occurred. Now that his previous experiments, not entered into the court records, have been brought to public attention, Professor Clark would have to conclude that segregation decreases, and congregation increases, the personality damage that is detected by the doll tests. For the tests not entered into the court record detect such personality damage more often where there is congregation than where there is segregation.

To avoid this embarrassing result Professor Clark now explains that if segregated Negro children prefer white dolls it indeed shows personality damage suffered because of segregation. And if nonsegregated children prefer white dolls even more frequently it does not show that they suffer more "personality damage." This would be "superficial" and "incorrect." The fact that segregated children prefer the white dolls less often than nonsegregated ones now shows that they have suffered even deeper personality damage. The fact that congregated children prefer the white doll more often suddenly becomes an indication of comparative health.

Which is to say that whatever the outcome of the experiment, it shows that there is personality damage owing to segregation. When Negro children identify more often with the white doll (North) it is bad and shows psychological injury. When they identify less often (segregated South) it is even worse. But wasn't the self-identification of Negro children with the white doll supposed to be the very evidence of their confusion and psychological injury? Yes, Clark writes now, except when the identification occurring less frequently among segregated Negro children would indicate that segregation makes for mental health. This would be inconvenient. Wherefore when this is the case less frequent identification with the white doll suddenly indicates *more* psychological damage.

Just what choice of dolls would have shown that segregation does not harm children? None of those available. Whichever doll the children choose would, according to Clark's new interpretation, show that segregation is harmful. What can an experiment which supports the same conclusion, regardless of its outcome, possibly show? Only the experimenter's prejudices and his failure to grasp the purpose and nature of experimental methods of research. Clearly, Professor Clark's conclusions do not depend on any of his experiments. For these are inconsistent with his conclusions, if they are meaningful at all. None of the material which the Supreme Court accepted as probative of injury through segregation is any more cogent. No injury by segregation *per se* has been proved by any scientific test.

#### V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary groups to which an individual belongs are his family and his peer group. The latter is the group with which the individual identifies himself on the basis of a feeling of community, observable physical characteristics, and commonly shared emotion. Later the individual will also become a member of such groups as are based on material matters such as membership in a profession or persons of a given income level.

Such group membership is a main factor constituting the individual's identity or personality. It is essential to the normal individual to have a firm feeling of belonging to a group. Failure to identify with a group prevents the individual from functioning normally. An individual identifies with persons in his own environment whom he takes as models accepting some characteristics, developing others of the individual's own, and in this way building up the essential personality of the individual.

Without such a sense of identity, the mental health of the individual will be seriously impaired. Unrealistic identification is a form of insanity. An identity once acquired cannot be lost.

Groups are formed from individuals having common self-identification. In the small child the factors involved will be almost exclusively visual, such as skin color; but as the child grows, other factors of intelligence and achievement will play a part, as in joining a football team. In different aspects of activity, the individual belongs not to one, but to a series of groups.

Group identification must be voluntary. Involuntary placement in a group with which the individual does not identify creates hostility. The group approval or disapproval is extremely important to identity, and the disapproval destroys the individual's image of himself.

Where ethnic identity is clearly visible, it becomes a matter of considerable importance in group relations. The variation in attitude created by differences in skin color exists in all countries.

Group members tend to adhere to group norms, which, if they are within the potential of the individual, is of advantage. On the other hand, if the norm of the group exceeds the maximum potential of the individual, then this gives rise to feelings of humiliation, incapacity, and inadequacy which impair his motivation.

Contrary to the "psychological evidence" which apparently was accorded great weight by the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education*, scientific tests have not proved any injury by segregation *per se*. In fact, some sociologists contend that Negroes would suffer far more from racial integration than from segregation.

Under a freedom of choice system for school attendance, as the individual increases in age, his willingness and ability successfully to associate himself with other groups would increase, provided there was a generally favorable atmosphere and favorable attitude on the part of the superintendent, principals, and teachers, as well as parents. Voluntary mingling would have beneficial effects on personality and education. Immediate, total, enforced integration would lead to even greater demoralization of Negro pupils than is already taking place, and would also lead to lower educational achievement.

Whatever one may think of the more radical Negro organizations, they have captured the emotions and the imagination of a large part of our black population. They have been, particularly with the young people, far more successful in that aspect than the old style organizations. High school and college students, if they do not join, do certainly admire and support organizations such as the Black Panthers and the Nation of Islam. They look up to such figures as Rap Brown, Stokeley Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Malcolm X, *et al.* The organizations differ among themselves in their methods and to the extent one can discern them, in their purposes. But they have one thing in common. They try (and largely succeed) to produce a prideful racial identity. They make their followers accept that "black is beautiful" and they attract support because they are creating a black identity, and pride in it.

They do this largely by declaring their independence of and, in some cases, even hostility to whites. But the hostility here is largely a gesture necessary to support the independence and the pride.

I am not concerned with the justification of such movements. But they clearly indicate a psychological need. By gratifying this need, these organizations have succeeded to an astonishing extent in rehabilitating members who previously suffered from major symptoms of personality disorganization, such as drug addiction, criminal behavior, general irresponsibility, etc. This is not just to say the Panthers do not allow members to take drugs. It is that they make the drugs unnecessary; they offer their members a self-image of adequacy that makes the resort to drugs unnecessary. The basic ingredient in that self-image is the identification with an image of historical, racial and cultural adequacy, if not superiority.

I submit that this is what the black minority needs more than anything else. It is in this respect that its problem has differed from that of other minorities—Irish, Italian, Jewish—and it is this ingredient that a wise and just process of education should help provide. Integration, desirable as it may be in the end, is possible only if the elements to be integrated each feel a sense of identity and a pride in that identity rather than a feeling of inadequacy. For feelings of inadequacy produce hostility to those who make one feel inadequate.

Black students know this. Their behavior itself is evidence for the need it tries to fulfill. If one looks at recent happenings in our colleges, one finds that there has been a great increase in black enrollment in previously largely white schools. That increase, fostered by the colleges with the idea of giving blacks the benefits of their college life, and education, far from leading to immediate integration, has led to the very opposite. Thus, at Vassar College where I served as Visiting Professor in 1969, the one demand almost immediately made by the

newly-admitted black students was a separate black dormitory. There were no complaints of inhospitality on the part of the white college students. The black college students simply wanted to have a place of their own. They wanted to cultivate their own identity, lead their own life, elaborate their own traditions. They also wanted black teachers and "black courses." This development has been paralleled in almost every college in the country.

Many colleges have gone so far as to take black students less prepared or qualified than white students. Whatever the motives that led them to do so, it is relevant here to point out that the less well prepared students felt necessarily left out, and humiliated, when they could not perform as adequately in class as their more qualified white fellow students did. They, therefore, were psychologically compelled to seek to achieve the prestige they had lost in their own eyes—which they could not achieve in classroom work—outside the classroom. The opportunity was readily at hand. They could, and did, achieve status as revolutionary leaders against the "irrelevant" college curriculum in which they were unable to excel. In some cases (with the help of disaffected and masochistic whites) they came near destroying the institutions which had recruited them.

I am fully aware that we are dealing not with colleges but with primary and secondary schools. But I am mentioning this history because it is about to be repeated in secondary schools. "Those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it." In our high schools we already have a similar development. When well prepared white students and inadequately prepared black students, in many cases coming from underprivileged backgrounds, are compelled to go to school together, those who cannot perform well by the standards of the school, necessarily become hostile to the school which humiliates them, and to the whites who outperform them. They also become discouraged. They are likely to seek outside the prestige they lost in school work; and they will be tempted to make up for the humiliation suffered by displaying their hostility to whites and insisting on their own superiority in activities which undermine the academic and educational purposes of the school.

This is by no means to say that black and white students should forever remain separated or should be separated as a matter of administrative rule. On the contrary, what I am advocating is that they should remain free to select the school and the fellow students that in each individual case most fulfill their academic and psychological needs.

I foresee that freedom of choice will lead ultimately to far more integration than is now extant, but it will do so slowly. The advantage of that slowness will be that blacks will be able to compete both academically and psychologically with whites in a way that does not make the school "irrelevant" to them, nor psychologically requires them to seek compensation, through subversive or criminal activities, for the sense of inadequacy that it will generate.

Much research has been done since the Supreme Court decided (on most dubious evidence) that separation is educationally damaging to Negro children. No evidence confirming this idea has been uncovered. Very little evidence has been offered to show that integration has been beneficial. Most programs which attempted to remedy the comparatively low performance of Negro children attributed to inferior schooling have been shown to be ineffective.

Social scientists, therefore, have reached in many cases the conclusion that the inferior performance may be due to factors in very early infancy which, as yet, we have found no way of offsetting. Others have insisted that there is evidence of a genetic difference which may explain the differences in performance, at least when the same methods of teaching are used for both groups.

I wish now to draw the attention of this Committee to an article "Early Childhood Intervention—The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism" by Stephen F. and Joan C. Baratz, appearing in the *Harvard Educational Review* (February, 1970). The authors maintain, with considerable evidence, that the two models that seek to explain the inferior performance of black children—the genetic model and the social pathology model (of which there are many varieties referring to the family, the subcultural background, nutrition, etc.)—are both unnecessary. The authors maintain that if there were a deficit not just in the actual performance of the children, but in their ability to perform, then such models would be required. But in their opinion the low performance of Negro children is due to the disinclination of teachers, and the failure of schools to perceive the linguistic and other resources of these children. This failure leads schools to insist that Negro children express themselves in a language to

which, in their subculture, they are not accustomed and in which they become "dumb." In short, the authors maintain that by insisting that Negro children have the same linguistic and other resources as white children and allowing them to use only these resources, schools produce the lower performance of Negro children. If on the other hand, the authors maintain, the resources actually available to Negro children were utilized—as are those actually available to white children—then Negro children might be quite as able to perform as white children. Thus the low performance of Negro children could be improved only by distinct teaching methods and a distinctive curriculum utilizing their subcultural resources. Needless to say, this would require at least temporary separate education.

I have no personal knowledge that would indicate to me whether the contention of the authors is correct. They do, however, quote a great amount of research that certainly suggests that their thesis is worth exploration. And this is the conclusion that I wish to submit to this Committee.

A great amount of money has been spent on forced integration. A great deal of hostility has been aroused on all sides—certainly race relations are worse than they were before 1954 and there is no evidence whatever that compulsory integration has led to more academic progress than free choice would have achieved. More and more evidence is accumulating that a different Negro subculture exists and requires for its utilization distinct methods if the members are to learn what the schools are trying to teach. This may indeed require separate training for teachers and separation of those pupils who wish to learn and are best able to learn by utilizing the resources of their subculture. If there is any sort of genetic difference in addition to the subcultural differences this, too, would probably lead to different learning and teaching methods.

I am not suggesting that this Committee should institute the new methods that may turn out to be useful. I am, however, suggesting that this Committee should, instead of throwing further money into an approach that no one could possibly term successful, reserve such money (a) for thorough evaluation of the approaches so far tried, and (b) for thorough exploration and experimentation with different approaches resting on a variety of competing teaching methods with free self selection of pupils.

I do not expect to convince this Committee that the premise on which such vast federal expenditures have been made for the integration of schools over the past ten or fifteen years is a false premise, or that the truth lies elsewhere. I do, however, most seriously recommend that alternatives be explored and all approaches scientifically evaluated before the educational system of the nation becomes so far committed to a single article of faith ("the evidence of things not seen")—that integration of the races brings better education—that the point of no return will have been passed.

Thus I appear here to recommend that investigation of all views on this question become part of the evaluation directed by this bill and that we substitute objective measurement for the subjective, if praiseworthy, opinions of those who see compulsory integration a forwarding of the democratic dream of equality. If the basic purpose of schools is to be education, then we should put aside any preconceived emotional assumptions about the factors which improve or destroy the educational accomplishment of any child, black or white, and use every available scientific facility to isolate the actual factors wherever we find them. To do so would be in the interest of all concerned, of all children, black and white, and contrary only to the vested interest of educational dogmatists.

#### REFERENCES

Bastide, Roger, & van den Berghe, Pierre, "Stereotypes, Norms & Interracial Behavior in Sao Paulo, Brazil," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1957).

Clark, Kenneth B., "Desegregation, an Appraisal of the Evidence," *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 4, p. 3 (1953).

Clark, Kenneth B., *Prejudice and Your Child*, Beacon Press (1955).

Clark, Kenneth B. and Mamle, "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," reprinted in *Readings in Social Psychology* (1st ed., 1947).

Davis, Allison, "Racial Status and Personality Development," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 57 (October, 1943).

Elmer, Glaister A., "Identification as a Social Concept," *Sociology & Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 103-109 (1954).



Goodman, A. M. E. (Mae), "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," *The American Anthropologist*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (October-December, 1946).

Hill, Mozelle, "A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in the All Negro Community in Oklahoma," *Phylon* (Third Quarterly Issue, 1946).

Ichheiser, Gustav, "Socio-psychological and Cultural Factors in Race Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949).

Landreth, Catherine, & Johnson, Barbara C., "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," *Child Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1953).

Lundberg, George A., "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem," *Modern Age*, pp. 285-297 (Summer, 1958).

Lundberg, George A., "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population," 17 *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 23 (1952).

Merton, Robert K., *Social Structure and Social Theory*, pp. 225 ff.

Radke, Marion; Sutherland, Gene; and Rosenberg, Pearl, *Sociometry*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1953) (racial attitudes of children in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania).

van den Haag, Ross &, *The Fabric of Society* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1957) (specifically chapter on prejudice).

van den Haag, "Genuine and Spurious Integration," *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences* (New York).

Willems, "Racial Attitudes in Brazil," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5, pp. 402-408 (1949).

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. I have been concerned with the questions that are dealt with in the bill for many years, my profession being the study of the relationship of groups.

It is clear, as I read the bill before you, Mr. Chairman, that it deals with an attempt to end what is called racial isolation, defined as an attendance by more than 50 percent of a minority group in a single classroom.

The question that arises is whether the compulsory congregation of different groups so as to avoid what has been called racial isolation will be effective academically and, more broadly, educationally.

I concur with my colleague, Dr. Jensen, that very little conclusive research has been done at this point, but I wish to go a step further by referring to events, of which we are all aware from the newspapers, to simply indicate that if we introduce blacks into classrooms, where they are not fully able to compete with their white fellow students—be it for reasons of prior cultural deprivation or any other reason—we thereby unavoidably humiliate them. This humiliation necessarily, and even on a commonsense level, will lead to hostility toward those who, they feel, have humiliated them—their teachers, the school system, and fellow students. In my opinion this is one of the major reasons for the unrest and the trouble of most major school systems, for the feeling that the blacks have openly expressed, that the schooling in the system is irrelevant to them.

Clearly, if you are unable to compete with your fellow students for lack of background which may not, of course, be your fault at all, but, nonetheless, if you are introduced into a class where you are humiliated by your inability to compete, you will resort to saying that, in effect, what happens in the classroom is irrelevant; for this will be the best way of offsetting your humiliation.

Let me now briefly summarize the contents of my statement which you were good enough to introduce into the record.

I think every individual needs to identify with a particular group. Such groups are formed on the basis of selective perception of similarities and dissimilarities. Such perceptions occur very early in age and

occur in all human groups regardless of the existence of hostility or lack of hostility among them.

Wherever we go, we find that people band together according to perceived similarities and dissimilarities. I may point out in some countries which were held up in the past to us as models of nearly total racial integration, such as Hawaii and Brazil, such integration is nonexistent. I do not wish to say there is racial hostility. There is some of that there too, of course, but what I wish to say, in these countries as in other countries, people gather together on the basis of perceived similarities, psychological and otherwise.

For instance, we find in Brazil stereotypes against Negroes. I quote from an article in the *American Sociological Review* :

Stereotypes against Negroes and mulattoes are widespread. Seventy-five per cent of the sample accept twenty-three or more stereotypes against Negroes.

And so forth.

Strong patterns of racial preference emerge in preschool children—even as early as 2½ years of age.

I wish to turn now to a statement, which I fully support, by Professor Ichheiser, again in the *American Journal of Sociology*. He says—

If Negroes would refuse to identify themselves consciously with other Negroes as a subgroup, then they would develop a kind of collective neurosis, as do other minorities too; for the conscious "we" would in case of such an attitude be persistently in conflict with the unconscious "we," and this inner split would inevitably reflect itself in different pathological distortions of the Negro personality.

I think there is now considerable evidence that where Negroes and any other groups identify consciously and unconsciously with members of their own group and take pride in such an identification, we find much less social and individual pathology than we find where that is not the case.

My statement quotes a number of research studies to that effect.

I would like to turn now briefly to the real basis for the bill before you and for quite a number of developments in the last 15 years; namely the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

That decision quoted a lower court to the effect that:

Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system.

The court went on to say:

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority.

The modern authority that the court very largely relied on consists of a variety of studies undertaken by Prof. Kenneth B. Clark. His testimony in the lower court became part of the Supreme Court record and his research papers are quoted by the Supreme Court.

Very briefly, what his testimony consisted of in the lower court and what his research papers submitted in the appendix, in the



amicus curiae brief in the Supreme Court decision, is that Professor Clark submitted black and white dolls to a group of segregated Negro children in southern districts and asked them which dolls they preferred, which dolls they thought were nice, which dolls they would favor and finally asked these segregated Negro children which doll was like them.

A majority of the segregated Negro children said, after having answered the prior questions, that they themselves were like the white doll. This Professor Clark interpreted to mean that they have been gravely disturbed, that they have been psychologically injured by segregation, for their own misidentification with the white doll to Professor Clark meant that their conception of themselves had been distorted.

Professor Clark went on to say that his results in these studies were "consistent with previous results which we have obtained in testing over 300 children."

I have looked at these previous results which Professor Clark obtained and which he had published and which he maintained in court and in subsequent papers, are consistent with what I have just quoted. I have found that these previous results, far from being consistent, are totally contradictory to the results he submitted to the court.

The previous research consisted of testing 134 Negro children in segregated schools in Arkansas and 119 Negro children in unsegregated nursery and public schools in Springfield, Mass. These results are published, and I quote the result in the statement which is before you.

In these previous results, undertaken with far larger groups, what Professor Clark found, subjecting the Negro children both in the segregated and in the unsegregated schools to the same questions which he had submitted to the Negro children in various southern districts and to which he had testified in court, Professor Clark found in this major group of Negro children that in the desegregated northern schools a higher percentage identified with the white doll than in the segregated southern schools.

In effect, the percentages were 39 percent as opposed to 29 percent in the segregated schools. Thus Professor Clark misled the courts, including the Supreme Court. The previous results were not consistent with those entered into the court record, though he assured the court they were. Actually his previous results clearly contradict those submitted in his sworn testimony, for he found that in the desegregated, northern schools, a higher percentage of Negro children identified with the white doll, thus, in his interpretation, indicating more personality disturbance than did the segregated southern schools. If we were to accept his interpretation, or if he were to accept, himself, his own interpretation, he would have to conclude that desegregation, or integration, is unhealthy for these Negro children.

I myself do not necessarily conclude this, at least not on this evidence, because Professor Clark's experiments seem for a variety of reasons to me totally invalid. One very simple reason is, I would say if a Negro child prefers a white doll and says he himself is like a white doll because he preferred it—after all, children are very consistent; once they say "I prefer A," they will say, "I am like A."

If a child has such a preference, it may be simply due to the general preference of children for light colors over dark colors. In our culture, as in other cultures, as a matter of fact, black is usually identified as the color of evil, death, sorrow, and so on, while white and light colors generally speaking are identified with gaiety, innocence, purity, and pleasure. Children fear the dark on the whole.

I should think the whole experiment, to begin with, makes no sense, which I am glad about for the very simple reason that if it did make sense it would show that segregation is necessary for mental health, a view which I myself do not share.

Let me now refer to what I feel is the real question in this bill: Whatever one may think of the more radical Negro organizations, I do think that it is a fact that they have captured the emotions and the imagination of a large part of our black population, particularly of the young. They have been in this respect far more successful than the old style organizations whose major attempt was to integrate.

High school and college students, if they do not join, certainly do admire and support organizations such as the Black Panthers, the Nation of Islam and so on.

They do look up to such figures as Rap Brown, Stokeley Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Malcolm X, and so on. Certainly these organizations differ among themselves in their methods and to the extent which I am able to discern them, in their purposes. But they all do have one thing in common: They try, and I believe they largely succeed, to produce a prideful racial identity. They try, and in my opinion they largely succeed, to make their followers accept "Black is Beautiful," and they attract support because they are creating a black identity and they are creating pride in it.

I submit that this is a healthy development, regardless of the political dissent and the political radicalizations by means of which these groups achieve what I regard as this psychologically healthy result.

By gratifying this need for a prideful, psychological identity, these organizations have succeeded to an astonishing extent in rehabilitating members who previously suffered from symptoms of personality disorganization such as drug addiction, criminal behavior, and general irresponsibility.

I do not say the Panthers do not allow their members to take drugs. I am saying they make the drugs unnecessary because they offer their members a self-image of adequacy that makes resort to drugs unnecessary. The basic ingredient is the identification with an image of historical racial and cultural adequacy, if not superiority.

I wish to stress that this is what the black minority needs above all. It is in this respect that its problem has differed from that of other minorities, the Irish, Italians, the Jews. This is what a wise and just process of education should help provide.

Integration, desirable as it may be as an end, is possible only if the elements to be integrated each feel a sense of identity and a pride in the identity rather than a feeling of being dominated and submerged.

I believe that black students are fully aware of this. If you look at recent happenings in colleges, you will find my contention borne out.

Last year I served as a visiting professor at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., which had recently tried to accept and recruit a number of black students. When I was there there were about 60 black girls who had been admitted to Vassar. The major and immediate result was that they immediately asked for a wholly black dormitory. Now, they had come to Vassar in an attempt to integrate the previously practically all-white college and yet the first thing they wanted was a separate, if you wish, segregated black dormitory.

Their demands went further. They wanted all black courses, black instructors, a black curriculum and so on. In short, one would think rather paradoxically that they wanted to make this previously white middle-class college into a southern black segregated school. From a logical viewpoint it would seem absurd.

Often psychological needs are fulfilled in a way that from a logical viewpoint may seem absurd but this should not lead us to ignore what need is being responded to. It seems to me that the need being responded to in this case was the feeling, the wish, the need that these black girls had for identification as blacks and pride in their own adequacy as blacks.

Throughout the college scene you find this. Colleges have gone out of their way in many cases to try to find black students. The black students, as soon as they have joined, have gone out of their way to separate themselves from the white students.

When the colleges went to the point of recruiting black students whose preparation was not quite adequate for the college curriculum and these black students met with better prepared white students (in many cases the black students came, of course, from underprivileged backgrounds) they found they could not perform as well as the white student. Thus, they became hostile to the school which humiliated them, and to the whites who outperformed them. They also became discouraged.

They are likely to look outside the school for something to offset the humiliation which they feel is inflicted upon them by the school and by the better prepared white students. I believe this result will be repeated in lower schools—high schools and grammar schools—if we insist on compulsory congregation. It is for this reason that I think this committee should emphasize further research before we do something that is intended to help the black minority, but which may, on the contrary, reduce their educational achievement and their psychological well-being.

I wish to conclude by referring to an article in the *Harvard Educational Review* of February 1970, written by Stephen F. and Joan C. Baratz, entitled "Early Childhood Intervention—The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism."

The authors in this article deal with a variety of attempts which have been made to explain the lower performance of black students. I classify these attempts by dividing them into the genetic attempt such as has been explored by Professor Jensen, and a variety of attempts under social pathology (which would explain the lower performance of black students in terms of a subcultural background, nutrition, family environment and so on).

The article rejects all these attempts because they say the deficit, the lower performance of black students, need not be explained by any

factors in their background; that that deficit arises simply because the schools do not utilize the resources that these black students actually have, and they do not utilize them because they insist on teaching these black students with methods which might be resorting to resources present in white students, but lacking in black students.

The authors maintain that the black students come from a subculture which uses a language and mental conceptualization different from that of the dominant white culture and that the black students are quite good, quite capable of performing as well as the white students if only the resources of their black subculture were utilized instead of being neglected; by asking them to conform to the resources—present in white but absent in black students—of the white culture, the low performance is produced.

What this article maintains is in effect that the lower performance of Negro children, which is generally agreed to in the present school system, is by no means due to any genetic inferiorities or differences, nor to any social preconditioning, family disorganization, nutritional differences, poverty in general, but it is simply due to the fact that they are, as it were, taught in a foreign language. They are asked to perform in a white culture to which they can perhaps adapt but when they are going to school they are hardly aware of this culture, in which they become, as it were, "dumb," not because they are dumb, but because they don't know its language.

It follows from the research of these two authors, which I think is supported by a great deal of evidence, that black students could perform as well as white students with the use of resources, proper to them. But since the resources are different from those available to white students, it follows also that their resources can be utilized only if they are, and to the extent which they are, educated separately.

I do not appear here to advocate segregation, either compulsory or otherwise, but I do appear here to advocate two things. We have spent enormous amounts of money to bring about compulsory desegregation. No one, I think, can seriously maintain that the results known so far have been either educationally or in any other fashion beneficial. Certainly I think the race relations today are worse than they were in 1954. It seems to me under these circumstances, and this is the conclusion that I wish to submit, that this committee would do well to advocate that a reasonable amount of money be spent to evaluate the results of the compulsory integration so far undertaken, and also that a reasonable amount of money be spent to explore other approaches to improve the educational achievements of blacks and whites. To do so, I think, is in the interests of all children, black or white.

I think we should find and utilize every available scientific facility to isolate and define the factors that will make for an improvement in education. To do so, I think, let me say once more, is in the interests of all concerned, of all children, black and white, and it is contrary only to the vested interests of educational dogmatists which I hope you will disregard.

Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, very much, Dr. van den Haag.

I think that Congressman Ashbrook, in inviting both you gentlemen before the committee this morning, certainly has given us a dimension



of the problem that we have not had before the committee before and I can appreciate your suggestion that we ought to make sure that section 10 does provide perhaps even more effective language to do this research. I am not too sure that perhaps if there are others who share your view on the lack of measurable data that what may be the wise thing to do here is to take the \$150 million that the Senate has voted, and use that as the experimental program in this whole field, and then put some extensive evaluation money in there, to see what impact and what effect it has, before we go ahead with a billion and a half dollars as proposed in legislation before us. I am not too sure the administration might not be "biting its nose to spite its face," when they rush through the \$150 million, the way they did it in the Senate, without waiting for the authorization that we have before us here.

There is one question that I think needs to be clarified. On page 3 of your testimony you say:

If such integration is compelled, as this bill proposes to do, it will injure rather than assist the future educational accomplishment of the nation's schools.

This bill has nothing in it that compels integration. This bill recognizes that the courts of this land have already resolved that problem and that question, as both you gentlemen have referred to in your testimony.

What this bill attempts to do is to provide the resources, the financial resources, to schools that are now under a court order or under a voluntary plan approved by HEW to provide some of the things that both of you have discussed in your testimony, which could bridge the obvious gap that does exist, when you have the sort of sudden integration that we have experienced in some of these court-ordered schools, and so I wanted to make clear that this legislation does not provide anything that would compel anyone to integrate. What it merely does is provide the funds, once a school has been ordered by the court to deal with the problems that both of you have described.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. I am sorry, I misread the bill in this respect, but if I may, I would still suggest that the amount that is allocated to provide the resources for integration seems to me highly disproportionate to the amount that is allocated to provide resources for research on how best to undertake this task. If I may suggest that, for instance, Prof. Milton Friedman has for many years made a proposal that I have long supported. He suggests that instead of giving money to public schools, we give students vouchers, equivalent to the money that is required to school them, and permit them or their parents to select freely the schools to be attended. This is one of many proposals which I think may ultimately lead to voluntary integration in all likelihood, because of self-selection, in the best possible way, educationally and otherwise.

I hope your committee will find it possible to allocate more money to this sort of experimental approach, rather than to simply inject massive amounts of money to carry out in the most direct way the orders of the court. As I understand them, the orders of the court can be carried out in a variety of ways, and they are aimed ultimately at educational improvement, and hence I think the carrying out should so aim.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Professor, again as I say, I am not qualified to question some of your findings here. I am reminded, though, that on the other side of the spectrum we have massive research as has been done by Dr. Coleman and various others, who argue precisely the contrary viewpoint that you take in terms of what removing youngsters from racial isolation does to their ability to absorb the educational process. As I say, this is a quarrel between your social scientists that I am not too sure I am qualified to get into.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. May I point out that Dr. Coleman does not, as far as I understand him, disagree with my view. I certainly don't disagree with his, and I think that Professor Jensen also will agree that the Coleman research, for which I have very high respect, basically states that the educational effects are largely produced by the student's background, whatever it may be, and very little affected by the actual process of schooling, a very peculiar result, but nonetheless that seems to be the result.

He says that there is a slight, in certain cases of selective—not massive—selective desegregation he has found that if a talented Negro student attends a previously white school, rather than a black school attended by largely untalented fellow students, that this talented Negro student benefits. I certainly would agree with that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As I say, I would not try to get into a debate here on that respect of the argument, but we are confronted with a problem, and the President has recognized that problem and the Congress is trying to recognize the problem, that you do have a substantial number of school districts in this country that are now under a court order, and regardless of the merits or demerits of your own findings in this matter, the fact of the matter is that these school districts can no longer argue this point. The "boat has gone" on that one. The court has issued an order, and now these schools are confronted with some very serious problems, and how best to achieve the court order.

Now the bill provides:

(a) The provision of additional professional or other staff members (including staff members specially trained in problems incident to desegregation or the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation) and the training and retraining of staff for such schools;

That is one of the things that the money from this bill could be used for by local school districts.

(b) Remedial and other services to meet the special needs of children in schools which are affected by a plan described in clause (1) or (2) of section 5(a) or are racially isolated, including special services for gifted and talented children in such schools;

(c) Comprehensive guidance, counseling, and other personal services for pupils;

(d) Development and employment of new instructional techniques and materials designed to meet the needs of racially isolated schoolchildren;

(e) Innovative interracial educational programs or projects involving the joint participation of minority group and nonminority group children attending different schools, including extracurricular activities and cooperative exchange or other arrangements between schools within the same or different school districts;

(f) Repair or minor remodeling or alteration of existing school facilities (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) and the lease or purchase of mobile classroom units or other mobile educational facilities.



And so I would like to ask both you gentlemen, as social scientists and gentlemen who have made obviously a substantial study in this whole field, whether or not the programs that would be financed by this bill would indeed meet some of the shortcomings that both of you have described in your testimony, and overcome the problems that you have described in your testimony.

Dr. Jensen, suppose we start with you.

Dr. JENSEN. Yes, I applaud all the provisions that you have just enumerated there in the bill. I think, however, if there is any social area in which it may be possible to observe the letter of the law rather than the spirit of the law, this may be it. Again that is why I think close monitoring and evaluation of the integration programs that are actually enacted under these funds is absolutely essential for the benefit of all children. I think one of the greatest areas of concern that I would have in these programs has to do with children who have special educational needs. I have seen this particular aspect of the problem abused in schools that I am familiar with. For example, because children are minority children, they are not singled out for any special attention.

There is apt to be a philosophy of treating them like the average white child, regardless of their individual needs, and allocating resources strictly on the basis of racial membership rather than on the basis of individual needs of students. Minority students can actually be cheated out of some of the special services that are given to children of the majority group with similar educational problems, problems in reading, various problems in school adjustment, learning handicaps and so forth. Special services can be denied to the children who need them most, because of their minority group membership, and the sensitivity of white school administrators to singling out these children, if they should turn out to be a higher proportion, in special classes, for example, than the white children, and the aim to maintain proportional balance of special facilities, I think, can cheat the minority children severely. I have seen this happen in schools where white children were getting nearly all of the special educational attention in schools, where black children with the same problems were being neglected and were languishing in classrooms and not learning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I can just tell you one thing, that we are now learning from this bill, and the testimony on this bill, what a real myth this separate-but-equal doctrine was in many southern communities. That comes from testimony of the witnesses themselves.

We had a witness here the other day from Louisiana who said it wasn't until the white youngsters had to attend previously all-black schools that they discovered—these were his words—that “separate but equal” didn't mean “equal” at all. They lacked gymnasiums, washroom facilities, and various other facilities in those buildings, and only now is the degree of difference coming to light, when the witness testified in support of this bill, to now correct at this late date those shortcomings, so I think there is a great deal to what you say in terms of the different facilities that are available.

Dr. JENSEN. I would agree with that. I think the situation probably exists more in the South than it does in the parts of California that I am most familiar with, where I think the facilities have been largely equalized even in de facto segregated school systems.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. van den Haag, would you care to comment on the provisions of this bill, and whether you believe that some of these programs that we authorize in this bill could address themselves to some of the problems that you have raised in your testimony?

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me start with your last remark, and just underline that the Coleman report, for which we both have high regard, has pointed out that if there is a difference in facilities, whatever its moral standing, and I certainly do not feel it is morally justified, but what the Coleman report reported out was that the difference in facilities cannot be shown to have made any difference in educational achievement. This is a major burden of the Coleman report, and it is a most surprising result; namely, that the difference in educational achievement seems to be correlated entirely to the background with which the student enters the school, and seems to be almost wholly independent of differences in schooling facilities.

I have myself not come to any conclusion as to how this result is to be explained, but that this is the statistical result to which Mr. Coleman has come, I think, is undeniable.

Now, as for the purpose of the bill that you were good enough to list, it seems to me that no one who believes as I do in democracy and the American system could not agree with these purposes, so the only possible disagreement would be on the means by which these purposes are to be attained. Here I, for instance, very much agree with the need for the allocation of funds for compensatory education for those who for one reason or other are below the standards of the school, or need compensation.

My only point is that we have not found a way of giving such compensatory allocation, which has been shown to be effective, so it seems to me almost premature to allocate moneys to something without evaluation. There is a perceived deficit in achievement. But so far nothing useful to overcome this deficit has been found other than good will.

Obviously, in my own view, there must be methods by means of which compensatory education can be successful, but it seems that we have to do much more research than so far has been done to make it possible to develop these methods. So far we have been successful in spending a lot of money on it, on such programs as Headstart, and a number of others, none of which, according to all evaluations of which I am aware, have achieved the desired result.

If what, as I quoted before, Baratz and Baratz say is true, then compensatory education would lead at least to a temporary re-isolation of the subject of that education, and that may, in the present climate, be politically difficult. I hope it is not, but nonetheless it may be one of the effects.

One other point. The bill provides for assistance and special training of teachers and personnel in providing integration. I am very much in favor of it, but I am wondering what kind of special training would be involved. I have concerned myself now for 10 years with such questions, and I must admit I do not know what kind of special training to give anyone to help him overcome problems of integration. I simply do not know of what it would consist. It is easy to institute a course, it is easy to get students, it is easy to get teachers, but it is not so easy to know what to teach.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I just want to make one final comment. You will be happy to know that section (d) of this bill provides for "development and employment of new instructional techniques and materials designed to meet the needs of racially isolated schoolchildren," and so many of the things that you have discussed here, in saying that we don't have all the answers, conceivably could be, at least we can make a start in finding those answers within the context of section (d).

Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. John, why don't you go first.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. van den Haag, I was interested in the remark you made about tying black to bad and white to good. You indicated in the course of your testimony that this is part of what happens, and in studies we find this to be part of the culture. Does that apply just among white students, or does that apply among black students as well?

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Curiously enough no actual research exists. It would be very interesting to know, for instance, whether, in cultures where blacks are practically unknown, such as Scandinavian cultures, or others in which whites are practically unknown, such as some cultures in Africa, this same kind of color discrimination obtains. To my knowledge no systematic study has been made on this. I have a few impressions. My own impressions are that regardless of any historical racial precedent, children prefer light colors in all cultures with which I am familiar, and do not like dark colors.

I think there is an exception in some Asiatic cultures, at least so I have been told, in Chinese and other cultures, but as far as I know in Africa and in Europe, the preference for light colors by children seems to be universal.

Now, as Professor Clark has found, that seems to be also true for black students generally in the United States. He has interpreted it in a way from which I have to dissent, but the color preference, to whatever one attributes it, I have no reason to dispute his results in this respect.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Moving on to your testimony about Vassar, what would you suggest doing in the Vassar type situation? Would you suggest simplistically not asking for this integration? Would you suggest rapid integration, to refuse to permit segregation within integration, or would you go ahead, and within the integrated situation segregate?

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. If you will permit me, Congressman, I will first give the answer that I gave to the Vassar administration, who asked me the same question. I suggested that they make a big sign saying, "This is a white middle class college. Everyone welcome who wants a white middle class education," because that seems to be basically, if you go to Vassar, what you have to expect. You should not expect to make it into a black college. You should expect to participate in a white middle class education, which an institution such as Vassar will give.

The administration did not take my response very seriously and I am not sure I meant it seriously, because I knew under the present situation it cannot be done. If I had been in the administration at the present time, it seems to me that the reasonable thing is to yield on the whole to the demands of the black students. If they wish to have

a black dormitory, I may reason with them, and point out that perhaps it is not such a good idea, but if they wish I certainly would not want to compel them to live in a white dormitory when they would prefer to live among themselves.

I would rather expect that if they be given their own facilities, in time the need to assert their racial pride and identity will diminish, because it has been fulfilled to some extent, and they will find it more easy to mingle with their white fellow students, and in time, so to speak, the black dormitory may fall into disuse, in time, but I would myself at first yield, because I think, though I myself think there is no rational reason for it, it is nonetheless an imperative psychological need and we might as well yield to it. My experience as a psychoanalyst has shown me that rational argument does not avail against psychological needs.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I now move on to the bill itself, H.R. 17846. I will now talk to you both, because I think it is imperative that as we look at this bill, we understand what the chairman made as his basic point. The thrust of this bill is not to deal with the question of whether there should or should not be integration. It has nothing to do with whether we ought to roll back the clock or what we ought to do. Instead it is a case of recognizing that right now, at the end of June 1970 we have a series of court orders ordering that things be done in certain school districts in the country, and a series of plans which have been negotiated out between the school district personnel and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which call for moving in the direction of integration.

Now against that background, my question is this: Is it better to let them struggle along, and somehow with all of the difficulties that will be involved if they don't get some special help, see what happens in these newly integrated schools, or whether we should give the type of help that this bill calls for making available to these districts?

Dr. Jensen, would you comment on that, because the premise of your testimony, as I read it, is a different premise from that which we have just now laid out.

Dr. JENSEN. I think the school districts that are going to integrate are going to need all the help they can get in doing this, there's no doubt about it. But I think this means more than just financial help. I think it is going to require technical help as well.

I think that a good deal can probably be learned by careful studies made where integration has already been enacted, such as in Berkeley, Calif., which I mentioned in the first part of my testimony, and in Riverside, Calif., where some evaluation has been made. These programs started with adequate evaluation, but have not carried through on it, and it would not take a great deal of resources to find out what has gone on in these schools, to assess their degrees of success and failure. I imagine a mixture of both success and failure have taken place wherever integration has been tried in this way, so that those measures which have proven successful, through the experience of these schools, could be made available and known to other schools that are now just beginning to integrate.

I think that right at the beginning of integration programs we should have assessments of the status of the school district, the students' level of achievement, and so forth, so that we can see the effects later on.



Mr. DELLENBACK. Have there been any studies made of those districts to evaluate?

Dr. JENSEN. Riverside has made a study. It is fairly adequate. It is probably one of the better ones that has been done in the country. They have been integrated now for 4 years.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Was the background prior to those 4 years a background that really had separate but equal facilities, or was it token separate but equal as we found unfortunately to be the case in many places in the South.

Dr. JENSEN. I think it was probably much less the case than you find in the South. I think the facilities were probably more nearly separate, but equal. It was a case of de facto segregation.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We would then be working against a situation 4 years in being which was built upon something closer to real equality than we are going to find in many schools to which this bill is attempting to speak.

Dr. JENSEN. That is true and that is the case in Berkeley. One thing about Berkeley, we have good baseline data, meaning predesegregation data, which they did not obtain in Riverside, and so comparisons in Berkeley would be excellent. One other advantage of Berkeley is that the difference between the white and black populations in Berkeley is quite large. It is larger than you will find in most school districts.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Differences of what nature?

Dr. JENSEN. Differences in average ability levels, measured by IQ tests and so forth. There is some 20 to 25 IQ points difference between the white and the black populations in Berkeley, and yet they have been completely integrated. The black population in the schools is 40 percent of the total school population. We have complete integration at the classroom level in Berkeley.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Is that data available in summarized form, so that any schools that are interested in obtaining it can do so?

Dr. JENSEN. The baseline data are available, but the followup data are not, as far as I know, because the evaluation was not continued beyond the baseline. It was called off. A plan for 5 years of evaluation was made, but it was called off at the end of the first year of school integration.

Now, the school claims to be doing some evaluation on its own. The University of California had been responsible for conducting this evaluation program, as an outside agency, going into the schools to conduct evaluation each spring over a period of several years.

Since I was the director of this evaluation program, and since I became a notorious figure in Berkeley, and in the Nation by now, as a result of my *Harvard Educational Review* article, pressure was brought upon the Berkeley school administration to discontinue the study, and the university was asked to withdraw from it.

The school has not had the resources itself to continue the study, unfortunately. I think such a study would be very revealing, and I think a lot could be learned there. If complete integration can work in Berkeley, it can probably work in many other communities, although I will say the Berkeley population itself, the adult population, has been very receptive to integration, which would not be the case in many other localities.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then you would feel, moving against that background into the situation to which I have alluded, where we have



literally hundreds of school districts, largely in the South which must over the course of these next few months, get ready for a situation which will obtain in September, that this type of assistance, imperfect as it may be, preferring something else as perhaps you do——

Dr. JENSEN. It would be better than nothing, yes, certainly.

Mr. DELLENBACK. It would be better than nothing?

Dr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would there be any other specifics under section 6, of authorized activities, that you would feel would be desirable? The chairman read those. He talked in terms of financial assistance shall be available "to carry out the purposes of this act including" and then he read down the list of the inclusions.

Dr. JENSEN. Right. I think that is a very good list, and I can't think of anything I would add to it. My additions would be in section 10. Although I would say if various school systems attempt the evaluation will have to be a spot evaluation. You can't do an adequate research job on every school system. This is obvious. There isn't the personnel or the time for it, but there should be spot checks in various places that are trying different sorts of programs to see which ones work and which don't.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You are aware that the thrust of this bill is not to dictate from Washington that which shall be done.

Dr. JENSEN. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. But it is an attempt to go down into the district.

Dr. JENSEN. Right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And let there be a diversity of things done, with emphasis placed in different places in different districts, because of the fact that the situation will be different in each district.

Dr. JENSEN. Right. The law says it must be done. It should be done, then, as effectively as possible and to the greatest benefit of all children.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So it would be your feeling that this type of assistance against this present situation would be desirable, better than letting it just go by itself, and that it should be——

Dr. JENSEN. I think it would. Yes, indeed. But I think the evaluation part is absolutely essential. Otherwise, I think you are wasting money, because you are not finding out what is going on and what will work, so that others can benefit.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I agree with you very much on this and we will touch on evaluation in a minute, but I want to be sure that as far as the bill itself is concerned, your testimony is, I gather, in strong support of this concept of giving some help to these districts that must move forward. Am I correct in this?

Dr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And there would be nothing else that offhand you would think of as additional authorized activities that these funds should be utilized for, and I am not meaning to push you on that at the moment. If after looking it over you come up with certain suggestions——

Dr. JENSEN. No, as I looked it over I thought it was a very comprehensive set of objectives.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Now on this matter of evaluation, I think this is one of the great weaknesses not only of the integration-segregation, but we find in program after program in education and in other

programs we do not have adequate evaluation. We create a program, we launch the program, and then we don't go in afterwards to see what the hand of man has wrought really in final results, so I find myself in strong agreement with what you say on this.

Section 10 is an attempt to have it done, this evaluation, not just by the local district doing it itself.

Dr. JENSEN. Right. I emphasize that in my preliminary statement, because I don't think you can simply set aside a little money for the local district to submit a report on how it all turned out. This, I think, is totally inadequate. That is why reviews of the research, such as I pointed out in this journal, entitled "Desegregation and Minority Group Performance, Effects of Desegregation" are so inconclusive. Most of the research has been left up to the local districts, and they have done only small scale studies. I would prefer seeing two or three excellent large-scale studies on a par with the Coleman study, let's say, to having 100 small studies conducted by local school districts.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Provisions of section 10, the Secretary would move forward to do the evaluating.

Dr. van den Haag, would you essentially say the same things that Dr. Jensen has said on this last line of questioning?

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Essentially, with one addition. I would very much urge that the bill make it mandatory that evaluation be undertaken by outside agencies, for the very simple reason that I agree with Dr. Jensen that the school boards usually do not have the facilities, and, of course, they may also be in the nature of the matter somewhat biased, in favor of their own effort, so I think it is extremely essential to make it mandatory that outside agencies, such as universities, make the evaluation required.

I agree with every other statement that Professor Jensen made, and basically with the statements in the bill itself. I would just place more emphasis, as you yourself have, Congressman, on evaluation, and on its being undertaken from the outside.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to briefly pursue the statement you made at the end of your testimony, that race relations are worse now than they were in 1954. In that regard, I would tend, myself, to agree with Dr. Clark, where you quote him as saying that:

"The apparent emotional stability of the Southern Negro child may be indicative only of the fact that through rigid racial segregation and isolation he has accepted as normal the fact of his inferior social status."

Prior to 1954, even in the North, it seems to me, many blacks accepted their inferior social status and weren't doing much about it. Haven't race relations worsened now, primarily from the fact that the black is asserting himself? He wants some equality with the white, and any time any group starts doing that, they cause some difficult relations. That must have occurred in Boston, when the Irish asserted themselves, and with many other groups as well.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. I would not share your interpretation, sir. Let me point out that Professor Clark's idea that it was due to acceptance and so on is no more than an idea. There is no evidence whatsoever about it. Yet when I speak of a worsening of race relations, I have in

mind very concrete material facts, from rioting to violence of various kinds.

Now, of course, it may be said, and I would certainly not wish to disagree with you on that, that these may be phenomena that occur in the nature of a rapid change taking place, and that the outcome may nonetheless be beneficial. I would think that this is a matter of interpretation. I don't think though that I would fully agree that these phenomena, the violence, the rioting and so on, are unavoidable effects of improvement. I would rather think that they are the effects of excessive promises, which lead to expectations that could not, under any circumstances, be fulfilled. I apply that to the bill that you are now considering. It seems to me that to some extent it suggests that mere integration will itself lead to an improvement in education. That is a promise that it may not be able to fulfill. And this unfulfilled promise, I think, is likely to lead to expectations, which in turn may, in my opinion, make race relations not better, but worse.

Not that I am not in favor as much as I hope we all are, of giving equal opportunities to all races, as the court has mandated. But this differs from sort of implying the promise that by integration achievements will occur which I do not think integration can promise. That is, I think, the mistake we have made in the past, and that I fear, unless we place more emphasis on evaluation of our efforts and on interpretation we may continue to make.

Mr. QUIE. What do you think of the concept, if that is your philosophy, of putting greater emphasis and even Federal expenditures in teaching young people about themselves in their own racial and cultural group? The chairman of this committee had a bill which would have encouraged the teaching of the various subcultures, and we on the committee decided we wouldn't go ahead with it, that there are other priorities that are greater. Just from what you have said in your testimony, it sounds like you might be favorable to that concept.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Yes, except that I would not think that we can really teach this. You cannot teach "racial pride" in education. It is an emotional matter. But I think you can give opportunities for it, and I think these opportunities would largely refer to the development of, at least temporarily, separate institutions involving schooling, social activities and so on, which would give an opportunity for the construction and display of this sort of pride. I would be very much in favor of teaching it, if I knew how, but I don't know how you can teach a group to identify with itself. I don't know of any method of doing that, but I certainly would again be in favor of trying to do research, and see what perhaps can be done, but to my knowledge nothing is known at this point.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you yield at this point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The committee has reached no final decision on that bill. The committee discussed it, but did not reach agreement and I would not want the record to show that somehow that bill has been dropped, because I think it is very much alive.

Mr. QUIE. It needs a transfusion or something perhaps.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Wait until you see what kind of a transfusion this bill needs.

Mr. QUIE. That is all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Gentlemen, one question that occurs to me, and I don't know whether I am right or wrong, but if there is any validity at all in your testimony, and it is very strong testimony, questioning very severely the potential success of integrated education, as I see your testimony here, it is quite conceivable that if we carry out your suggestions in section 10, and set up a very effective machinery for evaluating the results of this effort by the administration to pour a huge sum of money into these schools that are undergoing integration; if indeed the evaluation should ultimately sustain your conclusions, it is conceivable that this bill could shoot down *Brown*, and actually establish for the first time the kind of race relations which you gentlemen say is nonexistent.

In other words, I was under the impression that Dr. Coleman and various others had made extensive studies, but you gentlemen challenge the conclusiveness of those studies, and so do you think it is possible that if indeed we do make available all of these programs that are incorporated in this bill, and we make available the funds incorporated in this bill, or even \$150 million that has already worked its way through the Senate, and the evaluation sustains your findings, is it possible that the courts may want to take a whole new look at this concept of forced integration in education?

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Are you addressing this question to me, sir?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think you have raised this point and I think we ought to have an answer.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. I am sorry to say that I am no better than you would be or than anyone is, I think, in predicting the future decisions of the courts. It is one thing to say what the courts ought to do, to take possibly a new look on what they call modern authority, and on the empirical basis of their decision. Another thing is to predict what they will do.

May I, without claiming special competence, point out that the Supreme Court, if I read its history correctly, has very often reinterpreted its past decisions in such a way as to put them in conformity with new knowledge, as the court then saw it. The *Brown* decision itself is clearly evidence of this.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The *Brown* decision itself, 100 years ago the courts acknowledged separate but equal doctrine.

Dr. VAN DEN HAAG. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In 1954 they shot it down, in terms of the needs of 1954, but the thing that I am wondering, gentlemen, and I am not suggesting, so that the record be absolutely clear, that the courts review this, but what I am suggesting is that if what you say is correct, that there is no body of evidence at this point, and both of you are highly respected social scientists who obviously have made a very thorough study of this case, we will for the first time have a body of evidence from this legislation, because this legislation provides the funds and the machinery and the programs to do all the things that educators have said are needed to be done to make integration a successful operation, both for the white student and the nonwhite student, but if this evaluation, which you are now urging, should sustain your findings, which I gather from your testimony here that you have some serious reservations as to whether or not integrated education can succeed, if the subsequent evaluation should sustain your findings, then it

seems to me that the courts would have no recourse but to take another look at the *Brown* and some of the other decisions.

That is what I am asking you now. Is it possible that this legislation conceivably could shoot down *Brown* at some future date?

DR. VAN DEN HAAG. My own feeling is particularly if outside evaluation is made mandatory, it may throw new light if not on integration altogether but on compulsory integration, and it may indeed lead the court to approve freedom of choice to a greater degree, that is to still outlaw de jure segregation, but to permit to a greater degree freedom of choice than it has so far.

It may also lead to methods of integration far more beneficial than those we have so far tried. I certainly support all the dispositions of this bill that mandate research. I am in favor, let me emphasize this once more, of making this research independent of, and to have it undertaken by agencies not directly involved in the actual carrying out of the things on which we want to do research for quite obvious reasons, but if that is done, I think this bill could be very productive for all concerned.

MR. PUCINSKI. In the light of what you say, and I agree with you that perhaps this bill can provide the kind of information that both you gentlemen say up to now has been totally lacking, then perhaps what we ought to do is support the \$150 million that has worked its way through the Senate, and then just set this legislation aside and see what are the results that we get from that, and see what progress has been made, what the communities will do with that money, and perhaps that is the best way to proceed on this. We would have some immediate information on this right away.

MR. QUIE. If you will yield, \$150 million is going to be used primarily to prepare teachers for this fall, and you won't be able to get very much from that \$150 million.

MR. PUCINSKI. Oh, no, no. Let the record be very clear on that. HEW has put out proposed guidelines which go much further than that.

MR. QUIE. The guidelines use this \$150 million primarily in preparation for this fall. That is one of the reasons they are going ahead with this legislation.

MR. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will permit this observation, that is why I think this whole approach on this \$150 million is just as wrong as wrong can be. First of all, they are taking it out of poverty money.

MR. QUIE. They are not taking it out of poverty money. You know better than that.

MR. PUCINSKI. Sure they are. They are taking it out of a poverty authorization.

MR. QUIE. It is not poverty money. They have the authorization in a number of these programs and they are going to ask for additional appropriations. They are not taking it away from anyone.

MR. PUCINSKI. You know it is interesting that here is \$150 million working its way through the Congress and really I don't think anybody knows how that money is going to be spent. We have here what we are led to believe are the proposed guidelines for the distribution of that \$150 million. This is the note: "These draft criteria are being considered for purposes of administering the special \$150 million appropriation requested subject to change. They have not been reviewed



by all who might be able to contribute ideas and useful suggestions" and so on.

Here is \$150 million working its way through the Congress, and nobody really knows how this money is going to be used, by whom, for whom, to achieve what. Now our very distinguished colleague, whom I respect very highly, and is certainly a great influence on education in educational policies says that the \$150 million is going to be used primarily for training teachers, but the people who are here from Louisiana and Dade County and every place else tell us about the huge physical needs that they have. They come here testifying for this legislation because they have to make huge physical improvements to take care of the new integration situation.

It seems to me that as the Mad Hatter said in Alice in Wonderland, the situation is getting curiouser and curiouser as this legislation moves its way through the Congress.

Mr. QUIN. One thing I can say we know more about what they are going to do with this \$150 million than we had any conception what they were going to do with ESEA or the EOA.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Gentlemen, I want to thank you for giving us a new perspective here. I think that you have raised a lot of questions, and as I said, I think that this legislation, the merits that I see in it is that it will indeed provide the kind of resources for the information that you need, then I think that there is a great deal of merit in this legislation for yet another reason.

Any other questions?

Mr. Ashbrook has also requested that the statements of five other individuals be inserted in the record. Those statements will appear at the close of today's testimony.

The Committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.  
(The statements referred to follow:)

#### STATEMENT OF ARCHIE SABIN

My name is Archie Sabin. As a statistician, I have for the past several years compiled and compared the reported results of compensatory educational programs for minority children financed by state and federal funds. The following statement is a résumé of the published results of such programs as announced by the program personnel. Since I am not a professional educator, the conclusions stated herein are only as given in the cited reports.

I make this statement because it would appear that the subject legislation contemplates the expenditure of additional funds in this field upon the assumption that such programs will succeed in eliminating in whole or substantial part the differences which now exist in educability between majority and minority children. All experience in the record to date is to the contrary.

The academic achievement of black children is substantially lower than for other racial and ethnic groups. Ten to fifteen per cent of black students achieve at or above present school norms. Public policy and action programs have for some years been based on the assumption that there are no irremovable racial or ethnic differences in learning patterns and abilities<sup>1</sup> and, hence, the recorded educational achievement gap must be attributed to other factors. One theory has been that there has been a lack of equal educational opportunity for white and black children.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For example, the Department of Labor in 1965 issued *The Negro Family, The Case for National Action* containing the statement: "There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group."

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting statistically that the ethnic educational variation is uniform within test limitations over the whole United States. This theory, therefore, necessarily assumes that any measurable lack of educational opportunity is also uniform in all sections of the country, despite administration and other statements as to special conditions said to exist in the Southeast.

In 1966, the United States Office of Education<sup>3</sup> stated:

"It is a demonstrable fact that the talent pool in any one ethnic group is substantially the same as that in any other ethnic group."

Starting with that announced principle, the Office of Education concluded that if unequal opportunity contributes materially to the racial achievement gap, then equalization of opportunity should eliminate or greatly reduce the gap. Extending this principle, if black children are given greater opportunities than white children by means of "compensatory" programs they should more quickly reach the projected achievement level.

Such programs have, therefore, been devised and carried out in many areas, supported in major part by Federal expenditures under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other legislation. A number of these projects were reviewed by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1967.<sup>4</sup> The report concluded that compensatory education programs "on the present scale are unlikely to improve significantly the achievement of Negro students isolated by race and social class." The Commission's review did not include the New York Community Zoning, Open Enrollment, and More Effective Schools Programs, and did not mention the Burket Report of Project Talent.

The fourth annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children in 1969 reported the review of 1,000 Title I programs of which it was concluded that 21 (or 2 per cent) were successful in terms of having produced cognitive gains. The report estimated that about 20,000 Title I programs were then in operation. (The Council has not issued a 1970 report).

Of the 21 programs reported as successful by the Advisory Council, there was one for Appalachian whites, two for Mexican-Americans and the remainder were selected Negro volunteers and those academically advanced among the "disadvantaged" school population. Twenty of the Council's successful programs were published by HEW in a series called "It Works." They included the New York More Effective Schools and the Hartford Project Concern program.

An evaluation of the More Effective Schools project concluded "Children tested in the fourth and fifth grade after three years of MES, were further behind the standards of normal progress than when they began the program, and children tested in the sixth grade were no better off . . . . We see in these data no reason to expect better achievement in reading or arithmetic from the MES program as now constituted, nor any reason to believe that the program will result in significant alteration in the pattern of increasing retardation as a child progresses through the grades."<sup>5</sup>

Project Concern in Hartford reported that "the placement of two or three children in a suburban classroom had no measurable negative effect on the academic achievement of the suburban child." No advantage to any minority child was reported.<sup>6</sup>

Headstart and Title I are both enrichment programs and are similar in many respects—there are also important differences. Both attempt to raise academic achievement levels by increased exposure and innovation in normal school activities and both attempt to mitigate certain extracurricular hindrances to learning by providing lunches, dental and optical care, and the like. Headstart is limited to pre-schoolers, however.

Headstart programs operate almost entirely with volunteering children, generally those who are academically the more able among the "culturally disadvantaged," or those whose parents push them harder. Some Title I programs apply to whole schools or school districts but there is a strong tendency toward favoring those programs which attract the more able volunteering children. The fourth annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children listed 21 programs judged to be successful, including the New York MES program. Of these at least 17 appear to have been selective.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Office of Education, *American Education*, "How Good Are Our Schools?", October 1966.

<sup>4</sup> On inquiry, the source of the statement was given as the works of Professor Ashley Montagu. Actually Montagu had written (*Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 1961): "during more than thirty-five years of reading on the subject I have not more than once or twice encountered a writer who claimed that the races were equal in mental abilities."

<sup>5</sup> *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967.

<sup>6</sup> Center for Urban Education, *Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program*, September 1967.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Office of Education, *It Works: Project Concern*, Hartford, Connecticut, 1969.

The Higher Horizons project in 1959 was inspired by the success of the Demonstration Guidance project.<sup>5</sup> It involved from 44 to 67 predominantly black schools and from 12,000 to 64,000 students. However, schools were selected instead of promising students and the annual increase in expenditure per pupil was only on the order of \$50-\$60. Evaluation of the program after five years showed that both the participating schools and the non-participating control schools had an average increase of two years in reading comprehension in three years time.

The next was the All Day Neighborhood School program involving 15 New York schools.<sup>6</sup> Seven additional teachers with special training in child development and home and school relationships were assigned to each school. About \$60 more per pupil was spent than the city average. After several years of operation independent evaluators could find no measurable improvement in the treated students over those who were not.

One of the more recent New York experiments is the Community Zoning Program, started in 1964.<sup>7</sup> It involved both increased integration and enrichment. The integration was achieved by pairing four largely white schools with four largely black or Puerto Rican schools and the progress came about from a large infusion of supplies, equipment, facilities, and teachers. For example, the pupil-teacher ratio declined from 25.1 in 1963 to 16.1 in 1966 and the latter figure does not include the extra remedial and special teachers who were added. Expenditures per pupil at the predominantly black schools prior to the combination ranged from \$18 to \$162 a year higher than at the schools with which they were paired.

Evidence to date on this project shows that levels for both white and black pupils increased—the white at a greater rate than the national norms while achievement levels of black students declined in relation to the same standards. After one year of the program the number of pupils "other" than black and Puerto Rican dropped by more than 27 per cent.

Across the country in Berkeley, California, a wide range of compensatory programs in four majority-black schools was started several years ago.<sup>8</sup> The techniques included: reduction of class size, employment of additional special staff, improvement of teaching materials, tutoring, community involvement, after-school study halls, preschool programs, flexible class grouping methods, new teaching techniques, and intergroup education for the teaching staff. Schools receiving the treatment achieved no better than schools that did not and neither showed any evidence of narrowing the persistent achievement gap between black and white children.

Among the most massive of a long series of studies of academic achievement as related to race were three, all produced by the U.S. Office of Education. Project Talent got under way in 1960 with a sample of nearly 800 public senior high schools.<sup>9</sup> It was designed to measure various school characteristics at the time and to provide measures of change over a considerable period of time. The study is one of the few that relates school characteristics to the proportion of blacks in the student bodies.

The report confirmed the decline in general aptitude and achievement as the percentage of blacks in a school increases. Dropouts, absenteeism, and the volume of assigned homework increased as the black pupil percentage increased. In urban areas the study found that money spent per pupil, salaries of teachers, and size of library increased as relative black enrollment grew. One rather surprising finding was that "... in schools enrolling all Negroes, the test means tend to be higher in those schools serving low-quality housing areas than in those serving medium- and high-quality housing areas."

In July 1966, the Office of Education released "EQUALITY of EDUCATIONAL Opportunity" (The Coleman Report) and in the October issue of *American Education* appeared an article entitled "How Good Are Our Schools?"<sup>10</sup> Both dealt with large volumes of data and both confirmed the racial gap in ability and achievement levels found in all previous studies.

The *American Education* article reported results of the Armed Forces Qualification Test. The overall rejection rate because of mental failure was 19 per cent for whites and 67 per cent for blacks. Black rejectees averaged one more year of school than the white failures.

<sup>5</sup> New York City Board of Education, Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program, 1966.

<sup>6</sup> Project Talent, G. R. Burket, et al., Selected Pupil and School Characteristics in Relation to Percentage of Negroes in School Enrollment, 1963.

<sup>10</sup> J. S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, 1966.

No analysis of the effects of integration should omit reference to the District of Columbia where the public school population is now more than 94 per cent black. The system is also one benefiting from extensive analysis and special financing. The most recent study was a year-long study by some 80 senior investigators, assisted by numerous graduate students and other personnel.<sup>21</sup>

I attach a table summarizing special project reports. In summary, the results to date show that even the most intensive and costly programs for "disadvantaged" children will not raise cognitive levels. In about two percent of the programs reported on thus far, some success has been claimed. On analysis such programs are found to be based on selected academically advanced children.

There is, therefore, no statistically acceptable evidence at the present time that the many millions of dollars invested in compensatory programs for black children have had any positive result. To the contrary, all substantiated reports indicate that the intellectual differences between white and black students are unchangeable and, therefore, are presumably inherent in the child rather than in the educational process.

#### EFFECTS ON BLACK STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OF INCREASING EXPENDITURES AND SERVICES

Project and location	Date	Per pupil increase in dollars	Number schools	Number students	Results and comments
Banneker, St. Louis <sup>1</sup> .....	1957	0	23	14,000	Results negligible.
Demonstration guidance, <sup>1</sup> New York.	1956	80-250	1	700	Selected students, results unexceptional.
Higher horizons, <sup>1</sup> New York.....	1959	50-60	44-67	12-64,000	No change relative to control schools.
ADNS, New York <sup>1</sup> .....	(?)	60	15	(?)	Do.
Madison area, Syracuse <sup>1</sup> .....	1962	100	3	2,000	Do.
Berkeley, Berkeley <sup>1</sup> .....	1961	(?)	4	(?)	Do.
Seattle, Seattle <sup>1</sup> .....	1965	(?)	2	242	Bused students had slightly higher achievement.
Educational improvement, <sup>1</sup> Philadelphia.	1963	35	(?)	30,000	No evidence of improvement.
Community zoning, <sup>3</sup> New York...	1964	167	8	6,349	Related to national norms white pupils increased substantially—blacks declined.
More effective schools, <sup>4</sup> New York.	1964	428	21	16,502	"No significant difference in the functioning of the children—whether it was measured by children's ability in mathematics or reading on standardized tests."

<sup>1</sup> Racial isolation in the public schools, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967. The Commission reviewed some 20 other enrichment programs, not reported because of incomplete data, time of operation too short, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.

<sup>3</sup> Evaluation of the community zoning program, New York City Board of Education, 1966.

<sup>4</sup> Evaluation of the more effective schools program, Center for Urban Education, September 1967.

<sup>5</sup> Difference between MES and control schools.

#### STATEMENT OF DR. HENRY GARRETT, PROFESSOR EMERITUS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Henry Garrett. I am professor emeritus, Columbia University, where I was Professor of Psychology for 30 years and Chairman of the Psychology Department for 16 years. I have an A.B. from the University of Richmond, an M.A. and Ph. D. from Columbia and an honorary Sc. D. from the University of Richmond. I have been a visiting professor at various universities including the University of Virginia.

I have been president of the American Psychological Association as well as the Psychometric Society and the New York Association of Psychology; also a vice president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I have authored or edited twelve textbooks on the subject of psychology and am the author or co-author of many articles and monographs in scientific journals in the field of psychology. I should be glad to furnish the Committee with a list of my professional publications if that is desired.

My specialized field in the science of psychology concerns itself with what is known as experimental and differential psychology. This is the study of the measurement and definition of the differences among groups and individuals particularly as to their mentality and learning capabilities. My work has been

<sup>21</sup> A. Harry Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System*, 1967.



directly concerned with a continuing evaluation of published reports on mental testing and understanding the differences which such reports show between sexes, between various races and other socially and educationally significant groups.

And, of course, I have been a teacher, working with students of all kinds for more than 30 years, doing research on mental measurement of learning characteristics of various people under all sorts of conditions. The results of all such testing have shown that educationally significant differences exist between all groups and these can be measured and determined with such accuracy that academic success and teaching requirements can be forecast with considerable foreknowledge of the probable results.

I submit this statement in the hearings on the Emergency Educational Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846 for the Committee's consideration. Many of the provisions of this bill which seek to ameliorate the harsh effects of court ordered integration are commendable efforts to lessen the burden of the schools.

However, to the extent that this bill assumes that the integration so ordered will be effective in promoting an improvement in quality education for minority children, it is wrong. To that extent the bill perpetuates and strengthens the false assumption of many persons who believe they are acting in a moral and humane manner in equating integration with education. The facts are unfortunately to the contrary.

Majority and minority students differ to an educationally significant degree, first, in the measurement of over-all abstract intelligence used to predict scholastic success under existing curricula; second, in racially identifiable variations in basic factors essential to the learning process such as verbal ability, reasoning, number concept and space visualization; third, in their rate of maturation and learning progress; fourth, in the age past which no further development of learning faculties will occur.

Those differences are not only far too great to be spanned by a single teacher in the same classroom, but are not capable of being substantially changed by integration, by social benefits or by other alterations of the environment. Learning characteristics are essentially inherent abilities which are characteristic of the race of the child and typify its genetic mental endowment. As the failure of Project Head Start and other such programs showed, no compensatory training, however intensive, will make any substantial or continuing change in the ability to learn that a child is endowed with at his birth. To say and teach the contrary is to raise false hopes in our nation's youth, hopes whose inevitable defeat is a major cause of the frustrations of our society. Sometimes the hard truth about human capacities is kinder in the long run than sentimental hypotheses based on a democratic dream of creating an intellectual equality among all of our diverse citizenry.

These conclusions of mine are not assumptions. They are confirmed results of the objective studies which have been made in this field. I now turn to those studies to show the extent of the differences of which I speak and their source in the individual's inheritance.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TESTING

On most aspects of education, the principal support offered to the public or to a Committee such as this, is made up of the purely subjective opinions of the various speakers arising out of their own viewpoint of their experience and their various assumptions as to the innate nature of steps which can be taken to correct the downward course of the educational process. This is nowhere more true than in the area of assertion as to the capabilities of various types of students and their adjustment to the learning process as we know it in this country, or conversely, the adjustment of the learning process to them.

Studies sponsored by the Government, as well as privately conducted studies, show that major differences now exist between the different types of student groups, including racial groups. What those differences are today, I will cover in my next point. Here I only wish to emphasize the fact that the magnitude of the differences in question is of such character that the future of American education may well rest upon the extent to which these differences are recognized and accepted.

There have come before this Committee, speakers who assert as a matter of opinion either that such differences do not truly exist, are insignificant to the future of education, or correctable by alteration of the school or home environment.



On the other hand, there are those like myself, who see these differences between children as reflections of innate distinctions in their inheritance which can no more be changed than one can grow a 6th finger on each hand by willing it to be so.

How then can a Committee such as this make a true distinction between such contrary assertions, on the resolution of which the structure of school organization for the future may well depend? There have been developed and used for the past century, various forms of tests to determine how children learn, how much they can learn, and the effect on learning of changes of school and social environment. The results of many hundreds of such studies can be found in scientific literature. Probably the most complete summary of these studies relating to Negro-white differences in mental performance can be found in the encyclopedic treatise, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* by Dr. Audrey M. Shuey, professor of psychology at Randolph-Macon Woman's College. The summary and conclusions of this volume are attached to my testimony as exhibit A.

Such testing has been routinely performed for many years by the United States and its agencies—since at least World War I—and the result compiled and published in tables which few, if any, of the more vocal proponents of altering the basic school situation in the United States have even bothered to read.

Let me explain if I can what such tests mean. No complete catalog could even be made of all of the various mental abilities which exist. Just as every individual has a finger print which is distinctive, so every person has a mental profile characteristic of his own particular abilities or talents.

What we do know, however, are that certain of these talents have in the past been most effective in predicting academic success under the normal curriculum of American schools. The ability which is emphasized above all others in this regard is the capability of the human mind to deal with abstract concepts, and by this I mean the ability of the child to solve problems dealing with words, numbers, diagrams, and pictures. Education today is, and probably must be, largely the product of reading by the student.

The ability to read efficiently, to grasp and manipulate concepts conveyed by words and pictures, is essential to scholastic accomplishment beyond certain minimal limits. This facility has been measured for many years by what are called intelligence tests. These tests yield a result for each individual known as an Intelligence Quotient or I.Q.

Some years ago, when it became unfashionable to use the term I.Q., many of the standard school examinations were altered to read in terms of "mental maturity." Under either term, the measurement was made of the child's ability to understand abstract concepts as measured against all other tested children of his age and grade. Under the standard of I.Q., the country-wide norm would be arbitrarily set at 100 and a student scoring 110 would be above the median of other children of his age. On the test for mental maturity, the scoring is done by a relative grading position. Thus, a score of 6 for a child in the 5th grade would mean that on the average, he was a year advanced over the other children in terms of his ability to grasp the classroom material.

In either case, as you can see, what the tests are intended to do is to fix only a relative measure of capability and to do this with respect to that particular learning characteristic which in the past has had the highest correlation with school success in the learning process—namely, the ability to deal with abstract concepts. I emphasize the point only because there has been far too much common opinion that such tests indicate the superiority or inferiority of the individual in some general or social sense. It is not so. What the tests do tell us is that a specific child is likely to do well or poorly in the type of course now being taught in most American schools. They will show whether he is a fast or a slow learner under those circumstances.

I have emphasized the relationship between intelligence as psychologists measure it and the historical type of school in this country. As I shall explain, a principal difficulty with the concept of forcing children of all different capabilities and talents into a single school room with a single curriculum is that you thereby deprive all of the students except those with the particular talent required for that course to go without learning the subject matter which they could otherwise absorb were an alternative method of teaching to be adopted more suited to their own learning characteristics.

I can best illustrate the foregoing by reference to four major government studies in this field. The fact that these studies were done and published under government auspices should be an assurance that they have not been stretched

in favor of recording the racial differences which they show. As the commentary of these reports indicates, every effort was made to come to a conclusion contrary to their actual results.

#### TEST RESULTS ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN BLACK AND WHITE CHILDREN

##### (1) *Project TALENT*

In 1960, a massive Government study entitled "Project TALENT" was undertaken to test 450,000 children in representative schools throughout the United States. The study was continued from year to year employing a battery of 19 different psychological tests. It is regarded as a reliable source of statistical data on the testing of children. The research was financed by the Government and was directed by Dr. John C. Flanagan, Director of the American Institute of Research.

One of the studies made in Project TALENT was the Burket Report, entitled "Selected Pupil and School Characteristics in Relation to Percentage of Negroes in School Enrollment." This Report tabulated test results on the basis of the percentage of Negroes in given schools.

The tabulations in the Burket Report for the Southeast (Region 5 in Project TALENT) range from schools which are totally white to schools which are totally Negro. There appears to be an attenuation of test scores from the all white to the all Negro.

That this attenuation prevails also in other geographical regions is pointed out in the Burket Report, under the heading "Results" where it is stated (p. 4):

"The most obvious trend is the tendency for the mean scores to decrease as the percent of Negroes in school enrollment increases. The trend affects tests of nonverbal abilities (e.g., test 4, Abstract Reasoning) to about the same extent as tests of verbal abilities (e.g., test 2, Reading Comprehension). It cuts across geographical areas, appearing with almost the same strength in the four Office of Education areas sampled: the midwest, the Great Lakes area, the Southeast, and the Southwest."

These results are tabulated in Table 1, which shows the mean scores of 12th grade classes on 19 selected Project TALENT tests for the Midwest and Great Lakes Regions, and Table 2, which shows such mean scores for the Southeast and Southwest Regions. These tables are attached hereto as Exhibits B and C.

A pattern of difference is discernible in the attenuation with respect to the 19 different subjects, due to the changing of patterns of abilities, aptitudes and achievements. There are several primary mental abilities found on tests: verbal, numerical, space and reasoning. Those abilities vary from one ethnic group to another, as well as from one age group to another.

##### (2) *Equality of educational opportunity (Coleman Report)*

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 directed a two-year nationwide survey of education in the United States. The results of this study (usually referred to as the Coleman Report) were published by the Government Printing Office in 1966.

The principal survey included 600,000 children in the first, third, sixth, ninth and twelfth grades. The sample covered a total of 4,000 schools in all parts of the country, and was so selected as to represent the country as a whole. There was, however, some intentional over-representation of schools enrolling Negro children and other minority groups. Tests of educational achievement, as well as verbal and non-verbal tests of mental ability, were administered, plus questionnaires dealing with attitudes in general and home background. Findings, which were buried in a mass of detail may be summarized as follows:

A. Segregation was found still to be prevalent. Nationwide 65 percent of Negroes attended school largely Negro (over 90 percent), whereas 80 percent of the white children attended schools largely white. Other minority groups (Orientals, Mexicans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans) were often segregated but not so generally as the Negro.

B. School facilities for minority-group children were not significantly inferior to those of whites. Differences in class size, educational programs, physical facilities, and teacher qualifications, were characteristic of poor neighborhoods rather than any one racial group as such.

C. On the various tests, Negroes were significantly below the averages of whites. In order, they stood: whites, Orientals, Indians, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Negroes. About 15 percent of Negro children equaled or exceeded the white average; 85 percent fell below the average. This is the usual finding.

D. The poorer performance of Negro pupils cannot be attributed solely to poorer schools. The Negro lag from sixth to twelfth grades shows a marked increase (as usual) and the authors interpret this to mean an increasingly poor educational opportunity. But the apparent change downward in the Negro averages is in part an artifact due to unequal scale units (and downward slope in the growth curve) so that the contribution of the schools to differences in Negro-white performance is actually negligible. Again, statistical study of the variations from school to school does not reveal the increase to be expected if schools have a potent influence on racial differences.

E. Socio-economic status affects test performance chiefly because pupils from better homes tend to be brighter. It is also known that the sometimes better achievement of Negroes in a "good" white school is due to the fact that Negroes volunteering to attend white schools tend to be brighter than Negroes who do not choose to integrate.<sup>1</sup>

All in all, there is simply no evidence that would lead us to believe that a Negro pupil will be made "brighter" simply by improving his school or by putting him in a white school.

### (3) *Study of Negro Elementary Children in Five Southeastern States*

During the 1960-61 school year a research team from the Human Development Clinic at Florida State University made a normative study of the intelligence and achievement of Negro elementary school children in five southeastern states.<sup>2</sup>

The sample of 1,800 represented two-thirds of one per cent of the 1,110,393 children in the elementary school age range within the five-state area comprising Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee and South Carolina. Results were obtained for each child from the 1961 revision of the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test, from the 1957 revision of the California Achievement Test and from the Demographic Data Sheet devised for the study.

In preparation for the study all of the literature concerning the use of the Binet Scale to test Negro school children was surveyed. Most of the approximately 250 studies reviewed indicated that Negroes normally score lower than the normative samples which excluded Negroes and that when white and Negro samples are compared, the results usually favor the white sample. Throughout the literature, several problems which seemed to bear directly upon the problem of interpreting the test have been mentioned and discussed by various authors. These problems are variables related mainly to standardization, sampling, race definition, social status, status and caste confusion, language, education, test motivation, rapport, and selective migration.

One of the problems mentioned in the study was that of standardization on a white sample, as to which it was stated (*id.*, 37) :

"When one cultural group is administered an intelligence test which has been constructed for and standardized on another cultural group, the former consistently scores lower. When this effect is applied to the present situation, the Negroes would be expected to score below norms on a white sample."

The most important data of the project were the means and standard deviations of the Binet I.Q., the mental ages, and the California grade placements. The Negro elementary school children had a mean I.Q. of 80.7 and a standard deviation of 12.4, as compared with Terman and Merrill's data of a mean I.Q. of 101.8 and a standard deviation of 16.4.

The analysis of the tests showed that (p. 109) :

"\* \* \* in general, the abstract verbal items (vocabulary, absurdities, and comprehension) appear at too low a level in the test. On the other hand, rote memory items, days of the week, making change, digits, and sentence memory are placed too high on the scale."

The study further found that (p. 110) :

"At the sixth-grade level, where the magnitude of discrepancy was the greatest, the highest mean performance was on arithmetic fundamentals with a mean of 5th grade, 6 months. The lowest subtest means were 4th grade, 9 months and 4th grade, 10 months on reading comprehension and arithmetic reasoning, respectively."

<sup>1</sup> See *Report for the Center for Urban Education*, by David J. Fox, City University of New York, 1967.

<sup>2</sup> Kennedy, Wallace A., Van de Riet, Vernon, White, James C., Jr., "A Normative Sample of Intelligence and Achievement of Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States." Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 90, 1963/Vol. 28, No. 6.

The report concluded that (*ibid*) :

"This research has uncovered few surprises. That Negro elementary school children score significantly lower on intelligence tests was expected from a review of previous research; that the magnitude of the differences was as high as it was is depressing, but we do not really know how these results compare with white children in the Southeast. That the achievement scores are significantly lower than the standardization sample would follow logically as the achievement tests also depend upon cultural and socioeconomic factors. That the intelligence and achievement test scores vary positively with socioeconomic levels and negatively with age could be deduced. The fact that there is not any significant difference in intelligence scores from grade level to grade level nor from rural to metropolitan is surprising and seems difficult to explain."

The above conclusions are graphically illustrated in two charts from this study which I attach as Exhibits D and E.

(4) *Armed Forces tests*

For 50 years the Armed Forces tests (chiefly tests of abstract intelligence) have been administered to Negro and white recruits. Nation-wide results for the latest (1966) testing<sup>3</sup> show 19 per cent of young white adults and 68 per cent of young Negroes have failed to pass the tests. Just 12 per cent of Negroes scored as well or better than the average white. Some specific results are :

A. About 75 per cent of whites fall in Groups I, II, and III—the three upper groups. In contrast, 22 per cent of Negroes fall into these groups.

B. About 25 per cent of whites fall in score-groups IV and V (the lowest levels), whereas 75 per cent of Negroes place here.

C. The two top brackets contain 40 percent of the whites and about 4 per cent of the Negroes.

The following chart illustrates the relative rank of Negro and white draftees in the five mental test categories :

NEGRO AND WHITE DRAFTEES RANKED IN MENTAL TEST CATEGORIES, 1966.

Mental group	Percent		
	White draftees	Negro draftees	
I. Superior.....	7.6	0.3	25 times as many whites as Negroes.
II. High.....	32.1	3.3	10 times as many whites as Negroes.
III. Average.....	34.6	18.2	Twice as many whites as Negroes.
IV. Low.....	16.0	38.2	Twice as many Negroes as whites.
V. Borderline.....	9.1	37.1	4 Times as many Negroes as whites.

As indicated in the foregoing studies, major racial differences occur in all categories of mental ability subject to testing. These differences between black and white children occur most importantly in those categories of mental ability which are closely related to academic success.

I would like to add one further item of federally financed research. I noted the variations by subject matter in the Burket and Kennedy studies between white and black children. The exhibits show that these important differences consistently demonstrate strength and weakness of minority children in specific areas. Where the Kennedy opinion I have quoted referred to "too high" and "too low" a level on different educational factors, he was simply refusing to recognize the fact that these black students have their own learning pattern which differs to an educationally important degree from children of all other tested races. I would, therefore, like to refer at this point to a confirming study on this point.

Using four mental categories—verbal ability, reasoning, number facility and space conceptualization—Dr. Gerald S. Lesser of Harvard University, with the support of the U.S. Office of Education, undertook a major study of mental ability patterns in children of different social class and cultural backgrounds.<sup>4</sup> Pat-

<sup>3</sup> Source: *American Education*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, October 1966.

<sup>4</sup> Lesser, Gerald S., Eifer, Gordon, Clark, Donald H., "Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups," Monograph of Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 102, 1965, Vol. 30, No. 4.

These results and additional research were published by Stodolsky and Lesser in the *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (1967), p. 546 et seq. A selection of tables and charts from that article are attached as Exhibits F and G.



tern-type responses on these four elements were tabled and charted separately for Chinese, Puerto Rican, Jewish and Negro children of both high and low I.Q. in New York and Boston.

"The major findings were as follows:

"1. Differences in *social-class* placement do produce significant differences in the absolute *level* of each mental ability but do not produce significant differences in the *patterns* among these abilities.

"2. Differences in *ethnic-group* membership do produce significant differences in both the absolute *level* of each mental ability and the *patterns* among these abilities.

"3. *Social-class* and *ethnicity* do interact to affect the absolute *level* of each mental ability but do not interact to affect the *patterns* among these abilities.

"The following other specific results were found:

"1. Regarding social-class effects upon mental abilities, middle-class children are significantly superior to lower-class children on all scales and subtests.

"2. Regarding ethnic-group effects upon mental abilities: (a) On Verbal ability, Jewish children ranked first (being significantly better than all other ethnic groups), Negroes ranked second and Chinese third (both being significantly better than Puerto Ricans), and Puerto Ricans fourth. (b) On Reasoning, the Chinese ranked first and Jews second (both being significantly better than Negroes and Puerto Ricans), Negroes third, and Puerto Ricans, fourth. (c) On Numerical ability, Jews ranked first and Chinese second (both being significantly better than Puerto Ricans and Negroes), Puerto Ricans third, and Negroes, fourth. (d) On Space, Chinese ranked first (being significantly better than Puerto Ricans and Negroes), Jews second, Puerto Ricans third, and Negroes, fourth.

\* \* \*

"Ethnic-group affiliation also affects strongly the pattern or organization of mental abilities, but once the pattern specific to the ethnic group emerges, social-class variation within the ethnic group do not alter this basic organization. Apparently, different mediators are associated with social-class and ethnic-group conditions. The mediating variables associated with ethnic-group conditions do affect strongly the organization of abilities, while social-class status does not appear to modify further the basic pattern associated with ethnicity." (*Id.*, 82-83).

#### EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN I.Q. AND ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

The above-mentioned differences in I.Q. and learning patterns are significant in an educational sense. If a group of children is one to three grades behind another group, the level of the class is lowered so that the better children are not getting a good education and the poorer ones are just being frustrated. Results would further vary by subject and manner of teaching.

If there were complete desegregation of schools, the school administrator would be faced with one of two alternatives: he could lower standards to accommodate the less able Negro student, or he could maintain standards at their present white levels. The first choice would mean that schools would be diminished considerably in effectiveness for the superior white pupils. The second alternative would mean an increasing number of Negro failures, drop-outs, frustration, complaints of discrimination and resulting tension. Neither prospect is a pleasant one.

But let us even suppose that some middle compromise position could be reached as this bill seeks to do. Then we have a class not only inadequate for some and too advanced for others, but even more importantly the content and manner of teaching each of the subjects in the curriculum would have to be aimed at one group, with incomprehension or lack of interest for the other.

But what of the gifted Negro child, it will be asked, can't he do work equal to that of the white child? The answer is in many cases that he can. But in so doing his leadership position in his former class is forfeited, the other black children are given a sense of rejection, and because of his differing talents he must work much harder to retain the same level of achievement.

## THE HERITABILITY OF INTELLIGENCE

The importance of the differences given above will continue without regard to integration or other forms of change in the school environment for the child because of the hereditary nature of these differences. Much evidence has been published on the genetic aspects of intelligence. I will confine my comments on this point to the references which I feel constitute conclusive proof of the extent of the heritability of learning characteristics.

The study of twins has long been recognized as one of the best ways of determining the differing contributions of nature (inheritance) and nurture (environment) to intelligence.

The reasons for this are explained in an article I published a few years ago and which summarizes the result of such research (Exhibit H attached hereto). I will also refer to an article appearing in *Science* magazine,<sup>\*</sup> in which twin data accumulated over a period of 50 years was brought together for analysis. From a thorough review of this material, ranging from data on identical twins reared together and apart to studies of siblings and of unrelated persons reared together and apart, it can be determined that intelligence is heritable in the ratio of 3-1. This is in precise accord with my own findings as given in the prior exhibit.

The necessary conclusion here is that if we take any test area where the average difference between Negro and white students is the usual 20 I.Q. points, the maximum change which could possibly be made by a total alteration of all social, educational and other factors in the environment from the time of birth to the time of testing, would be approximately 5 points for the average child. Even this would not be enough to change the prior conclusions I have drawn and, of course, any actual change under realizable programs would be considerably less than any such theoretical level.

It is obvious we must look elsewhere than to environmental manipulation for an appropriate educational solution to I.Q. differences.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In general, the Negro lags behind the white student in abstract intelligence, but not in motor and mechanical intelligence or in social intelligence. The origin of these variations is genetic, rather than cultural.

Realization of a pupil's educational potential requires matching course content, subject matter, rate of progress, and type of teaching to the student learning pattern.

Any change in the social and cultural environment by compulsory commingling would not change the basic learning pattern and would increase educationally destructive tensions.

Scholastic success for any given individual is measured by the extent to which his achievement maximizes his native ability. This constitutes the best preparation for higher education or vocation and decreases the problem of school dropouts and discipline. To lead these minority children to believe that by transfer to a majority white school they will thereby overcome the handicaps of nature and raise their educational accomplishment to the average level of whites is the more cruel deception. Such a belief often leads to unrealistic aspirations by the child and his parents and his ultimate frustration when this is proven to be beyond accomplishment. The blame is then directed outward toward society and the schools and is a major cause of disciplinary problems and dropouts.

Maximum realization of learning potentials for both white and Negro requires two different educational approaches and methods. In a single school, this would result in the track system. This system is undesirable because of the assumption of superiority-inferiority as between tracks. Having separated school areas avoids this. And the greater the difference between such classes in form and content, the fewer would be the invidious comparisons which could otherwise be drawn between relative pupil accomplishment.

Alternatively, the ability of pupils to change schools under a freedom of choice system tends to eliminate any implication of school inferiority. A pupil who had a choice of going to the school adapted to his ethnic learning pattern would better understand any lack of academic accomplishment if he should choose to go elsewhere for other reasons.

<sup>\*</sup> Erlenmeyer-Kimling, L., and Jarvik, L., "Genetics and Intelligence: A Review," *Science*, 1963, Vol. CXLII, No. 3598.

## APPENDIX A

## Chapter XI

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have attempted to assemble and evaluate critically the research in the field of Negro intelligence as determined by psychometric tests. The survey covers a span of more than 50 years. Approximately 382 studies have been examined in which 81 tests were administered, and hundreds of thousands of Negro children and adults from various sections of the United States, as well as some 1600 from Ontario, Canada, and the West Indian islands of Jamaica and Grand Cayman, served as subjects.

The research has been summarized in fourteen tables. Three of these include studies of school children, ten of the others deal, respectively, with the testing of young children, high school pupils, college students, members of the Armed Forces, veterans and other civilians, the gifted, the mentally retarded, delinquents, criminals, and racial hybrids; and the last one with the special studies on selective migration. Within each table the researches have usually been grouped according to the test employed, with the Southern studies appearing first in chronological order, followed in turn by those from the Border and Northern states. We have, whenever possible, attempted to include the following items for each work examined: author; date, location of study; number of subjects, age, grade (if in school, or highest grade completed if not in school), and method by which selected; results; and some comment of the investigator. If white subjects were included in the research, comparable data on these were tabulated.

## YOUNG CHILDREN

Approximately 1700 colored and 13,900 white children between the ages of two and six years served as subjects in 17 studies reported between 1922 and 1965. Ten mental tests were administered, the results of eight of them being recorded in IQ units.<sup>1</sup> The majority of the children were attending kindergartens or nursery schools, or were enrolled in day nurseries; some had been brought regularly to a free clinic for a period of three years; others were examined relative to the appraisal of a preschool special training program; some were tested to determine if they were ready for first grade before the age of six, some participated in a voluntary testing program in a first-grade preregistration period, and a few were already enrolled in the first grade although under six years. Still others were selected from city playgrounds or served as subjects because they were within a

---

<sup>1</sup>The eight tests included: *Stanford-Binet, 1916, 1937, and 1960 Forms, Draw-a-Man, WISC, Lorge-Thorndike, Peabody Picture Vocabulary, and Ammons Full-Scale Picture Vocabulary.* These tests were administered in 15 of the studies.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

given age range and had siblings within another age range. The children lived in eight Southern, three Border, and four Northern states.

The average IQ's of the various groups of colored children ranged between 83 and 101; the average IQ's of the white groups with whom they were compared ranged between 102 and 113. The combined average IQ of the colored subjects was 94, or approximately 12 points below that of the white Ss.

The combined average IQ's of colored and white children whose test scores were reported prior to 1945 were 96.28 and 105.22, respectively, a difference of nine points; in the 1945 to 1965 period, the respective colored and white IQ's were 90.79 and 107.33, a difference of 16.5 points.

In general, the colored children obtained their highest scores on *Full-Range Picture Vocabulary* (106 IQ) and their lowest on *Lorge-Thorndike* (83 IQ) and *WISC* (83 IQ); the white samples earned their highest scores, on the average, on *Full-Range Picture Vocabulary* (118 IQ) and their lowest on *Lorge-Thorndike* (102 IQ) and *Draw-a-Man* (102 IQ).

It appears evident, therefore, that not only have young white children scored consistently above colored children, on the average, but that young children, both white and colored, have earned higher IQ's than school children of their respective racial groups. The higher IQ's obtained for young children may be attributed in large part to the fact that they do not represent a random sampling of their age group, since the brighter of 2- to 6-year-old children are more likely to be present (and therefore available for testing) in nursery schools, kindergartens, playgrounds, first grades, etc., than are the duller children. It has also been pointed out that preschool tests are not considered to be as reliable nor as valid as tests designed for school children.

### SCHOOL CHILDREN      INDIVIDUAL TESTS

The review includes 43 investigations in which fourteen individual tests were administered to 9925 colored school children. In 23 of these researches white subjects were also tested; in two of them the colored average equaled that of the compared white groups. However, one of the two studies (Peterson and Lanier, 1929) included white children from non-English-speaking homes. Excluding the records of the whites who spoke a foreign language at home, the median of the remainder is significantly above that of the colored. The other study (Higgins and Sivers, 1958) involved a comparison of test scores of pupils attending schools serving the lowest socioeconomic areas of a Northeastern city, and may be presumed to have included children from non-English-speaking homes.<sup>2</sup>

In the 20 investigations which included no white Ss, 17 authors report averages that were below the white norms. Of the three in which the results

<sup>2</sup>In the opinion of the reviewer. The authors have made no comment upon this point. Also, their method of selection may have had the effect of excluding some gifted children, particularly among the whites. See pp. 41-42.



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

compare favorably with the white norms, only Graham's Atlanta group (1926) and one of Long's Washington, D. C., groups (1933) were described as unselected. The other group examined by Long and those included in Beckham's data (1933) were not randomly selected.

In 26 studies the colored subjects were selected at random within the conditions of the experiment and the results presented in terms of IQ. The average IQ of these Negro children tested in the rural South was 77; in the Southern cities and towns, 83; in three Border cities, 90; and in the Northern cities and towns, 86. In the Border cities only children in the lower elementary grades were examined.

The average IQ's of colored and white children who were examined between 1921 and 1944 were 85 and 99, respectively, a *difference of 14 points*; in the period between 1945 and 1964 the respective colored and white averages were 82 and 96, a *difference of 14 points*.

In the ten studies in which whites and Negroes were selected from the same neighborhoods, where mill whites were compared with Negro children of varying status, and where white and colored subjects were matched for occupational status of father or socioeconomic status of the home, with one exception the colored have scored the lower.<sup>3</sup> Where comparisons were made in terms of IQ the colored averaged about nine points below the matched white groups.

### SCHOOL CHILDREN      NON-VERBAL GROUP TESTS

Forty-one studies which utilized seventeen nonverbal group tests in the examination of about 14,800 colored school children have been reviewed. White children were included in 22 of the investigations. In all of these the white subjects secured higher averages than the colored of the same localities or cities.

In the nineteen experimental studies where the scores of the Negroes were compared with white norms, all except Long (1933) reported inferiority of the colored. In general, the children seem to have been selected by random or stratified sampling or else saturated samples were obtained.

In 28 of the investigations, including 9300 colored children, the results were given in terms of group IQ's. The combined average was approximately 85, ranging from 77 in the rural North, through 80 in the rural South, 83 in the urban North, 86 in the urban South, to 91 in the urban Border states and the District of Columbia. The Negro children tested in the Border cities (St. Louis and Washington) were all in the lower elementary grades.

The combined average IQ's of colored and white children who were examined between 1925 and 1944 were 83 and 99, respectively, a *difference of 16 points*; for the period between 1945 and 1964 the respective colored and white averages proved to be 88 and 101, a *difference of 13 points*.

<sup>3</sup>The exception was reported by Higgins and Sivers previously noted.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

### SCHOOL CHILDREN

### VERBAL GROUP TESTS

We have reviewed 103 studies of colored school children in which 18 or more psychometric verbal group tests were administered. Altogether, about 60,850 colored children were examined by these tests, about four fifths of whom were living in urban areas and one fifth in villages or on farms. Approximately 64 per cent of the subjects were tested in the South, the other 36 per cent being about equally divided between the Border and Northern states.

White children were also tested in 58 of the researches, the whites achieving higher scores on the average than the Negroes in every investigation except one.<sup>4</sup>

In 45 studies the colored averages were compared only with established norms. In 44 of these the averages were found to be inferior to the norms, the exception being Long's District of Columbia group of 100 selected subjects (1933).

Group IQ's have been reported by the investigators on approximately 50,000 Negro school children. Separating the studies into South, Border, and North, the respective combined averages were approximately 81, 90, and 90, the overall average being 84.

The average IQ's of colored and white children whose scores were reported between 1923 and 1944 were 85 and 98, respectively, a *difference of 13 points*; in the period between 1945 and 1965 the respective colored and white averages were 83 and 99, a *difference of 16 points*.

### HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Twenty intelligence tests administered to approximately 23,600 colored high school students have been reported in the 55 studies included in this review. About 85 per cent of the pupils were tested in the South. In 26 of the investigations white students were also examined, the whites always obtaining higher average scores than the colored Ss with whom they were compared. In 29 studies the colored averages were compared with the test norms rather than with particular white groups; among these studies there were 45 separate means reported, 43 of which were below the norms.<sup>5</sup>

IQ's have been secured on about 13,250 Negro high school pupils whose combined average proved to be 83.5, about the same as the combined mean IQ obtained on Negro school children.<sup>6</sup> The average IQ of the Southern Negro high school pupils was 82, that of the Border and Northern colored students, 91.

<sup>4</sup>For review and appraisal of the McCord and Demerath study, see pp. 129-130.

<sup>5</sup>One of Oldham's Chicago groups, identified as of good socioeconomic status, earned a mean IQ of 101 (1935); Anderson's Okmulgee, Oklahoma, Ss achieved a mean of 103 (1947).

<sup>6</sup>i.e., 84.2; this figure is based upon the examination of more than 66,000 colored school children by the various individual and group tests.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The combined average IQ's of colored and white high school subjects whose test scores were reported prior to 1945 were 86 and 97, respectively, a difference of 11 points; in the 1945 to 1965 period, the respective colored and white IQ's were 83 and 102, a difference of 19 points.

### COLLEGE STUDENTS

About 61 per cent of the 24,640 Negro college students included in the survey have been examined on the *American Council Psychological Examination for College Freshmen*; 10 per cent have been tested on the *Higher Form of the Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability*; 21 per cent have been examined by the *School and College Ability Tests*, the *College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test*, or the *Medical College Admission Test*; and about nine per cent have been given some other test. Ninety-eight per cent of the subjects were enrolled in colleges for Negroes.

The obtained averages are typically much lower than the norms provided and below the averages of the specific white groups with whom they were compared. On the *Otis S-A* the colored students earned an average score which placed them at about the 13th percentile rank of the norms distribution; on the *ACE* the colored achieved an average score located at about the 12th percentile rank; and on the *SCAT*, the *SAT*, and the *MCAT* the Negro students attained average scores placing them at about the 6th percentile rank according to the norms.

### THE ARMED FORCES

### WORLD WAR I

A review of the research on the Army data of World War I indicates that white officers scored markedly above colored officers and that white enlisted men were consistently superior to Negro enlisted men. Using the white draft as a frame of reference with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 16, the *Combined Scale*<sup>1</sup> scores of about 23,500 colored recruits (selected on prorata bases) were converted into standard-score IQ's. The mean IQ of the colored enlisted men was 83 (Johnson, 1948), slightly more than one point below the combined average IQ's obtained on colored school children and high school pupils.

The Army data also indicate that Northern whites of the draft were unequivocally superior to Northern Negroes of the draft and that Southern white recruits were clearly superior to Southern Negro recruits. The position of the Northern Negro soldier relative to that of the Southern white, however, has been the subject of debate. Instead of comparing relatively limited numbers of *Alpha* or *Alpha only* scores as a number of investigators had done, a more comprehensive and accurate picture of the relative intelligence of the Southern

<sup>1</sup>The *Combined Scale* was a device whereby test scores could be converted into a common scale, whether they were scores on *Alpha only*, *Alpha and Beta*, *Beta only*, or *Beta* and some individual test.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

white and the Northern Negro recruits was obtained from data on the *Combined Scale*. A comparison of scores on the *Combined Scale* of about 10,000 Negro and 17,000 white enlisted men from the four Northern states where Negroes were reported to have scored their best and the four Southern states<sup>a</sup> where whites were reported to have scored their worst shows the four groups to rank in order of: Northern whites, Southern (and Border) whites, Northern Negroes, and Southern (and Border) Negroes.

### THE ARMED FORCES

### WORLD WAR II

Four studies have indicated that total rejection rates were higher for Negroes than for whites in World War II and that the rejection rates due to *educational and mental deficiency* were markedly different for the two races. Likewise, six investigations dealing with relatively small samples of enlisted men who were admitted to mental hygiene clinics or hospitalized in psychiatric or neuropsychiatric wards have consistently found the Negro recruit to test below the white.

A number of authors have discussed the Special Training Program designed to qualify intelligent illiterates for induction into the Army. Eighty-four per cent of the whites and 87 per cent of the colored who were admitted to this program completed the course satisfactorily in 8 to 13 weeks time and were assigned to regular Army service, the men having to demonstrate a degree of military proficiency and an achievement of at least a fourth-grade standard in reading and arithmetic. In the opinion of this writer the several studies of enlisted men sent to the Special Training Centers do not contradict, but probably support, the findings of other Army studies. Some of the important points to be considered in the evaluation of the Negro-white comparisons are as follows: the large percentage of Negroes as compared with whites who qualified for the program, the fact that the brighter of the illiterates were directed to the training centers, the fact that about one third of the men sent to the training centers were literate when they arrived (could pass the necessary tests at the fourth-grade level), the point that the ability to adjust was considered as particularly important in the disposition of Negroes of intermediate literacy, the inference that the English-speaking whites needed a higher aptitude score to graduate than did the Negroes, and the fact that about 99 per cent of the men released for assignment to regular training scored in the two lowest classes of the *AGCT*, increasing the Army manpower but not affecting the intermediate or higher levels from which leaders could be drawn.

Several studies, including many thousands of Negroes inducted into the Armed Forces, were based upon data from the Adjutant General's Office.<sup>9</sup> From these it is evident that the colored enlisted man averaged from 25 to 30

<sup>a</sup>The four listed as *Southern* include three Southern and one Border state, Kentucky.

<sup>9</sup>Davenport (1946), Stewart (1947), Star, Williams, and Stouffer (1949), and Fulk (1949).



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

standard score points below the white recruit on the *Army General Classification Test*; that significant differences occurred when colored and white men of the same Military Occupational Specialty were compared; that the differences were present when men of equivalent education were compared;<sup>10</sup> and that the differences persisted when whites from an all-Southern Command were compared with Negroes from their best Northern Command. Significant differences were also found between Negro and white aviation cadets of World War II and between Negro and white soldiers (post-Korean War) who had been carefully matched on a number of variables.

In making comparisons between the intelligence of enlisted Negroes and whites, one must accept certain pertinent facts that are unfavorable to the Negro: (1) the consistently lower scores earned by the Negroes, (2) the failure of relatively large numbers of Negroes to be inducted, the higher rejection rates not having been due to the presence of more physical defects, (3) the relatively smaller number of occupational deferments given to Negroes because of special abilities or skills, and (4) the smaller percentage of superior colored men drawn into the officer group and thereby eliminated from the comparisons.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, it seems highly probable that: (1) the lives of relatively more Negroes than whites were culturally impoverished, (2) proportionally more of the Negroes were not as test-sophisticated, were less well oriented to the testing situation, were less aware of the need for speed and attentiveness to the tasks required, were less interested in the tests, had a greater tendency to relax, even to sleep, and (3) relatively more Negroes were uninterested in fighting a war a long way from home, felt themselves completely uprooted from their families, and anticipated little advancement, arduous work, and white antagonism. Before one concludes that these cultural-motivational-personality factors are or are not sufficient to explain away the Armed Forces findings, it is suggested that he consider these studies not in isolation but in conjunction with the research on other Negro and white samples.

## SPECIAL GROUPS OF VETERANS AND OTHER CIVILIANS

In all nine of the researches dealing with the testing of special groups of veterans and other civilians, the colored averaged below the whites with whom they were compared. In six of the studies, the results were reported in terms of IQ with the colored averaging from 11 to 17 points below the white subjects and from 16 to 32 points below the white norms.

<sup>10</sup>Colored men who had completed as much as 10 grades of schooling earned lower *AGCT* scores than whites with little or no schooling. (Fulk, 1949; Fulk and Harrell, 1952)

<sup>11</sup>Ginzberg observed that at the end of *WW II* there was one Negro officer for approximately every 100 Negro enlisted men while the ratio for the Army as a whole was nearly one officer to 8 men. (1956, p. 85)

The Southern states may have contributed proportionally more white officers than did the Northern states in *WW I*. See Chap. 5, fn. 30.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

### DEVIATES

From a combination of relatively unselected samples of white and colored school children, it appears that proportionally the *colored gifted* have been reported about one sixth as often as the white gifted and that the *colored retarded* have been reported about six times as often as the white retarded. In the special studies of gifted, the colored were found about one third as frequently as were whites in proportion to the numbers surveyed. Among the special studies of the mentally deficient, the rate for the retarded colored was approximately twice that of the rate for retarded white.

### DELINQUENTS AND CRIMINALS

In all 28 of the studies reviewed, excluding Clarke's groups matched for IQ, the colored delinquents averaged below the white norms or below the white delinquents with whom they were compared. Where the results were given in IQ units the average of the Negro delinquents was 74, the average of the white delinquents, about 81.

The Negro criminals likewise earned lower means than the white criminals in the 16 investigations tabulated. Where the results were given in terms of IQ, the average of the Negro felons was 81, that of the white convicts, 92. When the Negroes were classified according to birthplace, the Northern-born scored higher than the Southern-born but below the native white criminals.

In the instances where colored criminals or delinquents were matched with white convicts or misdemeanants for occupational category, school grade completed, and type of community from which they had come, the differences between the respective means were significant.

### RACIAL HYBRIDS

Racial hybrids have a tendency to score higher on psychometric tests, on the whole, than Negro groups described as unmixed.

### SELECTIVE MIGRATION

Northern Negroes, both children and adults, have been frequently reported as achieving higher averages on intelligence tests than Southern Negroes of the same grade or age. Some psychologists attribute the Northern-Southern difference to superior education and the more complex, less constrictive environment afforded Negroes in the Northern states; others believe that the more able and energetic Southern Negroes are likely to appreciate the advantages of living in the North and consequently migrate in that direction.

We have separated the research in this field into three categories. In the first two are included five studies where either the amount of formal schooling or a form of scholastic index was used as the criterion of mental ability. Records

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

of approximately 20,000 Negro migrants when compared with those of Negro sedents indicate that migration was generally selective. In the third category, Negro children living in five Northern cities or in the District of Columbia were given intelligence tests and divided into Northern-born and Southern-born (or within the District and outside the District), were separated into various groups according to length of residence in the cities, or were retested after they had lived for a period of time in these cities. The test scores of more than 15,000 Negro children were thus compared. From these researches it appears evident: (1) that the Northern-born secure higher average scores than the Southern-born living in the North, (2) that the District of Columbia-born on the whole earn higher scores than those born outside the District, (3) that there is a tendency for the IQ to improve with increase of time spent in the North, at least up to five or six years, and (4) that when retested the IQ's of the Southern-born seem to increase a little more, or to decrease a little less, than do those of the Northern-born Negroes.

In the studies where IQ's were obtained, Negro children born in the Border and Northern metropolitan centers average from one to six IQ points higher than Negro children living in the same cities and attending the same public schools who were born in the South. In the opinion of the reviewer, these investigations have not disproved the hypothesis of selective migration but have shown that selective migration does not account for *all* of the difference between Northern and Southern Negroes. Our single best estimate is that between seven and ten points separate the average IQ of Southern colored children from Northern and Border children of their race. If this is correct, then about half of this difference may be accounted for by environmental factors and half by selective migration.

### SOME NORTH-SOUTH URBAN COMPARISONS

Recognizing the fact that urban children in general average higher in test performance than rural children and that any comparison between Negroes and whites from the Northern and Southern states is vitiated by the urban-rural variable, we have attempted to control this variable by *comparing only urban children with urban children*. We have, therefore, using Tables 1 to 5, tabulated the means of all preschool children, school children, and high school pupils tested in Northern or Southern towns or cities, provided their selection appeared to have been unbiased and the records were presented in IQ units.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Where authors included both rural and urban Ss and treated their scores separately, we included the appropriate statistics; if they specified *county* as source of data, or indicated that rural children attended the consolidated or village schools, the study was excluded. We likewise excluded some Northern urban studies on whites and colored, identified as follows by the investigators: Clark (1923) who later reported that the IQ's obtained were too high; Beckham (1933) whose Ss were not selected at random; W. W. Brown (1955) who reported IQ's only on Ss who had failed one or more grades or one or more high school subjects; and McCord and Deinerath, (1958) who gave no exact means or medians.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

The combined mean IQ of approximately 27,441 Northern white children was 101.7, that of the 25,641 Southern whites, 102.2; while the combined mean of the 15,017 Northern colored subjects was 88.7, and that of the 32,382 Southern Negroes, 82.6.<sup>13</sup> None of the specific Northern white- or Southern white- means were below the combined mean of the Northern colored; and in only one of the 49 studies including Northern Negroes was a mean reported which was above the combined mean of either the Southern or the Northern whites.<sup>14</sup>

In so far as these groups adequately represent their *urban school-age* populations,<sup>15</sup> it is apparent that the whites in the South and North average about the same, that the Northern Negro averages 13 points below the whites, and that the Southern Negro averages between 19 and 20 points below them. It does not lend support to the view (frequently reinforced by test results which have included rural and village Ss) that Northern whites earn higher mental test scores on the average than Southern whites; nor does it support the generalization (based upon tenuous World War I findings) that Negroes from some Northern states are superior on the average to whites from some Southern states.

### VARIABILITY

Variability appears to have been the greater among the white than among the Negro subjects examined. Where samples of both racial groups were tested and comparable *s*'s or *Q*'s reported, the white subjects proved to have been the more variable in 67 per cent of the 200 comparisons, the colored the more

<sup>13</sup>Probably Mermelstein's study of number development in 6- and 9-year-old Negro children living in Flint, Michigan, and Prince Edward County, Virginia, may be of interest to the reader at this point. Investigating developmental changes in children's thinking as a function of school background, Mermelstein (1965) tested their conceptions of *conservation of substance* both by standard Piaget experiments and by a nonverbal technique identified as the *Magic Experiment*. He found no evidence that the Flint children were superior to the Prince Edward children at either age level, despite the fact that one was a Northern group and one a Southern group, and despite the fact that two thirds of the Prince Edward 9-year-olds (on whom there were records) had had but 8 months of formal schooling prior to the testing. Mermelstein concluded that "the results are consistent with the claim that school experiences are not of sufficient moment to alter the natural processes of adaptation which take place in the child's adjustment to his objective world . . ." (p. 60).

<sup>14</sup>A Minneapolis sample of 20 Ss. See Bird, Monachesi, and Burdick (1952). This statement does not mean, of course, that there were no other Northern colored groups above the means of any Northern or Southern white groups.

<sup>15</sup>Northern white children tested were likely unrepresentative of the Northern white population, since in more than half of the studies including them the researchers planned to reduce environmental and educational differences between *w* and *c* by selecting children from mixed schools and similar neighborhoods. Further, relatively more *retarded children* in Northern cities have been enrolled in special classes and have seldom been included in testing programs. (See K. B. Clark's reference to the number of classes for retarded children in the Harlem schools alone, 1963.)



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

variable in 26 per cent of them, and no appreciable difference<sup>16</sup> was found in the remaining seven per cent. The differences in the sizes of the quartile or standard deviations were usually small and the significance of the differences between them rarely determined.

## OVERLAPPING

There were 37 studies of school children in which the amount of overlapping was reported by the researchers or could be determined by the reviewer. The overlapping ranged from 0 to 44 per cent, the average being approximately 12 per cent.<sup>17</sup>

At the high school level the average overlap, based on 26 comparisons in 23 studies was 10 per cent, the range of overlapping being from 0 to 69 per cent. At the college level the average overlap, based on 18 comparisons in eleven studies, was 7 per cent, the range being from less than one to 55 per cent. Our calculation of the average amount of overlapping, using available data from 34,784 colored school children, high school pupils, and college students examined in 71 studies is 11 per cent.

The reader may compare the 11 per cent overlap so determined with the schematic distributions used by Anastasi (1958, p. 549) to illustrate a 30 per cent overlap which she noted is "close to that usually found between psychological test scores of Negroes and whites in the United States." This authoritative statement made without supporting references is shortly followed with: "If 30 per cent of the Negroes reach or exceed the white median . . . ." and: "Under these conditions, therefore, the ranges will overlap almost completely." While she does not use the expression *intelligence test scores* but *psychological test scores* it is probable that many persons would infer that her assumption had become a fact and that she was referring to *intelligence testing*. Certainly Klineberg (1963, p. 202) who quotes the passage beginning: "If 30 per cent of the Negroes . . . ." and Ingle (1964, p. 378) who does not quote but who writes: "If the 30 per cent overlap usually found between the test scores of whites and Negroes in the United States . . . ." were inferring that Anastasi implied the presence of a 30 per cent overlap in intelligence test performance.

Pettigrew (*J. Negro Educ.*, 1964, p. 22) likewise must have been influenced by Anastasi's schematic distributions (fig. 84) cited above and her comments, for he includes a duplicate of the drawing with a few additions to make it easier for the layman to understand and with the substitution of 25 per cent for the 30 per cent overlap. Citing no authority for his premise (nor does he in the

<sup>16</sup>Assuming  $\pm .20$  to be "no appreciable difference", except in a very few instances where the means and standard deviations were very small.

<sup>17</sup>By overlap we refer to the percentage of Negroes' scores that equaled or exceeded the median or mean test score of the compared white group. Attention may be called at this point to the fact that in WW I slightly more than 13 per cent of the 23,596 colored recruits earned scores on the Combined Scale equal or superior to the average of the white draft, based on 93,953 cases. (Brigham, 1923)

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

same discussion accompanying the same figure in his book, *A Profile of the Negro American*, 1964, p. 131) he continues with the statement: "Figure 2 shows two typical intelligence test distributions with an overlap of 25 per cent, that is, 25 per cent of the Negroes tested (shaded area) surpass the performance of half of the whites tested. Notice how the ranges of the two distributions are virtually the same, even though the means are somewhat different."<sup>18</sup>

The reviewer has found the overlap to be 25 per cent or more in ten of the 71 studies, involving 3039 of the 35,107 Negro Ss,<sup>19</sup> six of the ten researches reported before 1945 and only two of them after 1950. Furthermore, if one looks for the investigations that produced a 30 or more per cent overlap he would find (according to the information available to the reviewer) five studies, including 872 colored cases. They are as follows: Murdoch (1920) 227; Peterson and Lanier, New York (1929) 187; Graham (1930) 181; Byrns (1936) 124; and Anderson (1947) 153. All but one of them would be called "earlier, less sophisticated investigations" according to Pettigrew, since they were dated prior to World War II. (*J. Negro Educ.*, p. 6; also *A Profile . . .*, p. 102)

On the other hand, there are 35 of the 71 studies in which the overlap was less than 10 per cent; these 35 included 23,222 Ss, nine of the researches dating before the close of World War II and 17 after 1950.<sup>20</sup>

There seems to be no doubt that writers on the subject have assumed a much greater percentage of overlapping than the research warrants.

### STABILITY OF IQ

IQ's of Negroes enrolled in the American public schools have proved to be relatively stable. In the first place, the combined mean IQ's of Negro elementary

<sup>18</sup> Pettigrew without doubt impressed the editor of the *J. Negro Educ.* with the truth of a 25 per cent overlap as well as with his scholarship for he commented as follows in an editorial in the same issue: "Fortunately, there are objective investigations available. The research by Thomas Pettigrew of Harvard makes clear the great amount of overlapping in the performance of Negroes and whites on intelligence tests. He shows by facts and figures that 25 per cent of the Negro subjects reach or exceed the median score of the whites, and thereby exceed the performance of 50 per cent of the total white population tested." (Daniel, 1964, p. 97)

Similarly, after having previously (p. 366) called attention to McGurk's statement of a 25 per cent overlap, Dreger and Miller thought as social scientists they should "set forth the full picture. The wide overlap between white and Negro distributions of scores should be pointed out so that it is evident that within group differences are far greater than between group differences." (1960, p. 374)

It might be noted at this point that Sherwood Washburn, anthropologist, while not committing himself on the amount of overlap, thinks of it as tremendous. "If one looks at the degree of social discrimination against Negroes and their lack of education, and also takes into account the tremendous amount of overlapping between the observed IQ's of both, one can make an equally good case that given a comparable chance to that of the Whites, their IQ's would test out ahead." (in Tumin, 1964, pp. 7-8)

<sup>19</sup>See fn. 95, Chap. 3.

<sup>20</sup>For identification of the 71 investigations, see pp. 205-206, 256, and 305.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

school children range between 84 and 85 on Individual tests, on Nonverbal Group, and on Verbal Group tests; (2) the combined mean IQ of Negro high school pupils proved to be 84.1; a large unbiased sample of Negro recruits in World War I earned a combined mean IQ of 83;<sup>21</sup> (4) there seems to be no evidence that in World War II the mean test score of the Negro enlisted man is closer to the white mean than in World War I; (5) colored children at several educational levels have earned average IQ's of comparable size—groups of Northern and Southern children tested in Grades 1 to 3 having earned a combined mean IQ of 83.1, as compared with a mean of 84.5 achieved by other Negro children tested from these regions but in Grades 4 to 7;<sup>22</sup> (6) the Northern Ss in Grades 1 to 3 earned a combined mean of 87.8, those in Grades 4 to 7, a combined mean of 88.2, practically the same as the combined mean IQ of 87.6 secured from the testing of many thousands of Northern Negro school children; (7) elementary school children of Ages 6 to 9 from Northern and Southern states earned a combined mean IQ of 84.0, whereas other Negro children from these areas between the Ages of 10 to 12 attained a combined mean of 83.0; (8) Negro elementary school children tested between 1921-1944 earned a combined mean of 84.8, whereas those tested between 1945-1965 earned a combined mean IQ of 83.6; and (9) high school pupils examined in the earlier period achieved a combined mean IQ of 86.2, while those tested between 1945-1965 proved to have obtained a mean of 83.<sup>23</sup>

## ANALYSIS OF TEST ITEMS

In general, Negroes have been reported as earning their best scores in tests identified as purposeful, practical, and concrete, and as achieving their lowest scores in tests that involve logical analysis, abstract reasoning, and certain perceptual-motor functions. Although these findings have been made over a period of many years and have seldom been contradicted, some additional support for them has followed the administration of the *Wechsler* tests to colored subjects of varying ages and circumstances.<sup>24</sup> Among the *Wechsler* subtests,

<sup>21</sup>Using the white draft as a frame of reference with a mean of 100 and *s* of 16, Brigham's Negro scores on the *Combined Scale* were converted into standard-score IQ's. A mean of 83 was secured on the 23,596 colored enlisted men. (D. M. Johnson, 1948)

<sup>22</sup>K. B. Clark (1965) however, reported a drop in median IQ of Central Harlem school children from 90.6 at Grade 3 to 86.3 at Grade 6, followed by a slight rise to 87.7 at Grade 8. These averages are based upon the following tests administered throughout New York City at Grades 3, 6, and 8, respectively: *Otis Q-S Alpha*, *Otis Q-S Beta*, and *Pintner General Ability and Intermediate Test, Form A*.

<sup>23</sup>Means based upon 4068 and 9156 records of colored Ss, respectively. The 66,000 colored elementary school pupils tested were about equally divided in the two time intervals.

<sup>24</sup>Approximately 21 studies have been reviewed in which Negroes have been tested by the *Wechsler-Bellevue*, the *WISC*, or the *WAIS*; three of these were reported before 1950, the others between 1950 and 1964.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

Negroes have appeared to their best advantage on *Comprehension*,<sup>25</sup> and have made their poorest showing on *Block Design*, *Arithmetical Reasoning*, and *Digit Symbol*. Likewise, Negro college students have shown the least amount of overlapping in the relatively abstract tests of *SAT*, *SCAT*, and *MCAT*. Negro pupils have also been described as being more rigid in their responses and less able to organize the elements of the *Rorschach* into a meaningful context than white children. In a recent analysis of the responses of underprivileged Negro and white children to a series of tests, Deutsch (1965) reported the Negro sample as performing poorly in areas including abstraction and verbalization, the language deficiency being evident in the use of abstractions and knowledge of categories rather than in the use of labels and word meanings.

Certain of the early investigators noted that the colored were at their best in the rote or immediate memory type of test, the more recent work of Kennedy, Van De Riet, and White tending to support this view.<sup>26</sup> However, the *Digit Span* subtest of the *Wechsler* has not generally proved to be an easy test for the various groups of Negroes tested on it.

There is a difference of opinion as to the difficulty Negroes have with verbal as compared with nonverbal test material. It has been generally assumed that underprivileged groups such as the Negro are particularly handicapped on verbal tests. A number of investigators, mainly before 1934, have described the language difficulties of their colored subjects. However, Yerkes reported that Negroes at Camp Dix, matched with white recruits for intelligence, did relatively better in situations dealing with words as determined by the *Devens Literacy Test*. In more recent years psychologists have compared Verbal (or Language) and Performance (or Non-Language) IQ's on the *Wechsler* tests and the *California Test of Mental Maturity*. In fifteen studies in which these tests were employed, the Negro children and adults achieved higher scores or IQ's on the *Verbal* section of the test, in seven studies their Verbal IQ's were the lower, and in four there was practically no difference between the mean Verbal and Performance IQ's.<sup>27</sup>

### RACE OF EXPERIMENTER

In searching for an explanation of the inferior performance of colored subjects on mental tests, several critics have called attention to the fact that the examiners were usually white and therefore unlikely to motivate the testees as effectively as would a member of their racial group. Canady (1936) attempted to test this hypothesis by having some Negro and white children of Evanston, Illinois,

<sup>25</sup>Designed to measure practical judgment and common sense.

<sup>26</sup>Kennedy, Van De Riet, and White (1961) reported that an analysis of item difficulty and biserial item correlation of the data indicated that, in general, the abstract verbal items appear at too low a level on the *Stanford-Binet, 1960 Revision* and the rote memory items are placed too high on the scale.

<sup>27</sup>Colored school children scored no higher, on the average, on the *Nonverbal* than on the *Verbal Group* tests (Chap. 3).



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

examined twice on the *Stanford-Binet*, once by one of 20 white students and once by himself (a Negro), all of the twenty-one testers having had a course in the measurement of intelligence and all working in the Northwestern University clinic. About half of the children were tested first by a white and subsequently by the colored student, the other half having the testing procedure reversed. The average IQ of the colored children when examined by Canady was 86.79, their average when tested by a white E was 84.31. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether this difference of 2.48 points was due to rapport established between examiner and colored S, to some unrecognized bias on the part of the examiner, or to some other factor.

Subsequent investigators have related the performance of colored subjects to the *race of the examiner* in conjunction with certain other variables, such as: difficulty of task, belief that the task was (or was not) an intelligence test, and type of incentive employed.

Katz, Roberts, and Robinson (1965), for example, administered digit-symbol substitution tests of three levels of difficulty to six groups of Southern Negro college students, the subjects having been informed that the investigator was studying *eye-hand coordination*. Half of the Ss were tested by a white person and half by a Negro. The students tested by a *white examiner* did better on the average than those tested by a Negro when they were working on *the most difficult* of the three substitution levels. When other groups of Negro students were tested on the *most difficult task* presented as a *test of intelligence* rather than a *study in eye-hand coordination*, there was no longer a significant difference in mean performance of the students, whether the tester was white or colored.<sup>28</sup>

Vega (1964) studied the behavior of Negro pupils in some discrimination situations, relating speed of reaction to the *race of the examiner*, to the type of incentive employed, and to other variables. The tasks were presented as a game

<sup>28</sup>Following *eye-hand coordination instructions*, the respective means on the most difficult task under white and Negro examiners were: 28.96 and 21.39; following *intelligence test instructions* the respective means under white and colored testers were: 22.91 and 23.48. The former difference, but not the latter, was significant.

In describing this research, Katz (1964, p. 393) indicated that when the task was presented as a *test of intelligence* the Ss did not attain higher scores in the presence of a white E: "... the effect of the IQ instructions was to slightly elevate performance with a Negro tester and to lower scores markedly in the white-tester group, so that the means for both testers were at about the same level."

In another reference to the same study, however, Katz, Robinson, Epps, and Waly (1964, p. 54) say: "But when the same task was described as an intelligence test, there was marked impairment of performance with the white tester, while subjects who were tested by the Negro experimenter showed a slight improvement." Notice that these authors omitted: "... so that the means for both testers were at about the same level," *probably giving a misleading impression to persons reading this report alone.*

Millinan and Glock (1965, p. 19) likewise appear to be misleading in their one-statement review of this same research: "Katz (1964) quoted a study of his which indicated that, especially with difficult intellectually oriented tasks, Negro students perform less well with white than with Negro administrators."

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

in which the subject was instructed to press one of four keys, depending upon which of four designs simultaneously presented was different from the other three. Twenty-four cards, each containing four designs, were presented successively to each of the 324 Negro pupils selected from Grades 2, 6, and 10 in two schools located in Havana, Florida. Two trials were administered at a given sitting, Trial 2 being a duplicate of Trial 1; between the trials, one third of the children were praised, one third reproved, and one third neither praised nor reproved. Half of the subjects at each of the third grades were examined by one of three Negroes and half by one of three whites, all six E's being male graduate students. Combining Trials 1 and 2, the author found the mean of the pupils tested by a Negro to be 6.00 seconds and the mean of the pupils tested by a white man to be 6.34 seconds. The small difference appears to have been due to the operation of the reproof condition; for the children allocated to the praise- or to the control-condition reacted slightly faster on the average in the presence of a white examiner, the respective mean reaction times being 5.79 and 5.78 seconds (white examiner) *vs.* 5.94 and 6.19 seconds (colored examiner). The children allocated to the reproof condition, however, averaged 7.46 seconds on the combined trials when the examiner was white, in contrast to 5.87 seconds when the examiner was colored.

Katz, Robinson, Epps, and Waly (1964) used an hostility questionnaire which they administered on successive days to male Negro high school students, each of whom was paid one dollar for an hour's participation. On the first day the test was administered under neutral instructions by a Negro. On the second day it was given to the same subjects, half of whom were tested by white and half by a Negro stranger, half of each of these groups being given the hostility questionnaire under *neutral instructions* (task described as a research instrument), and half of them with *intelligence test instructions* ("I am interested in this vocabulary test because it will show me how intelligent you are . . . . I want to see how bright you boys are at ..... School . . . ."). The authors report that in the neutral condition the changes in hostility scores (from the previous day) of those who had a white administrator were only slightly different from those who had a Negro administrator. "But when test instructions were used, the White Tester group expressed *less* hostility than previously, while the Negro Tester group showed an *increase* in hostile expression." (p. 57)<sup>29</sup>

The reviewer has selected the nineteen studies made on Negro elementary school children in the South where the results were given in IQ units and where the tester was Negro (either the fact was specifically mentioned or else the research was produced in a Southern Negro college, the author being a candidate for the Master's degree) and compared the combined mean IQ obtained from

<sup>29</sup>The authors interpret their findings as follows: both administrators instigated hostility in Ss when they announced that they were testing intelligence on the second day; however, when E was a Negro they revealed their annoyance by forming aggressive concepts, but when he was white the need to control hostile feelings resulted in their avoidance of aggressive words.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

the Negro examiners with that secured on all Southern Negro school children. The 2360 elementary school children tested by Negroes earned a mean IQ of 80.9 as compared with a combined mean of 80.6 earned by more than 30,000 Southern Negro school children, an undetermined but probably a large number of whom were tested by white investigators.<sup>30</sup> The present writer also calculated the combined mean IQ achieved by 1796 Southern colored high school pupils who were tested by Negro adults. This was 82.9 as compared with a mean of 82.1 secured by nearly 9000 Southern colored high school students, many of whom were examined by white researchers.

From these comparisons it would seem that the intelligence score of a Negro school child or high school pupil has not been adversely affected by the presence of a white tester.

## MOTIVATION

Hurlock (1924), Klugman (1944), and Tiber (1963) have investigated the relative effect of certain incentives upon mental test performance of Negro as compared with white school children. The results of their combined studies suggest that for the average Negro child pennies or candy mints serve as the strongest incentive, followed by praise, followed by reproof. For the white child none of these incentives seems to be favored over another. In the best designed of the three studies, Tiber found none of the differences between the Negro groups to be significant; in fact, the colored group (as was true of the white) *unmotivated by specific incentive*—candy, praise, or reproof—scored as well as any of the *experimentally motivated* groups.

In Vega's study (1964) briefly summarized on the preceding pages, Negro children were reported to have responded, when Trials 1 and 2 were combined and no differentiation was made as to race of examiner, to *praise* (mean of 5.86 seconds), followed closely by *neither praise nor reproof* (mean of 5.98 seconds), followed by *reproof* (mean of 6.66 seconds). As was suggested previously, Negro children allocated to the "cell" combining *reproof and the presence of a white examiner* were slower in reaction time than Negro children allocated to "cells" combining other conditions. Thus, his findings would (1) tend to support those of Tiber who concluded that children unmotivated by specific incentive (candy, praise, or reproof) do about as well in a testing situation as the experimentally motivated; and (2) suggest that at least in the presence of a white examiner the colored child may be better motivated by praise than by reproof.

Katz, Epps, and Axelson (1964) reported that students in a Florida college for Negroes did better on digit-symbol tests when informed that their scores would be compared with *their own college norms* than other students at the college who were told that their scores would be compared with *national norms*.

<sup>30</sup>Two of the 19 investigators (Mazique, 1934 and Younge, 1947) included private school children. If one eliminated the private school Ss tested on the basis of their selectivity he would obtain a combined mean IQ of 80.4 on Southern colored children tested by members of their race.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

Groups of white students from a Florida university, on the other hand, did equally well under either set of instructions, *i.e.*, comparison with their own college or comparison with national norms. The motivation of these white and Negro students cannot be compared effectively, however, for the testing conditions were different for the two groups. It is interesting that immediately after the testing session the Negro students in the *national-norms condition* *cared significantly more about doing well* than did those Negro students who received *local-norms instructions*.<sup>31</sup>

It may be appropriate to note here that a number of investigators have found the educational and occupational aspirations of Negro elementary and high school children to be as high as or higher than those of comparable groups of white children. They include: Witty, Garfield, and Brink (1941), Gray (1944), Boyd (1952), Geisel (1962), Smith and Abramson (1962), Gist and Bennett (1963), Gottlieb (1964), and R. G. Brown (1965).<sup>32</sup>

Probably more research is needed before one can be reasonably certain that inferior motivation or depressed educational aspiration has not influenced the mental test performance of Negro subjects.

### SELF-ESTEEM

It is not uncommon for students in the area of race or ethnic differences to refer to the *low self-esteem* of Negroes, this characteristic being attributed to their inferior caste status and one of the several nonintellectual factors sometimes held responsible for their lower mental test scores. Various investigators, including K. B. and M. P. Clark (1939, 1940, 1950), Landreth and Johnson (1953), and Morland (1962), have reported racial recognition and preference for white skin, frequently accompanied by some reluctance to acknowledge themselves as Negro, as appearing during the preschool period. Citing the early Clark work and that of Ruth Horowitz (1939), who also reported the presence of correct self-identification of Negro children of nursery school age but did not investigate their preferences, E. L. Horowitz (1944) observed that at the preschool level children learn that they are Negroes and come in contact with the culture pattern which says they are inferior; they may either accept the

<sup>31</sup>As indicated on a self-rating scale.

<sup>32</sup>Levin (1964) found the concept *school* to be more favorably evaluated by Negro boys and girls than by white boys and girls attending three integrated New Jersey junior high schools, the Negro boys evaluating the concept significantly more favorably than the white boys.

On the other hand, Mingione (1965) reported that white rural North Carolina elementary and high school pupils were more concerned with achieving high standards of excellence than Negro children in the same grades, living in the same area, and of the same socioeconomic status. And Mussen (1953), using the Thematic Apperception Test cards, reported that lower-class Negro and white New York City boys differed significantly in their *achievement need*, the stories of the Negroes including relatively few responses that indicated striving for accomplishment and success.



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

cultural evaluation of the Negro and consequently low *self-evaluation* or else there will develop in them an internal conflict between acceptance of the cultural pattern and an attempt at self-evaluation.

From their analysis of 25 New York Negro cases, some of whom were patients in psychotherapy and all of whom were given psychoanalytic interviews supplemented with projective tests, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) concluded that a direct effect of discrimination on the Negro is frustrated hostility toward whites and *low self-esteem* (or a tendency toward exaggerated self-hatred), these effects being manifested, altered, or concealed in a variety of ways. Dai (1949), from a study of about 80 Negro youths by means of autobiographies and clinical interviews, attributed a *feeling of unworthiness* to the Negro, due in part to his having absorbed the white person's evaluation of his dark skin and hair form.

Allport *et al.*, referring to the report submitted to the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, "a fact-finding report on the effects of prejudice, discrimination and segregation on the personality development of children . . . ." said: "The report indicates that as minority group children learn the inferior status to which they are assigned . . . . they often react with *feelings of inferiority* and a *sense of personal humiliation*. Many of them become confused about their own personal worth."<sup>33</sup> (1953, p. 69) Ausubel (1956) likewise, describing the home and community environment of Harlem children, said that the lower-class Negro child inherits an inferior caste status and almost inevitably acquires *negative self-esteem* that is the realistic ego reflection of such status.

The opinion that Negroes feel inferior has been substantiated by several researches. Anderson (1947) indicated that his Okmulgee, Oklahoma, high school Ss scored at the 35th percentile on the *sense of personal worth* norms when they were tested by the California Test of Personality; Grossack (1957), having administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to Philander Smith College students, reported that both males and females evidenced significantly greater needs for *deference* and *abasement* than the normative groups; Boykin (1959) stated that more than 700 Negro college students<sup>34</sup> who had completed the Bernreuter were *less self-sufficient* and *less self-confident* than the norms group; Katz and Benjamin (1960), selecting 32 Negro and 32 white male students attending New York City colleges or universities and placing them in 16 groups each consisting of two Negro and two white Ss who were matched for intelligence, required them to work for pay under different combinations of group- or individual-reward and high- or neutral- group prestige. Combining the biracial groups, the authors reported that the Negroes spoke significantly less than the whites, that they spoke more to whites than to one another, that they ranked the whites higher than themselves on mental ability, but that they favored one another as future

<sup>33</sup>Italics supplied by reviewer.

<sup>34</sup>College or colleges unidentified.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

work companions. "These results indicate that even when Negroes are given objective evidence of equal mental ability in a relatively brief interracial contact they tend to feel inadequate and to orient compliantly toward whites." (p. 456)<sup>38</sup>

Roen, having closely matched 50 white and 50 colored soldiers on ten variables, compared their mean scores on the *Army Classification Battery*, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety, the Bernreuter, and the California Test of Personality. The only significant difference between the racial samples, in addition to the difference in mean intelligence, was *lack of self-confidence*, the Negro soldiers obtaining the higher scores. Roen concluded that further research is warranted on the proposition "that Negroes as a group, lacking support from pride in significant historical achievement, and developing in an environment of negative experiences, incorporate intellectually defeating personality traits that play a significant role in their ability to score on measures of intelligence." (1960, p. 150)

Deutsch (1964), comparing 400 Negro and white school children in Grades 4 to 6 in two schools,<sup>39</sup> reported that in all comparisons the Negro children had significantly more *negative self-images* than the white children.

On the other hand, some investigators have found the self-esteem of the Negro subjects to equal, if not exceed, that of the whites. Hurlock (1927) administered the first of the Downey Will-Temperament tests to more than 400 white and colored Ss of the same mean IQ who were in two grades of one New York City public school. This test required the underlining of one word in each of 30 pairs which the pupil thought more nearly described himself. The percentage of *undesirable responses* underlined by the white Ss was 7.3 as compared with 4.6 underlined by the colored, indicating that the colored *overrated themselves on desirable qualities* slightly more often than did the whites.

Patrick and Sims (1934) found samples of Northern and Southern Negro and white college students tested on the Bernreuter to differ in self-sufficiency. The Negroes proved to be the *more self-sufficient*, with the difference between the means of the males being significant. Bayton (1936), testing about 200 Howard University Negro students with this measure, reported that both sexes scored higher in *feeling of superiority* and *self-sufficiency* than the respective standardization groups. Comparing the mean scores on the Bernreuter of 200 Agnes Scott College and Spelman College women, Eagleson (1938) noted that the Negro students were the *more self-sufficient*, the only significant difference obtained.

Administering the *California Test of Personality* to approximately 400

<sup>38</sup>The white group was composed of 22 Jewish, 5 Catholic, and 5 Protestant Ss. It would be interesting to replicate this study but using primarily non-Jewish Ss as the white members of the teams. New York City Jewish college students have been reported by several researchers to be somewhat more dominant than NYC non-J students. It is possible that the authors' Jewish subjects may also have been relatively dominant, thus serving to induce or increase a negative self-feeling on the part of their colored team members. (For pertinent studies by Eisenberg, Vetter, Sperling, and Shuey, see Shuey, 1944.)

<sup>39</sup>Location of the schools not given.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Negro, Amish, and non-Amish white children in Northern Indiana, Engle (1945) indicated that the colored girls and boys scored higher on the average on *sense of personal worth* than the girls and boys of either of the white groups. Day (1949) reported the mean of 40 fifth-grade colored pupils in Atlanta to be at the 60th percentile of the norms group on *sense of personal worth*. Flemister (1950), testing 100 Negro pupils in a Raeford, North Carolina high school, found that their average score on the *sense of personal worth* was at the 50th percentile of the normative group. Likewise, Outlaw (1950) reported that 100 Negro rural teachers in a Tennessee county in general earned their highest scores on *sense of personal worth*, their median falling at the 75th percentile of the norms group.

Two studies which utilized the California Test of Personality were reported from Hampton Institute. The 300 students entering this college in 1950 received their highest scores, on the average, on *sense of personal worth*, their mean falling at the 76th percentile of the norms distribution. (Walker, 1951) Reporting on the results of the test administered to 330 students entering the college in 1959, Roth (1961) indicated that the colored Ss were more *self-reliant* (mean at the 72nd percentile) and had a greater *sense of personal worth* (mean at the 61st percentile) than the normative samples.

Geisel (1962) compared more than 2000 colored and white junior and senior high school students of a Southern city in reference to a number of variables, one of them being the *concept of self*. Having adopted Osgood's Semantic Differential as his measure of self-concept and using the factor loadings given by Osgood, Geisel selected 18 words having the highest loadings on the three major factors: 10 for the evaluative, 4 for the potency, and 4 for the activity factor. A column of these words was set up on one side of the page and a column of their opposites on the other, the Ss instructed to mark a place on the line connecting each pair of opposites according to the position that very closely described himself. Geisel found that the self-concept scores did not support the hypothesis of a greater proportion of Negroes having low evaluations than whites. In fact, the Negro mean scores were significantly *higher* than those of the whites on the *evaluative factor of self*.

Levin (1964) also employed Osgood's Semantic Differential as a measure of 15 concepts, including that of *self*, selecting 16 words believed to be highly loaded on the evaluative, potency, and activity factors. Following the standard procedure a column of the 16 words was set up on one side of a page and a column of their opposites on the other, the students being instructed to mark a place on the line connecting each pair of opposites according to the position that most closely described how he felt about himself.

Approximately 400 colored and white junior high school students attending two schools in Trenton, New Jersey, and one school in a suburb in this state, were tested under conditions of anonymity. All three schools were integrated; in Trenton, the colored comprised 30 per cent of one school and 70 per cent of the

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

other, both Negro and white children enrolled in these schools coming from the lower socioeconomic classes. Like Geisel, Levin obtained *higher self-evaluations among the Negro than among the white children*, the differences between the Negro-white male suburban children and between the Negro-white female city children being significant.<sup>37</sup>

McDonald and Gynther (1965) attempted to relate race, sex, and social class variables to *self- and ideal-self-concepts* of adolescents. Obtaining *Interpersonal Check List* data from 261 Negro and 211 white high school seniors from segregated schools in a Southern city, these authors reported, together with other findings, the following: (1) as compared with the self-descriptions of the white pupils, the self-descriptions of the Negro subjects yielded significantly higher scores in dominance and love (warmth, friendliness, and cooperation); and (2) as compared with the self-descriptions of the white pupils, those of the colored were *significantly closer to their descriptions of the ideal-self*.

Basing our opinion on the results of the various studies noted above, we would conclude that at the preschool level there seems to be some evidence of awareness of color differences and a feeling of inferiority associated with dark skin, but at the grade school level and continuing through high school and college there is no consistent evidence of lower self esteem in Negroes; if there is a difference, it would appear to be more likely that Negroes have a *greater sense of personal worth*, rather than the reverse.

### ENRICHING SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Hoping to aid underprivileged children in a systematic and constructive manner, several professional people—psychologists, teachers, and school superintendents—have initiated school programs aimed primarily at developing *middle-class attitudes toward achievement* (motivation, persistence, ability to delay gratification, and interest in academic studies) and *certain school aptitudes* (perceptual development, concept formation, and language development). Only those projects which have included deprived Negro children examined by mental tests will be reviewed here.

As reported in Wade's thesis (1954), 32 first-grade North Carolina Negro children, mainly from large families of tenant farmers, were given a program of stimulating and varied activities for a period of three months.<sup>38</sup> The author, who was also the first-grade teacher, administered the *Otis Quick-Scoring, Alpha*, and other tests before and after the program. She observed that the mean IQ of these children dropped very slightly, from 82.8 to 82.2.

Other attempts at stimulating the intellectual development of the im-

<sup>37</sup>The high self-evaluative factor indicating the tendency to score oneself in the direction of good, kind, clean, successful, wise, and healthy, rather than in the direction of bad, cruel, dirty, etc.

<sup>38</sup>Her program of activities was taken from "recognized authorities in child development". For review of this research, see pp. 106-107 and 116.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

poverished, however, have produced more favorable results. Gray and Klaus (1963, 1964)<sup>10</sup> found that their 22 subjects composing Group I (those Negro children given intensive training during three successive summers and in addition special work *via* home visitors throughout the intervening school years) advanced in IQ from 85.6 in the early summer of 1962 to 95 in the late summer of 1964. This increase might be attributed to some cumulative practice effect as at the last testing the children had been examined *five times* on the *Stanford-Binet, Form L-M*, except for the fact that the two control groups of colored children dropped about 5 points from the first to fifth testing.

It seems unfortunate that in these excellent studies of Gray and Klaus there could be no control of examiner's bias. Although the psychometrists were apparently not a part of the working project and had not been informed which third of the Murfreesboro children were *control*, it is likely that they knew a good deal about the project, that the enthusiasm of the various college students, teachers, and supervisors working with the experimental group aroused their interest, and that, in any event, it would have been almost impossible for them not to detect from the behavior of the child tested whether or not he was a participant in the training program.

In a very brief and enthusiastic report, Brazziel and Terrell (1962) indicated that they organized a six-weeks enriched program and administered it to one first-grade group of 26 Negro children in Millington, Tennessee.<sup>11</sup> These children were described as being culturally disadvantaged as were the three other groups of Negro first-graders in the same town who made up the control groups. In the spring, at the end of seven months of schooling, the experimental group was given the Detroit Intelligence Test.<sup>12</sup> The authors do not tell us which of the Detroit intelligence tests was employed (presumably the *Detroit First Grade*), who administered and scored the tests, why it was not given *before* the children started on the program, and why it was not also administered to any of the three control groups. They report that the mean IQ was 106.5 and the standard deviation, 13.2, refer to Cronbach's indices for underprivileged children, and cite some miscellaneous IQ means reported on Negro and white groups (not first grade) in the state of Virginia. They conclude with this statement: "An efficacious combination consisting of a direct parent-teacher partnership, per-

<sup>10</sup>Experimental Group II (20-22 Ss) improved 5 points from the first to fifth testing. In between the first and final testings the colored children had experienced two summer sessions of special training and one winter of home contacts.

<sup>11</sup>The authors specifically mention: discussing the program with parents at weekly intervals, use of a 30-minute educational television program which was watched by the children daily in their homes, and a six-weeks period of intensified activity to develop perception, vocabulary, word reasoning, ability and will to follow directions.

<sup>12</sup>It is not clear to the reviewer whether or not the enriched program continued beyond the six weeks of "readiness" up to the time the children were tested in the spring; but since the junior author was the classroom teacher (E group) it is probable that she interested them as much as possible in a variety of objects and events throughout the seven months.



## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

missive regimentation, test wisdom development, excellent materials and energetic uninhibited teaching seems to have been the main discovery of this study." (p. 6)

The last of these programs, generally called the Banneker School Project, attacked the complacent attitude toward low achievement prevalent among city slum children and vigorously attempted to develop middle-class attitudes "through motivation, drives, desires for success". The driving force behind this achievement project was Samuel Shepard, Jr., an assistant superintendent of one of St. Louis' five elementary school districts which in 1959 was composed of 23 schools whose combined enrollment was 95 per cent Negro.<sup>42</sup> Following the city superintendent's announcement in 1957 that all children *entering the St. Louis high schools* would have to be certified (by achievement tests) on one of three tracks: I (high achievers), II (average), III (low achievers), and being fully aware from previous testings that the Banneker District would contribute about 47 per cent of its 8th grade graduating class to the third track, Shepard challenged the Banneker children to come up to the national averages on the tests. Not only did he meet frequently with groups of children throughout his district—and with teachers (showing them charts indicating the standing of their pupils on tests, advising them to help the children by visiting their homes, and the like), parents, librarians, principals, and business men—but he urged them to adopt action-arousing mottoes, such as "Success in School is My Most Important Business!"<sup>43</sup>

In the two years between 1957-58 and 1959-60, the 8th graders from Banneker District accepted on Track I *increased from 7 to 16 per cent*, and those entering Track III *dropped from 47 to 24 per cent*.<sup>44</sup> That this improvement was characteristic of the city as a whole (and not solely of Banneker) may be inferred from a report of W. C. Kottmeyer in 1960, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Special Education at that time. He said that the proportion of children entering Track I from all St. Louis elementary schools had nearly doubled during this period (13.5 per cent to 24 per cent) and the proportion entering Track III

<sup>42</sup>Shepard's speech before the Division of School Psychologists of the American Psychological Association (1962) has been multilithed and made available through George Peabody College. The reader may also refer to various issues between 1959-1964 of the *Southern School News*. For warm appraisal of the Banneker work, see Pettigrew (1964) and McCullers and Plant (1964).

<sup>43</sup>Implementing his drive to help children "climb out of poverty" Shepard used many devices, such as: hanging prints of great art works in classrooms, sending children on first visits to the city art museums, and organizing "operation dineout", the meals being financed by Banneker businessmen and chaperoned by teachers. (*Southern School News*, 1964, 10, April, p. 13)

<sup>44</sup>The median IQ of the Banneker high-8th-graders in 1952-53 was reported to be 84.9, and in 1958-59 it was 90.5. (*Southern School News*, 1959, 5, Jan., p. 12) Name of test not indicated, nor standard deviation. Notice that the *terminal program*, which removed those with IQ's between 48-78 from the regular public schools, began in 1955. The removal of these low-scoring children, many of whom were in the Banneker District, produces an erroneous impression of improvement in IQ.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

had declined to less than half (33 per cent to 15 per cent). Also, during this same interval, the proportion of pupils from *Long District* (one of the five elementary school districts, and the one nearly all white during these years) entering high school on Track I advanced from 26 to 39 per cent and the proportion of its pupils going into Track III decreased from 12 to 5 per cent.

Obviously, the Banneker improvement must be considered in its proper perspective, i.e., *the improvement throughout the St. Louis elementary schools*. Proceeding under this assumption, the reviewer examined issues of the *Southern School News* between the Summer of 1957 and the Spring of 1965 for articles on this city's public schools, and has noted three items that seem to pertain to the issue in question. (1) The median IQ of *Long District* pupils entering Track I in 1957-58 was 118.3, and in 1959-60 it was 118.7; however, the median IQ of the *Banneker* pupils entering Track I in the earlier period was 109.1, and in the more recent, 105.8.<sup>45</sup> In other words, if these statistics are correct, the median IQ's of children who enter Track I from the five school districts in different years are not necessarily the same and may not be directly comparable. (2) The writer does not know the percentage of St. Louis 8th grade children who were retained in 1957-58 for lack of promotion; but Kottmeyer has indicated that 6.6 per cent of the "eight high" pupils in the Banneker District were retained in the elementary school at the end of 1959-60, whereas 0.2 per cent of the Long District pupils were retained at that time. This relatively large percentage of Banneker children who failed to be promoted would have served to reduce the percentage of this district entering Track III. (3) There was an increase in the proportion of children not admitted to Track III because of their going into terminal education.<sup>46</sup> After the terminal program was initiated in 1955 some children between 48 to 78 IQ continued in the regular classrooms and subsequently went into Track III automatically; these were children who could not be enrolled in special classes for the retarded because of a lack of facilities and therefore did not go as a matter of course into the two-year terminal high school program. By 1959-60 they were being identified by tests and diverted into terminal education. During the period from the beginning of 1957-58 to the end of 1959-60 the proportion of pupils from the city schools entering terminal education in high school and thereby withdrawn from Track III increased from 1.2 per cent to 8.2 per cent.<sup>47</sup> As Kottmeyer observed: "This should make teaching of Track III students in the high schools easier than it has been in the past."<sup>48</sup> This withdrawal in increasing numbers of mentally retarded children from the regular classrooms has no doubt given artificial support to the evidence that St. Louis high school children are becoming more intelligent.

<sup>45</sup>*Southern School News*, 1960, 6, May, p. 6.

<sup>46</sup>Terminal education for the retarded children. It consists of two years of schooling beyond elementary grades for children who earn Binet IQ's of 48-78.

<sup>47</sup>No percentage figures were reported for the Banneker District alone. In the opinion of the reviewer, a conservative estimate of increase in this interval would be from 5 to 20 per cent.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

Because of incomplete data the reviewer cannot report with reasonable assurance the effect an intensive educational program has had on the IQ of underprivileged Negro children exposed to it. A fair estimate is that it is far less than that depicted by dedicated and enthusiastic social workers, teachers, psychologists, and news reporters.

### CONTROLLING EDUCATION AND SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

May investigators have attempted to control environmental factors by selecting white and colored subjects of the same socioeconomic status, those living in the same neighborhood and attending the same schools, white and colored children whose parents were of the same occupational class, and whites and colored matched for school grade completed and age, as well as father's occupation, residence and other variables. It is obvious that the following researchers have in general compared disadvantaged whites with disadvantaged Negroes and that the former are unrepresentative of their racial group while the latter are probably racially representative.

Strong (1913), for example, compared white cotton mill children with the total group of Negro Ss tested in Columbia, South Carolina; Phillips (1914) equated colored and white Philadelphia pupils according to home rating; Arlic (1921) compared a group of white children of native-born parents whose fathers were either semiskilled or unskilled laborers with the total Negro group, 88 per cent of whom were of low status; Pintner and Keller (1922) selected for comparative purposes three Youngstown, Ohio, schools from relatively poor neighborhoods in which a large majority were foreign-speaking; Hurlock (1924, 1930) selected two New York City schools, 40 per cent of the enrollments being Negro, and the children in attendance described as of the same social status; Hirsch (1926) compared a "representative sampling" of Nashville Negro children with white Massachusetts mill town Ss of below-average status; Kempf and Collins (1929) compared average IQ's of Southern Illinois white Ss of native-born parents of the unskilled laboring group with the total group of colored from the same urban and rural localities.

R. M. Clark (1933) tested colored and white pupils living in the inferior environment of Cleveland's Black Belt; H. J. Williams (1935) obtained IQ's on pupils attending three Milwaukee schools, a larger percentage of the white than the colored being from families on county relief; Charles (1936) selected St. Louis schools in which the social environment of the two racial samples was reported to be similar; Lichtenstein and A. W. Brown (1938) examined colored and white public school children in a Chicago area characterized by physical deterioration, a decreasing population, and high rates of dependency, crime and delinquency; Tanser (1939) compared rural colored and white school children in a county of Ontario, Canada, both racial samples considered to be of approximately equal socioeconomic status and in a community where racial prejudice was at a minimum; Bruce (1940) matched colored and white pupils in a rural Virginia

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

county according to their Sims socioeconomic scores; Ries (1940) compared white pupils from the poorest junior high school district of Louisville (where living conditions approximated those of the Negro) with the total Negro group (enrolled in the two Louisville junior high schools for Negroes); Shuey (1942) matched New York University white and colored students according to occupation of father, age and amount of previous education of Ss, and other factors; F. Brown (1944) tested white children of Minneapolis living in a Negro neighborhood and attending the same school where most of the Negro Ss were enrolled.

The colored and white subjects studied by Rhoads, Rapoport, Kennedy, and Stokes (1945) were from the three lowest occupational groups in Philadelphia; Garrett (1945) compared Northern colored enlisted men on *Alpha* with whites of considerably less educational attainment; Griffith (1947) examined colored and white children of the same average socioeconomic status who were attending one school in a predominantly Negro district of Portland, Oregon; Jordan (1948) compared Winston-Salem Negro and white school children whose parents were employed in the same occupations; Slivinske (1949) asked Virginia county classroom teachers to rate the homes of their pupils, and he made comparisons between colored and white children from "inferior" and from "superior" homes; Fulk (1949) and Fulk and Harrell (1952) have tabulated the mean *AGCT* scores of Negro and white enlisted men in the Army Air Force Service Command according to school grade completed; Davidson, Gibby, McNeil, Segal, and Silverman (1950) matched groups of white and colored psychoneurotic patients at the Detroit Mental Hygiene Clinic for diagnosis, age, and school grade completed; McPherson (1951) selected two public schools in East Waco, Texas, from the same neighborhood; McGurk (1951) matched colored and white seniors in fourteen high schools of New Jersey and Pennsylvania for school, curriculum, age, and eleven items of the Sims scale; Bird, Monachesi, and Burdick (1952) compared colored and white middle and lower-middle class children from two Minneapolis public schools, the racial samples reported as not differing significantly in social status.

Hess (1955) compared the test scores of groups of low-status white and Negro public school children in Chicago; McCary and Tractir (1957) tested white and colored pupils of middle middle-class families attending the same Pittsburgh high school; G. E. Clark (1957) examined colored and white children of the same socioeconomic class areas in St. Louis but attending separate schools; Sperrazzo and Wilkins (1958, 1959) classified their colored and white subjects who were enrolled in both mixed and separate public schools in St. Louis into three groups according to their fathers' occupational level; McCord and Demerath (1958) compared the test scores of Cambridge and Somerville, Massachusetts, colored and white children from lower and lower-middle socioeconomic levels, half of whom were believed to be predelinquent; Higgins and Sivers (1958) examined colored and white children attending public schools serving the

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

lowest socioeconomic areas of a "northeastern city"; Fowler (1959) compared colored and white Detroit and Hamtramck, Michigan, school children of lower-lower socioeconomic level who had been thus classified on the basis of parental occupation, house type, and neighborhood type; McQueen and Churn (1960) compared colored and white children living in a "Western community" who had been matched for school grade, age, years in the school system, residential area, type of house, and father's occupation; Roen (1960) matched colored and white soldiers stationed in an Army post in the Southwest (after eliminating those of extremely low mental test scores) according to age, education, parental occupation and income, geographic area of childhood, Army rank and number of years in service, urban or rural background, and other variables.

Geisel (1962) separated his colored and white subjects enrolled in junior and senior high schools in a "Southern City" into two sociostatus groups according to the schooling of their parents, the school authorities having previously selected for each racial group one junior high school whose pupils were on the whole from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and one whose pupils were from upper socioeconomic backgrounds; Semler and Iscoe (1963) tested colored and white children from two public schools in Austin, Texas, selected to minimize socioeconomic differences between the racial samples; Tiber (1963), using the McGuire-White Index, identified the social status of his subjects enrolled in a "Southeastern public school system", and tabulated the mean IQ's of middle-class whites, lower-class whites, and lower-class Negroes; Wylie (1963) rated the occupations of the fathers of all children enrolled in the only junior high school in a "small, highly industrialized, Pennsylvania city" according to Hollingshead and Redlich's socioeconomic scale positions, permitting one to compare the IQ's of Negro and white pupils at either the higher or lower occupational level; Hickerson (1963, 1965) compared San Francisco-Bay Area Negro and non-Negro high school students whose fathers were employed in similar occupations, *i.e.*, all were skilled or semiskilled laborers or were first grade noncommissioned officers in the Armed Forces; and Deutsch and B. Brown (1964) compared colored and white children from an unidentified urban school system after selecting a sample stratified by race, grade level, and occupational class, the latter being based upon a scale derived from the education of the main family breadwinner and his occupation.

With two exceptions, the colored averaged below the white groups in mental test performance in all of the 42 investigations.<sup>48</sup> Average IQ's were reported in

---

<sup>48</sup>McCord and Demerath reported no essential difference in mental ability between their groups but so tabulated their results that a reader could not verify their statistics. For detailed comments upon this research, see pp. 129-130.

Higgins and Sivers secured inconclusive results, the colored being the equal of the white Ss on one test but significantly below the whites on the other. The mean difference on the two tests combined was 5.3 IQ points in favor of the white Ss. For other comments on this research, see pp. 40-41 and 117-118.



## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

33 of the studies including a total of about 7900 colored and 9300 white Ss, and from these a mean difference of *11 points* favoring the whites was obtained.<sup>49</sup>

Twenty-five of the 41 studies were located in the North, and in at least fourteen of the researches the colored and white children were not only attending the same schools but were living in the same district or neighborhood.<sup>50</sup> The combined mean difference in IQ between the 2760 colored subjects tested in the North<sup>51</sup> and the whites of comparable socioeconomic status or occupation was 7.6. Nearly all of these Ss in the eighteen studies were of school age, the whites and Negroes attending the same school and living in the same areas, many with large Negro populations.

Where Negro pupils have been compared with whites of the same occupational or socioeconomic class and where children from two or more classes have served as subjects, a greater difference has been found between the racial samples at the upper than at the lower level. McGurk and Sperrazzo and Wilkins, for example, have reported large differences between the means of their Negro and white Ss identified as belonging to the *high* socioeconomic group and smaller differences between the means of their samples belonging to the *low* socioeconomic group. Comparable results have been obtained in the studies where mean IQ differences were reported.<sup>52</sup> The *higher status* white groups averaged the following number of IQ points above Negro groups of comparable status: Jordan (1948) 21.9; Slivinske (1949) 19.8, G. E. Clark (1957) 19.7, Geisel (1962) 21.2, Wylie (1963) 22.6, and Deutsch and Brown (1964) 12.4; whereas the *lowest* (or *lower*) status white groups scored on the average the following number of IQ points above comparable Negro groups of low status: Jordan 12.3, Slivinske 12.6, Clark 8.1, Geisel 11.4, Wylie 8.1, and Deutsch and Brown, 6.0.<sup>53</sup> The combined mean difference in IQ between the 617 colored Ss of higher status and their 1504 white counterparts is 20.3, in contrast with a combined mean difference of 12.2 between the 3374 colored and 2293 white children of low status. The latter difference is very close to that calculated by this writer between the combined groups of colored *v.* white (based upon 32 studies) where the various investigators attempted to control several aspects of the socioeconomic environ-

<sup>49</sup>In contrast with a mean difference of 15-16 IQ points when random or stratified samples have been used.

<sup>50</sup>See: Pintner and Keller; Hurlock; R. M. Clark; Williams; Lichtenstein and A. W. Brown; Tanser; F. Brown; Griffith; Bird, Monachesi, and Burdick; Higgins and Sivers; Fowler; McQueen and Churn; Wylie; and Deutsch and B. Brown (whose research is presumed to have been conducted in a Northern city.)

<sup>51</sup>See: Pintner and Keller; Kempf and Collins; Hurlock; R. M. Clark; Williams; Lichtenstein and Brown; Tanser; F. Brown; Rhoads, Rapoport, Kennedy, and Stokes; Griffith; Bird, Monachesi and Burdick; McCary and Tractir; Higgins and Sivers; Fowler; McQueen and Churn; Wylie; Hickerson; and Deutsch and Brown.

<sup>52</sup>Or IQ's tabulated, from which the present writer calculated mean differences.

<sup>53</sup>Researches of McGurk, Wylie, and Deutsch and Brown (probably) were conducted in the North; those of Clark and Sperrazzo and Wilkins in a Border state; and those of Jordan, Slivinske, and Geisel in the South.

## THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE

ments of their subjects.<sup>54</sup> This agreement is no doubt due to the fact that in the great majority of the 32 researches the colored and white groups compared were of relatively low socioeconomic status.

The consistent and surprisingly large difference of 20.3 IQ points separating the high-status whites and the high-status colored is accentuated by the finding that the mean of the latter group is 2.6 *points below* that of the low-status whites.<sup>55</sup> It is probable that the home, neighborhood, and school environments of the white and colored lower-class children tested are more nearly alike in their stimulating qualities<sup>56</sup> than are the home, neighborhood, and school environments of the white and colored upper and middle-class children; but *it seems improbable that upper and middle-class colored children would have no more cultural opportunities provided them than white children of the lower and lowest class.* The reviewer offers two possible (and to her, reasonable) explanations of the above findings: (1) The likelihood that status-bearing positions open to Negroes in the United States have not required as high a level of intelligence as the much larger number of status-bearing positions open to whites.<sup>57</sup> If this is true, they have not served equally as selective agents in recruiting the most able colored from the laboring class as is true with whites. The continual drawing of the more intelligent from the lower classes would in time produce a difference in the mental test scores of the divergent classes; if this drain is not equally present in the colored and white races one would expect greater differences in the testing of high-status groups and lesser differences when low-status groups are compared. (2) The probability that the disadvantaged living in integrated neighborhoods may not be equally representative of their respective racial groups. Living in these mixed neighborhoods being more prestigious for colored than for whites, a form of selective migration may be presumed to operate, "positively" for the Negroes and "negatively" for the whites. If this hypothesis is correct, it would account for the leveling tendencies observed in the test performances of the two lower-class groups whenever the samples tested are drawn from mixed neighborhoods.

### CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The remarkable consistency in test results, whether they pertain to school or preschool children, to children between Ages 6 to 9 or 10 to 12, to children in Grades 1 to 3 or 4 to 7, to high school or college students, to enlisted men or officers in training in the Armed Forces—in World War I, World War II, or the

<sup>54</sup>A difference of 12.2 as compared with one of 11.0.

<sup>55</sup>The combined means of the *upper-status white and colored* groups were, respectively, 111.88 and 91.63; the respective mean IQ's of the *lower status white and colored* were 94.22 and 82.04.

<sup>56</sup>*i.e.*, culture-enriching experiences provided.

<sup>57</sup>Dreger and Miller (1960), holding the view that whites and Negroes comprise separate castes, indicate that they do not see how the nature-nurture issue can be resolved by any number of ingenious methods of equating for social and economic variables.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Post-Korean period—to veterans of the Armed Forces, to homeless men or transients, to gifted or mentally deficient, to delinquent or criminal; the fact that differences between colored and white are present not only in the rural and urban South, but in the Border and Northern states; the fact that the colored preschool, school, and high school pupils living in Northern cities tested as far below the Southern urban white children as they did below the whites in the Northern cities; the fact that relatively small average differences were found between the IQ's of Northern-born and Southern-born Negro children in Northern cities; the fact that Negro school children and high school pupils have achieved average IQ's slightly lower in the past twenty years than between 1921 and 1944; the tendency toward greater variability among whites; the tendency for racial hybrids to score higher than those groups described as, or inferred to be, unmixed Negro; the evidence that the mean overlap is between 7 and 13 per cent; the evidence that the tested differences appear to be greater for logical analysis, abstract reasoning, and perceptual-motor tasks than for practical and concrete problems; the evidence that the tested differences may be a little less on verbal than on nonverbal tasks; the indication that the colored elementary or high school pupil has not been adversely affected in his tested performance by the presence of a white examiner; an indication that Negroes may have a greater sense of personal worth than whites, at least at the elementary, high school, and college levels; the unproved and probably erroneous assumption that Negroes have been less well motivated on tests than whites; the fact that differences were reported in practically all of the studies in which the cultural environment of the whites appeared to be similar in richness and complexity to that of the Negroes; the fact that in many comparisons, including those in which the colored have appeared to best advantage, Negro subjects have been either more representative of their racial group or more highly selected than the comparable whites; all taken together, inevitably point to the presence of native differences between Negroes and whites as determined by intelligence tests.

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM SHOCKLEY, PROFESSOR OF ENGINEERING, STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is William Shockley. I am a Professor of Engineering Science at Stanford University. I received a B.S. degree from the California Institute of Technology and a Ph.D. from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I have also received honorary Sc.D. degrees from Rutgers University, the University of Pennsylvania and Gustavus Adolphus College.

I was a co-winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1956, and am a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Physical Society, and Fellow, American Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. In 1946 I received the Medal of Merit from the United States Government.

In addition to various publications in the field of physics, I am the author of "Human-Quality Problems and Research Taboos," an article which appeared in *New Concepts and Directions in Education* (Educational Records Bureau, 1969), and of "'Cooperative Correlation' Hypothesis for Racial Differences in Earning Power," a paper presented at the April 29, 1970, meeting of the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C. In these articles I have urged that additional studies be made of the effects of heredity, including race, on human behavior and intelligence.

I submit this statement to the Committee to be considered in connection with its review and analysis of H.R. 17846, the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. A fundamental premise of that legislation, as described in Section 2, is that increased integration of the races in school will improve the quality of American education.

In my opinion that premise lacks any substantial support in scientific fact. There exists between the white and black races a well known and often measured difference in learning skills. In addition to the data that I shall present I refer to statements of other scientists which I understand will be submitted at this time to indicate the scope of such differences. If the congregation of the two races in a single classroom were capable of overcoming these differences which I have just referred to, then there could, of course, be no doubt that an increase in integration would constitute an improvement in American education. And if it were true, as many have hoped and asserted as a matter of faith, that these learning differences are caused by the conditions which have existed in previously separate schools, then we would be forced to agree that integration could overcome such an environmentally caused disability.

Unfortunately, however desirable and humane it may appear to adopt such a conclusion, the substantial weight of all objective scientific studies made on the subject which I have been able to discover come to the contrary conclusion—that the differences which exist between these children are innate. By that, I mean that the cause of these differences has been shown time and again to be of a hereditary character which no change in the school environment can overcome. Moreover, the pattern of difference in learning skills has been shown to be definitely associated with race in the average individual.

Research directed to a more precise analysis of the origin of differences between these children, which would give the nation a scientific basis for designing the educational system to meet the needs of the students has been made a taboo subject by many if not most, scientists today.

During the past few years, I have observed that open, intensive research to test "environment-heredity" uncertainty has been barred in the United States by the inverted liberalism of many social scientists, who treat this problem like a frightened person hiding a tumor from a doctor's inspection. As a scientist it is my greatest concern that Congress and the public shall have available to it all the facts which science can determine on subjects of public importance. And no fact could be of greater public importance than the extent to which heredity controls the educational capabilities of our children of any race.

Yet, on the asserted grounds of humaneness, responsible scientists today either wholly avoid any research in this area or in some cases as I will illustrate, simply pronounce opinions of individual and race equivalence without any meaningful knowledge of the underlying facts.

In my opinion, the evaluation authorization in Section 10 of this bill permits a comprehensive and impartial determination of this issue of appropriate instruction by the operating agencies of government.

Moreover, I believe such research to be wholly humane in purpose and capable of leading to material programs of benefit to all Americans.

## A SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR HUMANITARIAN RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

My statement today is based on two postulates that I hold to be fundamental for civilized men :

(1) The truth shall make you free.

(2) The basis for a humane civilization is concern for memories of emotions stored in neurological systems of earth's hereditary sequence.

I propose the second postulate as a scientific, modern-day foundation for the moral principle formulated in the golden rule and by Schweitzer in his reverence for life. I regard it as logical to take "concern for memories of emotions stored in neurological systems of earth's hereditary sequence" as a postulate that leads to the golden rule as one theorem and as another to Thomas Aquinas' conclusion that abortion of an early foetus is not murder. I feel deep concern for the memories of frustration that will be stored in the neurological systems of babies now alive or about to be born as an unforeseen consequence of our well-intentioned welfare programs that may be unwittingly encouraging our most improvident to have large families. I take this opportunity to urge once more that this Committee request the National Academy of Sciences to set up a study group to inquire into ways to determine how many probable misfits regardless of race will be born into our potentially great society as a result of present population patterns.

To understand these problems is what I consider Scientifically Responsible Brotherhood.

## SCIENTIFICALLY RESPONSIBLE BROTHERHOOD

A few days after the assassination of Dr. King, I received a telephone call from Harold Urey who felt that his fellow Nobel Laureates should express their feelings in some organized way. In response I suggested this statement :

"We abhor the assassination of fellow Nobel Laureate Martin Luther King, Jr. We grieve at the silencing of his eloquent humanitarian voice. We enshrine in our memories the goodness of his intentions to confer greatest benefit on mankind by increasing the brotherhood of man."

My intentions in making this statement are precisely what I attributed to Dr. King in the phrasing of Nobel's will. I propose as a social goal that every baby born should have a high probability of leading a dignified, rewarding and satisfying life regardless of its skin color or sex. To understand hereditary cause and effect relationships for human quality problems is an obligation of Scientifically Responsible Brotherhood. I believe also that this goal can best be achieved by applying objective scientific inquiry to our human quality problems. My beliefs in this social goal and in the use of science to achieve it are what motivate me to make this presentation.

The three Nobel Laureates whom I consider to be the most distinguished for their decisions to set personal service to their fellow men clearly above self interest are Dr. King, Dr. Bunche and Dr. Schweitzer.

Albert Schweitzer devoted his life to personal service to man. I deem that his intellectual powers and his capacity for detailed personal observations of African Negroes are unquestionably of the highest order. Schweitzer wrote:<sup>1</sup> "With regard to Negroes, then, I have coined the formula: 'I am your brother, it is true, but your elder brother.'" Schweitzer was labeled a racist for this view. Academy member Carleton Coon tells me he was persecuted for publishing in his *Origin of Races*<sup>2</sup> scientific speculations that Negroes are the younger brothers of Caucasians on an evolutionary basis by about 200,000 years.

If these conjectures are true that Negroes are evolutionary adolescents, then to demand that a younger brother perform beyond his basic inherent capacities is a most irresponsibly cruel form of brotherhood.

To fail to urge a sound diagnosis, painful though it may be, to determine if our national racial difficulty is caused by problems of evolutionary adolescence or by environmental disadvantages is an irresponsibility I do not propose to have upon my conscience nor upon the history of the National Academy of Sciences of which, save for this area of thought blockage, I am proud to be a member.

I sincerely and thoughtfully believe that my current attempts to demonstrate that American Negro shortcomings are preponderantly hereditary is the action most likely to reduce Negro agony in the future. That the well-established sig-

<sup>1</sup> Albert Schweitzer, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, quoted in Gerald McKnight *Verdict on Schweitzer*, New York: John Day Co., 1964, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Carleton Coon, *Origin of Races*, New York: Knopf, 1962.



nificant differences shown in Figure 1<sup>3</sup>,<sup>4</sup>,<sup>5</sup>,<sup>6</sup> between the I.Q. distributions of Negroes and whites are not scientifically accepted as caused almost entirely by environmental inequalities alone is attested to by publicly-recorded views of at least two of the most recent past 24 presidents of the American Psychological Association<sup>7</sup>,<sup>8</sup> and of the very famous E. L. Thorndike before them.<sup>9</sup>

Professor Harry F. Harlow stated: "It is my opinion, and it is the opinion of many psychologists, that the average intelligence score of people labeled 'black' are lower by about one standard deviation than the average of those labeled 'white', and I believe that at least half of this difference is related to genetic variables."

I understand that Professor Garrett will submit his own testimony before this Committee.

The late Dr. Thorndike<sup>10</sup> estimates relative importance as follows: genes: training: accident—80: 17: 3 and Negro overlap in I.Q. as 10% (10% means offset of 1.28 standard deviation).

*Furthermore, I believe that there is a most valuable intellectual endeavor that might give a basis for remedies for the growing national agonies associated with Negro frustration.* The Negroes themselves would, I believe, be the greatest beneficiaries. I propose a serious scientific effort to establish by how much the distribution of hereditary potential for intelligence of our black citizens falls below whites. Furthermore, if it is really scientifically impossible to prove that there is any deficit whatever, then establishing the underlying cause of this impossibility would be, I believe, of enormous value to mankind. If the cause could be shown by new and unambiguous scientific demonstration to be that there were no racial genetic deficits whatever, then the resultant contributions of this new knowledge would probably go far in solving our racial problem, including prejudice and failure of our remedial education programs. If on the other hand basic mental differences were acceptably established, then social actions can be based on sound methodology rather than emotionally prejudiced racism.

The philosophy of Scientifically Responsible Brotherhood embraces these principles: the courage to doubt in the face of the desire to believe is the true mark of the scientist. The truth shall make you free. The proper study of mankind is man.

In preparing this present statement, I concluded that I would indeed violate the principles of Scientifically Responsible Brotherhood if, as a consequence of personal fear, I failed to state what during the last two years of my part-time investigations I have come to accept as facts, not yet perhaps as facts at the level of pure mathematics or physics, but nonetheless facts that I now consider so unassailable that I present them with a clear scientific conscience.

The basic facts are these: Man is a mammal and subject to the same biologic laws as other animals. All animals, including man, have inheritable behavioral traits. The concept of complete environmental plasticity of human intelligence is a nonsensical, wishful-thinking illusion. Let me note that in comparisons between men and animals there are close parallels to races and to breeds since both are mammalian forms of life.

The most dangerous illusion or nonfact facing humanity today is a popular belief expressed as a policy of our government through its Department of Labor and echoed by the Office of Education:<sup>11</sup>

"There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group." The only reason that I do

<sup>3</sup> W. A. Kennedy, V. Van de Riet, and J. C. White, Jr., *A Normative Sample of Intelligence and Achievement of Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States*. Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development, Inc., 1963, 28, No. 6.

<sup>4</sup> M. Deutsch, I. Katz, and A. R. Jensen (Eds.) *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

<sup>5</sup> Leona E. Tyler, *The Psychology of Human Differences*, (3rd ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

<sup>6</sup> T. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American*, Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

<sup>7</sup> H. E. Garrett, *Scientific Monthly*, 65, pp. 329-333 (1947).

<sup>8</sup> H. F. Harlow's position is quoted by W. Shockley, *Science*, 156, 3774, p. 542 and by D. Perlman, *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 January 1967, p. 42.

<sup>9</sup> For other references see Audrey Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, Social Science Press, New York (1966).

<sup>10</sup> E. L. Thorndike, *Human Nature and the Social Order*, MacMillan, New York, 1940.

<sup>11</sup> Office of Policy Planning and Research, "The Negro Family, The Case for National Action," U.S. Dept. of Labor, Ch. IV, p. 35, March, 1965.

not characterize this statement as a falsehood, and in my opinion a damnably evil falsehood, is that I have no way to appraise the intellectual acumen of its authors. They may actually believe it.\* It is unfortunately true that most scientists today lack the courage to doubt the truth of this statement—at least for the public record.

I do credit the Council of the National Academy of Sciences for saying that there is no scientific basis for the Department of Labor statement. However, I condemn the N.A.S. statement on Human Genetics and Urban Slums<sup>11</sup>—which stated as a corollary that there is no scientific evidence for racial differences in intelligence—for obscuring or ignoring relevant data. Significant research results can be found if one has the courage and initiative to look for them. Dr. Robert E. Kuttner<sup>12</sup> has had the ingenuity to extract from the massive and expensive Coleman Report<sup>13</sup> the obvious, but previously overlooked, fact that American Indians overcome greater environmental disadvantages to out-perform Negroes on achievement and ability tests.

Let me compare Dr. Kuttner's ingenuity with that portion of the N.A.S. statement that I shall name the research blinders' dictum because it espouses a flexibility of inquiry as trammelled as the motive power of a one-horse shay. Here is the research blinders' dictum: "

"In the absence of some now unforeseen way of equalizing all aspects of the environment, answers to this question [about racial differences in intelligence] can be hardly more than reasonable guesses."

Dr. Kuttner's title "Utilization of Accentuated Environmental Inequalities in Research on Racial Differences" shows that he was not trammelled by the research blinders' dictum.

#### EVIDENCE FOR RACIAL INFLUENCES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLIGENCE

An objective examination of relevant data leads me inescapably to the opinion that the major deficit in Negro intellectual performance must be primarily of hereditary origin and thus relatively irremediable by practical improvements in environment. I shall support this opinion by stating a set of prevalent illusions that I shall call Nonfacts and refuting them with a set of well-established Counterfacts. I call this reasoning an opinion and not a proof, less because I doubt its soundness than because it has not yet been subject to the test of objective, open-minded appraisal by a competent scientific tribunal.

*Nonfact Number 1.*—This nonfact is the unjustifiable assertion that Negro I.Q. deficits are caused by prenatal, perinatal, or early environmental disadvantages that permanently damage learning potential.

*Counterfact 1A.*—Negro babies during the first 15 months show no environmental damage to mental development as reported in a study<sup>14</sup> of a representative sample of 1400 babies, published in 1965 by Nancy Bayley of the National Institute of Mental Health. The 600 Negro babies outperformed on the average the 800 white babies in that they matched in mental and surpassed in muscular neurological development. Figure 2 shows, for example, that the median Negro baby walks about one month earlier than the median white baby. Negro babies are thus superior with a N.Q. or overall neurological quotient of about 105 compared to 100 for white babies, to put it simply in my own words.

*Counterfact 1B.*—Extreme environmental deprivation has been experienced by monkeys from birth to 12 months by raising them in individual isolation in a patternless world of solid steel-walled cages the chief stimuli being presence of

\*I have heard of the existence of a document that is alleged to attribute to the author of this statement the assertion that he did not believe it and made the statement (no doubt with good intentions) for political purposes.

<sup>11</sup> Robert E. Kuttner, "Utilization of Accentuated Environmental Inequalities in Research on Racial Differences," *Science*, Vol. 160, No. 3826, 26 April 1968, pp. 439-440.

<sup>12</sup> James S. Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

<sup>13</sup> Proc. N.A.S., 59, 652, 1968. The "Introductory Remarks" imply that the research efforts presented in papers like this one are "needless of opinions or hazards," "attracted by emotional attention, and reminiscent of the song stanza 'The French they are a funny race.'" The relevance to the present author is recognized as clear in *Science*, Vol. 158, No. 3083, 1967, pp. 892-893. Coupled with the words "prescience" and "sixth sense" the Introductory Remarks appear to me to exhibit a low point of national scientific leadership.

<sup>14</sup> Nancy Bayley, "Comparisons of Mental and Motor Test Scores for Ages 1-15 Months by Sex, Birth Order, Race, Geographical Location, and Education of Parent," Vol. 36, *Child Development*, June 1964, pp. 379-411.

light and automated mechanical feeding and cage cleaning. This profoundly disadvantaged environment produced social behavior deficits but did not produce any measurable loss of learning ability for mental tasks.<sup>16</sup> Twelve monkey months represent four human years.

**Counterfact 1C.**—Similar conclusions are reached from studies of inhumane environmental deprivation of children that has accidentally occurred. In one well-documented case Isabel,<sup>17</sup> an illegitimate white child, was raised in a dark room by a deaf-mute mother so that at age 6½ Isabel had no speech, an I.Q. of about 30, and rachitic physical handicaps. After being discovered and given intensive training, two years later at 8½ her I.Q. had trebled to a normal value. Isabel's case, a rare though not unique example of extreme human primate deprivation, is thus quite in keeping with the well-controlled extensive deprivations at the animal primate research centers. It is evident that Negro I.Q. deficits cannot reasonably be blamed on preschool environmental disadvantages.

**Counterfact 1D.**—The famous and uncontested Skeels study<sup>18</sup> of a group of environmentally deprived orphanage babies shows that an environmentally induced loss of at least 30 I.Q. points at 19 months was with improved environment wiped out at age 6 years. This significant finding of substantially complete I.Q. recovery from Skeels' research is in effect suppressed by its omission from most discussions of Skeels' important contributions.

**Counterfact 1E.**—A unique case of overcoming in half a lifetime a cultural gap of centuries or even millennia including a session of slavery involves a professional engineer recognized at an historic anniversary of his university by an honorary Sc.D. as one of six distinguished service alumni. His story (as I obtained it by telephone interviews) was that until age six he was an Aztec Indian at blow-gun and stone-axe level, isolated from modern civilization for four centuries since his tribe escaped from Cortez. His father explored, was captured and enslaved. After escaping he brought his family to America and the engineer entered school at age ten and the second grade two years later at age 12. Yet at 21 he had an Electrical B.Sc. and Physics M.Sc. His brother has been comparably successful. Both worked their way through college. This example supports my conviction that fantastic cultural deficits can be overcome in a fraction of one generation by individuals of outstanding inherent determination and intelligence.

**Nonfact 2.**—This nonfact blames the Negro I.Q. deficit on cultural disadvantages, specifically those involving language and verbal skills so that, as clearly enunciated as a conjecture by anthropologist S. L. Washburn,<sup>19</sup> "given a comparable chance to that of the whites, [the Negroes'] I.Q.s would test out ahead."

**Counterfact 2A.**—Relationship of Negro children's I.Q. to home environment as measured by socioeconomic class or parents showed in A. B. Wilson's San Francisco Bay Area Study<sup>20</sup> an incremental difference in eighth grade I.Q. of only about four points from 90 to 94 with a socioeconomic difference that for whites corresponds to a three times greater increment of 13 points from 98 to 111 as shown in Figure 3. The obvious inference is that if intelligence is determined entirely by environment then these facts require that Negro professional and managerial families provide a substantially poorer intellectual environment that do white families rated one step lower than semi-skilled labor. At sixth grade similar results are obtained with increments of 12 points for whites and four for Negroes associated with family status increments from a minimum of lower than semi-skilled labor to a maximum of professional and managerial. For primary grades, the results show again an I.Q. increment for whites but no increment whatever for Negroes.

These statistics indicate such a fundamental difference between the ways in which white and Negro I.Q. distributions are related to family classifications that they imply to me a basic racial or racial-hybrid difference in the laws governing distributions of intelligence. This aspect of Counterfact 2A constitutes a Counterfact to my next Nonfact; namely:

<sup>16</sup> Personal communication from M. Harlow, Wisconsin Regional Primate Research Center.

<sup>17</sup> Kingsley Davis, "A Final Note on a Case of Extreme Isolation," *Am. J. of Sociology*, 52, 432, 1947.

<sup>18</sup> H. M. Skeels, *Child Development Monographs*, 31, No. 3, Serial 105, 1966.

<sup>19</sup> S. L. Washburn, *Am. Anthropologist*, 63, 521, 1962.

<sup>20</sup> A. B. Wilson, "Racial Integration With Public Schools," U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Vol. II, 1967, p. 165.

**Nonfact 3.**—This nonfact unjustifiably maintains that competent scientists have clearly established that there is no evidence for racial differences in brain structure or intelligence.

**Counterfact 3A.**—Competent scientists, or more precisely eminent scientists whose competence would be expected to be unquestionable, are by no means thorough and objective in the positions that they take on racial questions and even on much less emotionally charged matters. I shall document this Counterfact by a set of examples.

My first example is a letter to the editor exchange which occurred when an interview with me in *U.S. News and World Report* was reprinted in the alumni journal of the Stanford Medical School. The attack upon my position by the Faculty of the Department of Genetics clearly exhibits an emotional rather than a scientific tone. Since this attack and my response to it are already published in the *Congressional Record*, I shall not repeat them here (*Cong. Rec.*, Dec. 20, 1969, p. E-10907).

My second example is also contained in the same item in the *Congressional Record*. It consists of my analysis of the National Academy of Sciences statement on "Human Genetics and Urban Slums" cited above (p. 10908).

I could document many further illustrations of the lack of objectivity of scientists in dealing with this problem. Such documentation would be too lengthy for its inclusion here but I should be quite willing to submit such correspondence and records to the Committee on request.

**Counterfact 3B.**—Patterns of relative competence for various mental abilities for Negroes differ distinctly from whites in that, contrary to the general impression, Negroes perform relatively better, not worse, on items more dependent on verbal skills than they do on nonverbal items. A significant test<sup>21</sup> was reported in 1958 on 7- to 10-year-old children of low socioeconomic status including 440 white and 349 Negro. The two groups had nearly equal Stanford-Binet I.Q. They were also given a version of the Progressive Matrices Test designed by Raven incorporating colored diagrams. The CRPM test is recognized as an important nonverbal test that is exceptionally effective in measuring the Spearman g-factor, or "general" intelligence. (A useful label might be "gentelligence.") If Negro Stanford-Binet I.Q. is artificially lowered by verbal disadvantage, the Negroes would be expected to score relatively higher on the nonverbal Raven's Matrices. However, the Matrices involve more sophisticated logical processing and are thus a measure of a more advanced reasoning ability than occurs in the Stanford-Binet. Whereas white students had on the average, as a consequence of standardizing the scoring system, the same I.Q. on the Stanford-Binet and the Matrices, Negro I.Q. was unexpectedly 9.83 points lower on the matrices at a level of significance with more than six zeros.

This result is in keeping with some statistical findings that I reported in 1967.<sup>22</sup> The statistics that I analyzed showed that consistent with Figure 4 the Negro distribution of Stanford-Binet I.Q. was offset downwards by about 20 I.Q. points or 1.2 standard deviations compared to the white distribution. For higher levels of intellectual performance, such as recognition in science, however, the offset was even greater in keeping with the results for the Raven's Matrices. These data are shown in Figure 4 together with data on physical performance. On the winning of Olympic medals<sup>23</sup> the same type of offset analysis<sup>22</sup> shows that the Negro distribution is offset upwards compared to the white distribution by about two-thirds as much as the Stanford-Binet is offset downwards. An upward offset of the Negro distribution is also found for rejection by the armed forces for physical disability. These upward offsets are in keeping with Counterfact 1A. The pattern of Figure 4 of high upward offset for high level physical performance varying towards even larger downward offsets for high level logical performance appears hard to explain convincingly on any basis other than racial genetic differences that are directly relevant to optimizing educational procedures.

<sup>21</sup> C. Higgins and C. H. Sivers, *J. Cons. Psych.*, 22, 465, 1958.

<sup>22</sup> W. Shockley, "A 'Try Simplest Cases' Approach to the Heredity-Poverty-Crime Problem," *Proceedings, Nat. Acad. of Sci.*, Vol. 57, No. 6, June 1967, pp. 1767-1774.

<sup>23</sup> "Arthur Lentz, executive director of the United States Olympic Committee, said 'the Committee resents being used as an attention-getter.' He supplied figures: In the 1964 Olympics at Tokyo, 50 of the 362 U.S. athletes were Negroes. Of the 126 medals won, 22 were by Afro-Americans." Reported by Art Rosenbaum, *San Francisco Chronicle* 25 Nov. 1967, p. 38. (U.S. population in age range 15-29 in 1960 was  $2.3 \times 10^8$  Negro and  $17 \times 10^8$  white leading to a per capita ratio for medals of  $(22/2.3)/(28/17) = 5.8$  corresponding to an offset of about 0.75.)



**Counterfact 3C.**—Studies in New York<sup>24</sup> and Boston<sup>25</sup> show clearly that changes in socioeconomic status have little effect on ethnic differences in pattern of relative intelligence for different abilities. For example, as shown in Figure 5, Negro children, regardless of socioeconomic class, average highest on Verbal and are lower for Reasoning, Number and Spatial by about 0.2, 0.5 and 0.35 respectively standard deviation units for the population as a whole. As shown in Figure 6, Chinese children in contrast are lowest on Verbal and approximately equal and about 0.4 to 0.7 units higher on Reasoning, Number and Space. These observations lead to a new research proposal given in the conclusion.

**Counterfact 3D.**—Children of primitive Australian aborigines score at about 10% to 20% compared to a reference standard of 100% for European children on six tests that measure comprehension of conservation laws<sup>26</sup> defined by Piaget,<sup>27</sup> such as, conservation of volume of sugar when poured into a different shaped glass. Evidence that the test performance deficit is racial and not cultural is furnished by the improved performance to a level of 20% to 40% for the racially-diluted portion of the environmentally integrated population that has one European grandparent or great-grandparent. The 38 children averaging 16% European dilution outperformed the 42 children of 100% aboriginal ancestry at a high level of significance as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON OF PART-BLOOD (P) AND FULL-BLOOD (F) CHILDREN ON CONSERVATION TESTS

Children Race.....	8 to 11 years			12 to 15 years		
	F	P	Sig.	F	P	Sig.
Number.....	25	17	Lev.	17	21	Lev.
Quantity.....	2	<6	<0.1	2	<15	<0.01
Weight.....	9	<11	<0.01	7	<17	<0.01
Volume.....	0	<5	<0.05	2	<4	N.S.
Length.....	10	=10	N.S.	3	<13	<0.05
Area.....	1	<4	N.S.	2	<8	N.S.
Number.....	0	<4	<0.05	3	<8	N.S.

These results are consistent with the approximately linear metallurgical model for effects of racial mixing on mental performance I proposed in 1966. (Figure 7).<sup>28</sup>

**Counterfact 3E.** Evidence for racial differences in brain structure have been reported recently by D. Carleton Gajdusek, who writes: "Elisabeth Beck of the Neuropathological Service of the Maudsley Hospital in London, and I have found unexpected variations in fine structure of the brain in Melanesians, including the size and shape of the septal nuclei massa intermedia, thalamic and hypothalamic nuclei, lateral geniculate bodies and the frontal lobes. Neural anatomical detail may vary with individual and group as to facies hair and habitus. The awareness or response to intractable pain in cancer patients has been dulled in man by stimulation of the septal nuclear area by R.G. Heath. It is tempting to wonder whether neural and anatomical differences in this area in Melanesians might not permit their less exaggerated response to pain."

#### CONCLUSION

As the pattern of counterfactuals I have presented illustrates, my chief proposal for research consists of establishing orderly relationships between independent scientific studies. I point out that in the research on existing research that I have discussed, eight of my 14 counterfactual references were published after 1964. My failure to provoke in the National Academy of Sciences any inquiry or recommendations for similar research makes me fear that the research blinders for the life sciences may now support programs doomed to fail because they are against nature much as were those supported by Lysenko-biologists in Russia.

<sup>24</sup> G. S. Lesser, G. Fifer, D. H. Clark, "Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social Class and Cultural Groups," *Mon. Soc. Res. in Child Dev.*, 30, No. 4, 1965.

<sup>25</sup> S. S. Stodolsky, G. S. Lesser, "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged" *Harvard Educational Review*, Fall 1967, pp. 546-593.

<sup>26</sup> de Lemos, M.M.M.P., *The Development of Conservation in Aboriginal Children*, Ph. D. Thesis, Australian Nat. Univ., Nov. 1966. The writer appreciates the cooperation of Dr. de Lemos, the National Australian University and the San Francisco Australian Consulate.

<sup>27</sup> J. Piaget, B. Inhelder, *Le Développement des quantités physiques chez l'enfant: Conservation et atomisme*, (Second Revised Ed.), Delachaux and Niestlé; Neuchâtel, 1962.

<sup>28</sup> *Science*, Vol. 158, No. 3082, 1967, pp. 892-893. (Note: same as in 26)



One research proposal that might reduce the environment-heredity uncertainty regarding racial differences is suggested by the findings, quoted in Counterfact 3C, that school children in New York and in Boston show characteristic ethnic patterns of mental abilities. I have heard that the drastic environmental change of adoption from a Negro slum into a middle class New York Jewish family has actually occurred for some 70 orphans. The difference in the patterns of these ethnic groups are great as shown in Figure 8. What would be the patterns of the Negro orphans adopted into Jewish families? If there were significant alteration in the ethnic patterns, it would be strong evidence against a biological basis for the apparent racial differences. On the other hand, invariance of the pattern to drastic environmental change would suggest racial differences in neurological patterns.

A second approach worthy of investigation is outlined in my paper for the 1966 Fall meeting of the National Academy of Sciences. I outlined a means whereby gene frequency information could in principle be used (more effectively than was done in the 1953 study that determined that 30% of the genes of Baltimore Negroes came from white ancestors),<sup>29</sup> to permit determining with high accuracy what the racial fractions were for siblings in a given family group. In a family with an unmarried mother, the scientific tools of gene frequencies might now be capable of furnishing a scientific answer to effects of racial mixing on potential to develop intelligence especially if significant hereditary differences should occur for the fathers of children of the same mother. Such gene studies might usefully be supplemented with morphological measurements.

This approach may be improved as a result of recent findings. Recently Dr. T. E. Reed reported in *Science*<sup>30</sup> that Oakland, California Negroes average 22% of their genes from Caucasian ancestors with an uncertainty of only 1%. I incorporated Reed's techniques into a research proposal that I mailed for their comments to all members of the National Academy of Sciences. None attempted to reject it on technical grounds but several wrote conveying the impression that they wished it would go away. The only serious professional evaluation was from noted human geneticist Curt Stern of Berkeley who found it "interesting." An individual similar proposal by schizophrenia researcher L. L. Heston of the University of Iowa has been denied support by the National Research Council without any written explanation.

One application of my new proposal would study the student body of an all-Negro college. Here, racial prejudice might well invert so as to discriminate against lighter skins. This population would be classified into upper and lower halves on the basis of I.Q. scores, scholastic achievement tests, or grade point averages. Next, the racial composition of each half would be determined using Duffy's blood type gene that Reed calls a "Caucasian gene" because the original population from which the slaves came do not have it. It is not related to physical appearance. If the lower group had the higher percentage of Duffy's gene, it would imply that prejudice was the main factor but if the brighter ones had the higher percentage, this would support the old fashioned and currently rejected view that intelligent Negroes occur chiefly because of their white ancestry.

My last recommendation is that a National Study Group, funded under section 10 of H.R. 17846, should be set up to analyze the research that has already been done. The facts on which definitive conclusions may be based may already be available, if not in this country, perhaps in Denmark's genetic records.

I further urge the Committee to require the executive agencies charged with evaluation under this bill to consider and test evidence that increasing lack of adequate school performance may be a direct result of declining population quality. Evidence counter to the prevailing view that intelligence of children has been increasing each generation has recently been presented by Sir Cyril Burt. He reported that the young people of 1914 scored significantly higher than the pupils of today in every category of the tests according to a UPI article of 22 Feb. 1970 based on a report in the *Irish Journal of Education*. These results are frightening evidence that dysgenic effects may really be occurring. This may well be the most important single cause of our national illnesses of which school problems are only one aspect.

<sup>29</sup> Bentley, Glass, and C. C. Li, "The Dynamics of Racial Mixture—An Analysis Based on the American Negro," Vol. 5, *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, March, 1953, pp. 1-20.

<sup>30</sup> T. Edward Reed, "Caucasian Genes in American Negroes," *Science*, Vol. 165, p. 762, August 22, 1969.

Can significant results be found from such research? I have confidence that the intellectual power of our nation that set up a 10-year program to place a piece of the moon in the hands of our scientists can also set up programs to establish facts in the environment-heredity uncertainty that will contribute to our national competence to deal with the problems of the city slums—but only if this intellectual power has the ability to doubt, to express contrary opinion, and to search openly for truth through objective discussion of conflicting ideas.

An ultimate accomplishment of such creative thought has been expressed by noted Sociology Professor Kingsley Davis:<sup>31</sup> "When man has conquered his own biological evolution, he will have laid the basis for conquering everything else. The universe will be his, at last." Speaking for myself, I believe man can.

#### SUMMARY

It is generally agreed that a basic principle, applicable across socioeconomic levels and races, is that students achieve their academic goals best at institutions where they are not too poorly (or well) prepared to compete academically.<sup>32</sup> The application of this basic principle to the problems of offering equal educational opportunities to disadvantaged minority groups and especially Negroes is complicated by certain statistical facts. Specifically, "... in the general population Negroes have a distribution of intelligence [as represented by scores on I.Q. tests], or readiness to do college work, that has a mean approximately 1 standard deviation below the caucasian mean. In the ability area in which the highest 25% of caucasians are found, which is the area from which the more distinguished state universities draw their students, only about 5% of the Negroes have a competitive ability level."<sup>33</sup>

As a consequence, "... there is only one Negro to every 30 caucasians on a nationwide basis who is in the top 25% of our population. . . . The result [in the 1968-69 academic year at the University of Illinois] was a difference between the means of two races that was 2.4 times the standard deviation of the caucasian distribution [—a difference corresponding to about 30 I.Q. points]."<sup>34</sup>

It is obviously basic to questions of national policy relative to quality education and racial isolation in schools to determine the root causes of these enormous racial differences. It can be disastrous to base national policy on premises that may be false.

Thus it is of utmost importance that it be attempted clearly to determine how much of the Negro intellectual deficit is caused, not by the environmental disadvantages that are now postulated to be the sole cause, but instead by basic racial differences in brain structure that control the capacity to develop intellectual powers. Evidence for the existence of racial differences in brain structure has been reported in recent research that has revealed "unexpected variations in fine structure of the brain in Melanesians, including . . . the frontal lobes."<sup>34</sup>

Research on American Negroes appears on balance to indicate that their intellectual responses are primarily hereditary and racially genetic in origin. Further research is eminently possible but is currently not encouraged and is indeed in large measure suppressed. One promising research subject involves studies of Negro orphans adopted into white families, particularly into middle class Jewish families whose children average about 2 standard deviations higher in numerical ability. Another significant study involves determining the relationship of I.Q. to genes and using blood type genes in a role parallel to radioactive tracer atoms in metallurgy.

Such research should be encouraged to create a firm scientific basis for future educational legislation. And if such research should show that our declining level of education is an expression of an increasingly low inherited learning capability of our population, then we must for the future safety of the country honestly explore the delicate human problems involved by every known scientific means. The future of our country can be no greater than the predictable future of our citizenry.

<sup>31</sup> K. Davis in *Genetics and The Future of Man*, Ed. by J. D. Roslansky, North-Holland Publishing Co. 1965.

<sup>32</sup> Julian C. Stanley, *Science*, 14 Feb. 1969, p. 622.

<sup>33</sup> Lloyd G. Humphreys, *Science*, 10 Oct. 1969, p. 167.

<sup>34</sup> D. Carleton Gajdusek, *Engineering and Science* (Calif. Inst. of Tech.), April, 1970, p. 26.

STATEMENT OF DR. FRANK C. J. MCGURK, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MONTEVALLO

My name is Frank C. J. McGurk. I am Professor of Psychology at the University of Montevallo. I have taught at the University of Pennsylvania, Catholic University, Lehigh University, the United States Military Academy, and Villanova University. I received my B.S. degree and Master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania, and my Ph. D. from Catholic University. I am a member of the Executive Board, American Institute of Climatology; American Psychological Association; and the Society of the Sigma Xi.

I submit this statement to the Committee in connection with its consideration of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846, which states in Section 2 its purpose to reduce racial isolation in schools as a way of increasing quality education of minority groups.

One of the principal and often-repeated bases upon which it is assumed that a greater degree of integration in the classroom will result in increased quality performance of minority groups arises under what has come to be known as the cultural hypothesis. Under that hypothesis the assumption is that an equalizing of environment—such as a single classroom—will result in an equalizing of the performance of the students of the minority and majority races, principally the latter. It is commonly believed under this hypothesis that the gap which is generally known to exist between the two groups in terms of school performance can best be overcome by a change in the learning environment, i.e., raising of the cultural level of the minority group to that of the majority.

The validity of the cultural hypothesis is, therefore, a direct measure of the validity of the premise which underlies the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 and the expected efficacy in terms of improved learning for minority groups which is expected to result from an increased degree of integration in United States classrooms.

I understand that other witnesses have considered the question from the various points of view of describing the actual lag or difference between the two groups and other scientific aspects of its cause and its eradication. I will, therefore, direct my attention solely to the known objective studies which demonstrate, I believe without substantial question, that the cultural hypothesis and the conclusions drawn from it are invalid as a matter of scientific fact.

ESSENCE OF THE "CULTURE HYPOTHESIS"

Few writers today deny that there are measurable psychological test score differences among racial groups. Most of those presently writing on this subject insist that these differences are not biological differences; they are referred to as cultural differences. This has given rise to the "culture hypothesis" as the explanation of racial differences. While the "culture hypothesis" has been expressed in various ways (e.g., Ashley-Montagu 1945,<sup>1</sup> and Klineberg 1944<sup>2</sup>), its essence is that what we call observable race differences are really social differences and not biological differences, and that these differences, since they are caused by differences in cultural advantages, will disappear when the differences in cultural advantages disappear.

The "culture hypothesis" has been invoked particularly in discussions of differences between Negro and white groups. While the advocates of the "culture hypothesis" have presented strong moral and ethical arguments against biological differences between Negroes and whites, they have failed to present any factual data in support of their hypothesis.

If the "culture hypothesis" has any meaning, it could be expected that, as cultural differences between Negroes and whites decreased, the difference between their mean psychological test scores would decrease. The objective measurement of a decrease in mean test score difference would, thus, support the hypothesis. It would not be necessary that the mean racial test score difference should disappear completely. The "culture hypothesis" would gain in stature if it could be shown empirically that even a small reduction in the mean test score difference between Negroes and whites accompanied a reduction in the cultural differences between these two racial groups.

<sup>1</sup> Montagu, M. F. A., *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, Columbia University Press, New York (1945).

<sup>2</sup> Klineberg, *Characteristics of the American Negro*, Harper Bros., 1944.

Reduction in the cultural differences between Negroes and whites has occurred in the United States. My testimony will be directed toward showing what, if any, measurable psychological test score differences have accompanied this reduction in racial cultural differences.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY—WORLD WAR I PERIOD

The most convenient place to begin the study of our problem is the World War I period. It was at this time that the first extensive psychological study was done; tests were administered to very large groups of Negro and white draftees who represented the entire country. The results of this study were carefully recorded and published by Yerkes (1921).<sup>3</sup>

The World War I period was also a period of marked social and economic restriction for the Negro. He was limited in his choice of residence and the choices he had were undesirable by present-day standards. Generally, the Negro was a rural dweller at this time. Schools available to him were under-equipped, understaffed, and often not accessible. In general, he was limited in his social participation, he was limited economically, and there is no question that this period was, when compared with the present, one of great deprivation for him.

During this World War I period, the psychological test scores of the Negro recruits bore a clearly inferior relationship to the psychological test scores of the white recruits. For the country as a whole, only about 27% of the Negro recruits obtained psychological test scores that equaled or exceeded the mean test score of the white recruits (Garrett, 1945). This is usually referred to as overlapping; it is said that 27% of the Negro recruits overlapped the mean of the white recruits. With this degree of overlapping, the Negro mean score is much below the white mean score.

The World War I period is, then, a basis for testing the "culture hypothesis." Here was a period in which 27% of Negro recruits equaled or exceeded the mean score of the white recruits when the cultural restrictions for the Negro were marked.

If the inferior test performance of the Negro is truly the result of his cultural restriction, then it follows that, under the "culture hypothesis" an improvement in the Negro's cultural status should be accompanied by an improvement in his test performance when compared with whites.

The cultural position of the Negro has certainly improved since 1918. This improvement has not been sudden, but has been in progress for at least two generations, during which time the Negro has achieved more and more of the social and economic opportunities that were once reserved for the white man.

What has happened to the relationship between the psychological test scores of Negroes and whites while this cultural change has been taking place? Has the Negro-white test score difference of the 1918 period reduced in magnitude while the Negro-white cultural differences were being reduced? Do the available data support the "culture hypothesis"?

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY—1935-1950

Between 1935 and 1950 inclusive, about 140 articles were published in the scientific literature of psychology which dealt with the question of Negro-white test score differences. Only 63 of the 140 articles presented statistical data, and in all 63 articles the mean test score of the Negro subjects was lower than the mean test score of the white subjects with whom they were compared. The other 76 articles were simply speculative comments about the problem, and almost totally lacking in data.

Of the 63 articles which presented data, only six submitted sufficient material to permit comparisons with the World War I period. These six articles are important; they covered a wide range of years, a variety of age groups, different grade groups, and different psychological tests. Because they were spaced over a range of years, they covered a variety of cultural opportunities. Also, they were written by six different investigators.

##### (1) *Tanser Study (Canada)*<sup>4</sup>

Tanser (1939) is responsible for the earliest of these studies, which was done on a group of Canadian Negroes and whites. Three standard psychological

<sup>3</sup> Yerkes, R. L., *Memoirs of the Academy of Natural Sciences*. Vol. 15 (1921).

<sup>4</sup> Tanser, H. A., *Kent County Negroes, Chatham, Ontario*, The Shepherd Publishing Co., 1939.



tests were administered to Negro and white school children enrolled in grades 1 through 8. All of the Negro children were described as descendants of slaves who had escaped from the South prior to, and during, the Civil War. According to the author, social and economic opportunities had always been equal for all Negroes and whites in this area, except for a few minor outbursts of oppression directed towards the Negroes.

Tanser reports that the mean test scores of the Negro children were markedly below the white mean at every age and every grade. Overlapping for the total group (all children of all ages and grades) was between 13% and 20%, depending on which psychological test was used. In no case did overlap exceed 20%. Thus this study, done some 21 years after the World War I period, indicated that the gap between Negroes and whites had not been lessened: it had been increased. In Tanser's study, the Negroes made a much poorer showing relative to whites, than Negroes did in the World War I study. The cultural advantages of Canadian life did not increase the relative standing of the Negro children to white children, and this study offers no support for the "culture hypothesis."

(2) *Bruce Study (Virginia)*<sup>5</sup>

The second study appeared when Bruce (1940) published her doctoral dissertation. In Bruce's study, three psychological tests were administered to 9- and 10-year-old Negro and white children from an impoverished rural area in Virginia. All children attended segregated rural schools. By administering a socio-economic scale, and pairing children according to score on this scale, the author developed two groups of subjects, one Negro and one white, both of which groups were equivalent for socio-economic factors contained in the scale. All socio-economic scores were very low.

As did Tanser, Bruce found that Negro overlapping varied with the psychological test under consideration, but it never fell below 15% and never exceeded 20%. Even in these deprived cultural conditions, Bruce's subjects performed almost identically with Tanser's subjects, although the difference in cultural status between Tanser's subjects and Bruce's subjects appears to have been marked. Bruce's findings indicate that equal socio-economic opportunity, even as low as it was, did not change the psychological test score relationship between Negroes and whites which was shown in World War I. Such evidence does not support the "culture hypothesis."

(3) *Shuey Study (New York City)*<sup>6</sup>

Shuey (1942) reported the third study. One psychological test, constructed especially for college subjects, was administered to a very highly selected group of students in a New York City college. The subjects ranged in age from 18 years to 35 years, and came from various sections of the country. Negro and white subjects were paired so that, in the opinion of the author, each member of a pair was equivalent in social and economic background. Thus the Negro and white subjects were of the same average age, the same educational background, and generally the same cultural status.

In Shuey's study, Negro overlapping of the white mean was approximately 18%. For such a highly selected group of Negroes, this was surprisingly low overlapping, and is quite consistent with Tanser's and Bruce's findings even though the subjects in the latter two studies were considerably lower in cultural status. Moreover, Shuey's findings are markedly below World War I findings and are no indication whatsoever that equal cultural status equalizes or will equalize the Negro's test performance in relation to the white's.

(4) *Brown Study (Minneapolis)*<sup>7</sup>

The fourth study was reported in 1944 (Brown, 1944). An individually-administered psychological test was given to Negro and white kindergarten children in Minneapolis. Brown reports that the average age of each racial group was identical, so we can assume that they were five-year-olds. Unfortunately, Brown made no attempt to equate his racial groups for cultural factors except that all children attended non-segregated schools, and this was assumed to be an equating factor.

<sup>5</sup> Bruce, M., Factors Affecting Intelligence Test Performance of Whites and Negroes in the Rural South, *Archives of Psychology* of New York, No. 252 (1940).

<sup>6</sup> Shuey, A. M., A Comparison of Negro and White College Students by Means of the ACE, *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 14 (1942).

<sup>7</sup> Brown, F., An Experimental and Critical Study of the Intelligence of Negro and White Kindergarten Children, *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, Vol. 65 (1944).



Although Brown reported no overlapping data, it was computed that about 31% of the Negro children equaled or exceeded the mean white score. While this is better Negro performance than in the previously reported studies, it is no better than the performance recorded by the culturally deprived Negroes of the World War I period. Thus, whatever cultural benefits accrued to the Minneapolis Negro children in 1944, they were not sufficient to change their standing, relative to the white Minneapolis children, when the World War I data are the basis of comparison.

(5) *Rhoads Study (Philadelphia)*<sup>8</sup>

While the fifth study was primarily directed in another direction, interesting psychological data were computed from it (Rhoads, *et al.*, 1945). The subjects were all males, Negro and white, under four years of age, and residents of Philadelphia. An individually-administered psychological test was given to all children when three years old. All children in the study had birth-weights of five pounds or over. Each child had been examined physically in a hospital clinic once a month from birth until one year of age; thereafter every two months until the end of the study. Children of uncooperative parents were dropped from the study before the child was two years old. In addition to the clinical examinations, home visits were made every two weeks by a nurse or social worker in order to keep the experimental conditions as operative as possible. Socio-economic factors were considered to be low, but generally equal for both Negro and white subjects.

Although the psychologist who did the testing reported that the Negro and white mean test scores were not significantly different, this was found to be not the case. The Negro children were significantly lower than the white children. Only 30% of the Negro scores overlapped the white mean score. Since these findings are identical with Brown's study described above, the same comments could be repeated. For this testimony, it is important to note that whatever cultural differences existed between these Philadelphia three-year-olds in 1945 and the World War I adults and adolescents did not change the relationship between Negro and white test scores.

(6) *McGurk Study (Pennsylvania and New Jersey)*<sup>9</sup>

The last study, the sixth, was done by the present writer (McGurk, 1951). A special test was constructed, half the questions of which were rated as depending heavily on cultural background (the cultural questions) while the other half were rated as depending little on cultural background (the noncultural questions). Each set of questions yielded a score—either a culture score or a non-culture score. Total score was the sum of the cultural and non-cultural scores. These questions were administered to high school seniors in various areas of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The mean age for each racial group was 18 years. Negroes and whites were paired so that the members of each pair—one Negro and one white—were identical or equivalent for 14 socio-economic factors.

In spite of the socio-economic equivalence, Negro overlapping for total score was only 28%—a figure almost identical with that reported for the World War I data. There is no question about the cultural superiority of the Negroes in 1951 over the Negroes in 1918, yet this did not improve the Negro's test performance at all.

Thus, in the 16 years between 1935 and 1950, a period of unquestioned cultural advancement for the Negro (compared with World War I period) there can be found no factual evidence to support the claim that equalizing the cultural opportunities of the two races results in equalizing their psychological test scores, or even reducing the racial test score difference. On the basis of the only studies available for this comparison, it must be concluded that the "culture hypothesis" must be rejected.

(7) *Some Further Analysis*

The above findings seemed such a clear rejection of the "culture hypothesis" that I decided to analyse further the data obtained in the 1951 study (McGurk, 1953a).<sup>10</sup> The social scientists were still persistently announcing (but not sup-

<sup>8</sup> Rhoads, T. F., et al., Studies on the Growth and Development of Male Children Receiving Evaporated Milk. II. Physical Growth, Dentition, and Intelligence of White and Negro Children Through the First Four Years as Influenced by Vitamin Supplements," *Journal of Pediatrics*, Vol. 26 (1945).

<sup>9</sup> McGurk, F. C. J., Comparison of the Performance of Negro and White High School Seniors on Cultural and Noncultural Psychological Test Questions, Washington, D.C., Catholic University Press (1951).

<sup>10</sup> McGurk, F. C. J., On White and Negro Test Performance and Socioeconomic Factors, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 48 (1953).

porting) the "culture hypothesis" as the explanation for the poor Negro test performance. Specifically, I wished to answer this question: If the cultural opportunities were such important factors in causing racial test score differences, what would be found if we compared the difference between Negro and white subjects of very high socio-economic status, on the one hand, with the difference between Negro and white subjects of very low socio-economic status on the other hand? Under the "culture-hypothesis" the racial test score difference should decrease with an increase in socio-economic status; that is, the racial test score difference between the subjects of very high socio-economic status should have been smaller than the racial test score difference between the subjects of very low socio-economic status.

In order to follow the procedure that was used in answering the above question, it is essential to understand the composition of the socio-economic groups described in the 1951 study (McGurk, 1951). In that study, a white subject was paired with a Negro subject when the white subject was identical or equivalent to the Negro subject in terms of 14 social and economic factors. There were no white subjects higher in socio-economic status than the highest Negro subject, and there were no Negro subjects lower in socio-economic status than the lowest white subject. Each Negro subject was permanently paired with a white subject so that both subjects were equal or equivalent in terms of each of the 14 socio-economic factors.

An extremely high socio-economic group was selected by picking out of the entire group of Negro subjects that 25% whose socio-economic factors were the highest. This was called the High Negro Group. In picking these Negro subjects, the white subjects who had been permanently paired with them were also picked. This latter group was called the High White Group. There were, then, two groups of subjects, each equivalent in socio-economic status but differing in race.

An extremely low socio-economic group of Negroes was selected by picking from the entire Negro group that 25% of Negro subjects whose socio-economic factors were lowest. These became the Low Negro Group. The white subjects who had been paired with these Negro subjects became the Low White Group. Again, there are two groups of subjects, one Negro and one white, both equivalent in socio-economic status.

In terms of mean test score, the High Negro Group was significantly lower than the High White Group, but when the mean scores of the two low groups were compared, the Low Negro Group was not significantly different from the Low White Group (McGurk, 1953a). The overlapping data indicated the same relationship: only 18% of the High Negro Group overlapped the mean of the High White Group, but 41% of the Low Negro Group overlapped the mean of the Low White Group (McGurk, 1951).

Thus, in the comparison of the difference between Negroes and whites of high socio-economic status with the difference between Negroes and whites of low socio-economic status, the racial test score difference does not decrease with an increase in socio-economic status. The difference between the racial groups was zero when socio-economic status was very low. When socio-economic status was very high, however, the difference between the racial groups was statistically significant, and in favor of the whites.

These data indicate that an increase in the socio-economic status of the Negro increases the racial difference. They do not indicate any support for the assumption, under the "culture hypothesis," that an increase in the socio-economic status of the Negro decreases the racial test score difference.

Other aspects of this study (McGurk, 1953a) lead to the rejection of the "culture hypothesis." Negroes, highly selected for socio-economic status in 1951, make a poorer show relative to whites of similar socio-economic status (Negro overlap was 18%) than the Negroes of the culturally restricted World War I period did relative to the whites of the same time period (Negro overlap was 29%). If the "culture hypothesis" were true, such a finding would be impossible.

Moreover, when both racial groups were very low in socio-economic status, the Negro mean score was not statistically different from the white mean score—a finding reflected in the overlapping data. This suggests that the only validity possessed by the "culture hypothesis" is when both racial groups are culturally deprived.

From the finding of this study (McGurk, 1953a) the "culture hypothesis" could be restated thus: Racial differences in mean psychological test score will disappear when cultural opportunities between the races are equal but extremely

low; as cultural opportunities increase for each racial group, mean psychological test score differences increase.

This denial of the "culture hypothesis" raised still another question. It has been stated as proof of the validity of the "culture hypothesis" that Negro test score inferiority results from the culturally loaded questions used in most psychological tests, and the inference is that the low cultural status of the Negro was the cause of the Negro's test score inferiority (Klineberg, 1944). Klineberg's assumptions can be verified by comparing the Negro test performance (relative to the white test performance) on both the cultural questions and the non-cultural questions. According to Klineberg's assumption, Negro test performance should be more approximate to white test performance on the non-cultural questions than on the cultural questions.

It must be recalled that the test used in the earlier study contained an equal number of cultural and non-cultural questions. In selecting questions for the test, a cultural question was paired with a non-cultural question when each was of the same approximate empirical difficulty (McGurk, 1951).

Consider first the racial difference with the cultural questions between members of the high socio-economic groups. The mean culture score of the High White Group was significantly greater than the mean culture score of the High Negro Group (McGurk, 1953a). Negro overlapping of the white mean cultural score, for these two High Groups, was 34% (McGurk, 1951).

The mean non-culture score of the High White Group was also significantly greater than the mean non-culture score of the High Negro Group (McGurk, 1953a), but the Negro overlapping of the mean white non-culture score was only 25% (McGurk, 1951). This does not support Klineberg's assumption; on the basis of the overlapping data, Negroes performed better (relative to the whites) on the culturally loaded questions than on the less culturally loaded (non-cultural) questions. The racial difference would have been *less* had only *cultural* questions been used. On the basis of their mean scores, however, there was no statistically significant difference between the Negro-white performance on the non-cultural questions (McGurk, 1953a). Thus, in relation to whites, Negroes perform as well (or as poorly) on cultural questions as they do on non-cultural questions. Clearly, cultural questions do not penalize the Negro of high socio-economic status.

When the low socio-economic groups were compared, similar findings appeared. For the cultural questions, the mean of the Low Negro Group was actually *higher* than the mean of the Low White Group, but the difference was not statistically significant (McGurk, 1953a). Negro overlapping of the white mean culture score was 53% (McGurk, 1951), as was expected from the mean differences. But when performance on the non-cultural questions was compared, the white mean score was significantly higher than the Negro mean (McGurk, 1953a), and Negro overlap was 36% (McGurk, 1951). The Negro-white difference on the cultural questions is significantly *lower*, statistically, than the Negro-white difference on the non-cultural questions for these two Low Groups.

Thus, Klineberg's attempted validation of the "culture hypothesis" by his insistence that culturally loaded test material penalizes the Negro must be rejected.

A further attempt to validate the "culture hypothesis" is equally forceless. It has been maintained that increased length of residence in the culturally stimulating environment of New York City causes an increase in the psychological test scores of Negroes, and that this increase is more apparent in the Negro performance on linguistic tests than on performance tests (Klineberg, 1944). This has been interpreted to mean that, with improved cultural status, improvement occurs in Negro performance on culturally loaded test material.

Analysis of the earlier study (McGurk, 1951) does not support Klineberg's (1944) findings. The difference between the mean cultural scores of the High Negro Group and the Low Negro Group was *smaller* than the difference between the mean non-cultural scores of these two groups although the difference between the two differences was not significant (McGurk, 1953b). The difference in mean cultural score between the High and Low Negro Groups was significant; however, the difference in mean non-culture score between these two Groups was not significant (McGurk, 1951). On the cultural questions, about 39% of the Low Negro Group overlapped the mean score of the High Negro Group, and on the non-cultural questions, 36% of the Low Negro Group overlapped the mean score of the High Negro Group (McGurk, 1951).

While it may be true that a sample of Negro children who had lived in New York City for ten or more years achieved higher scores on *some* psychological tests than samples of other Negro children who had lived in New York City for shorter periods of time, it is by no means acceptable evidence that the cultural climate of New York City is responsible for the differences in test score. Nor is it acceptable evidence that the cultural climate of New York City increased performance on culturally loaded test questions any more than it increased performance on less culturally loaded test questions. The data presented here are contrary to this assumption as well as they are contrary to the entire "culture hypothesis."

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Whenever the academic performance of randomly selected groups of Negro pupils has been compared with the academic performance of similarly selected groups of white pupils, the Negroes invariably score below the whites. This objective finding is generally accepted by all investigators in the field.

There is not general acceptance, however, of the cause or causes of this racial difference in school performance.

Many well-intentioned people insist that the Negroes' poor performance results from lack of academic opportunity. These people hope that desegregation of the public schools will cause the racial difference in academic performance to disappear. This latter argument receives no support from any of the objective investigations in this field; actually, there is evidence that desegregation, as a method of equalizing the opportunities of Negroes and whites, may act to *increase* the difference between Negroes and whites.

Psychological differences between Negroes and whites today are of about the same magnitude as they were two generations ago. These differences, since they are not the result of differences in social and economic opportunities, will not disappear as the social and economic opportunities of whites and Negroes are equalized.

The values that are attached to the moral and ethical arguments advanced in support of the "culture hypothesis" should not be confused with scientific evidence that this hypothesis possesses validity. Ethical and moral values are important according to the degree by which they are accepted and believed; scientific validation, however, is a matter of objective demonstration and should not be confused with beliefs or moral acceptance.

The available objective evidence does not support the "culture hypothesis" as an explanation for Negro-white differences in psychological test performance.

The conclusion indicated by all of my studies is that a difference of achievability in various school subjects between white and Negro children should be anticipated, that the differences are educationally significant, that a difference in rate of teaching would be of advantage as between the two groups, that different emphasis should be brought on different parts of the curriculum and that different types of treatment in the teaching of some of these subjects are implied for the best education of the children.

Although I have, on a number of occasions, challenged the proponents of the "culture hypothesis" to present factual evidence to support their point of view, no such proponent has ever done so. Instead, they reply with anecdotes, beliefs, moral arguments, and sometimes with name-calling, but they have never replied with fact. On one occasion, one man, closely associated with the Office of Education of H.E.W., actually agreed with the deficiency of the Negro, but insisted that this should be hidden because of the effect it would have on the world, and the United Nations in particular. The Education and Labor Committee is invited to pay particular attention to the information submitted to it from the defenders of the "culture hypothesis," and to note, in much of that information, the confusion between belief and fact. It is, then, possible to say categorically that there is no objective evidence to support the notion that intermixing of the Negroes and whites would raise the educational level of the Negro. One need but to look in the Project TALENT Report, sponsored and financed by this Government, for confirmation of the fact that no plan of racial mixing has benefited the Negro. It has not in the past, and it is unlikely to do so now.



STATEMENT OF DR. R. TRAVIS OSBORNE, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY,  
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

My name is R. Travis Osborne. I am Professor of Psychology and Director of the Student Guidance Center at the University of Georgia. I received my A.B. degree at the University of Florida and my M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Georgia. I am licensed as a Psychologist by the State of Georgia.

I am a member of the American Psychological Association, the Southeastern Psychological Association, and the Georgia Psychological Association.

I have published many studies in my professional area, including "The Prediction of Academic Success by Means of 'Weighted' Harrower-Rorschach Responses," appearing in the *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, "Variation in Graduate Record Examination Performance by Age and Sex," published in the *Journal of Gerontology*, "Comparative Decline of Graduate Record Examination Scores and Intelligence With Age," appearing in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* and "Racial Differences in Mental Growth and School Achievement," published in *Psychological Reports*.

My specialties are educational psychology and differential psychology. The latter phrase refers to an investigation of the changes in learning patterns, achievement, aptitudes, and interest of students in relation to sex, age, race and other variables.

I submit the following statement to the Committee for its consideration in connection with the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846. That bill adopts the fundamental assumption from President Nixon's May 21 statement that

"... desegregation is vital to quality education." Like the great majority of people in this country, the President here is repeating an assertion which to the best of my knowledge has no foundation in scientific fact—and is actually contrary to the conclusions of substantially every objective study including those made by the federal government itself.

But if that premise is wrong, if desegregation is destructive of quality education for minority as well as majority pupils—then not only the enormous expenditure of national resources provided by this bill but past and future spending will not merely be wasted, but may prove to have been a major factor in creating the chaotic conditions in public schools today which have so greatly diminished the levels of American education from their position fifteen years ago when the President's proposition was first voiced by the Supreme Court in the famous *Brown* case.

And in my opinion compulsory desegregation is destructive of quality education, and that effect necessarily follows when we scientifically consider the learning variations of the average majority and minority pupils—a variation too great to be spanned in a single class, a variation which requires not only a different level of learning but a different type of instruction to maximize the educational accomplishment of the minority students. Some have gone so far as to say that a different teaching language must be employed.<sup>1</sup>

Other witnesses have considered differing aspects of the adverse effects of classroom desegregation on the learning of the minority. I will, therefore, restrict this statement principally to the studies which I have myself made to determine the nature of the differences which exist between these pupils with references to supporting research.

SEVEN YEAR STUDY OF WHITE-NEGRO COMPARATIVE  
SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

Intelligence quotient (I.Q.) is a term used by psychologists to describe the mental potential for academic progress. It may be determined by dividing the score made by a child in one particular test, which is mental age, by his chronological age, which is years and months. There is a good correlation between the I.Q. test and arithmetic and language tests.

<sup>1</sup> Torrey, Jane W., "Illiteracy in the Ghetto," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (1970).



My study of the nationally standardized tests made over a number of years by the local school authorities to measure the level of achievement of students in the Savannah-Chatham County (Georgia) area led me to the unavoidable conclusion that, at all levels in the educational program from pre-school through the 12th grade, there were substantial differences in academic achievement between the white and Negro pupils. In 1958, for example, the median (i.e., the middlemost case in distribution) I.Q. for white students in Savannah-Chatham was 103, and for Negro students the median I.Q. was 81.

The children involved in this study were first examined with the California Test Battery<sup>2</sup> during the spring term of the 6th grade in April, 1954. In 1954 the elementary levels of the 1950 edition of the California Battery were used for the 6th grade white and Negro pupils. In 1956 intermediate levels of the 1950 edition of the same tests were used for the 8th grade white and Negro pupils. In 1958 the advanced levels of the 1950 edition were used for 10th grade white pupils and the intermediate levels of the 1950 edition were used for the 10th grade Negro group. In 1960 the advanced level of the California test battery, 1957 edition, was used for both groups.

Of the 1467 white and 876 Negro children who were tested in April of 1954, 530 white and 273 Negro pupils remained in the school system, made normal progress, and were retested in 1956, 1958, and 1960. The attrition rate over the six-year period was 63 per cent for the white students and 69 per cent for the Negro students.

At the time of initial testing the mean age of white children was 11 years 9 months with a standard deviation of five months; the mean age for the Negro group was 11 years 10 months with a standard deviation of 8 months. The Negro children were on the average one month older than the white boys and girls.

In the longitudinal study I made of these children following their performance for seven years from 1954 through 1960, I found there were major differences in reading achievement, mathematics, and mental maturity scores. This study showed that such differences were of the magnitude of 1 to 1½ years in the sixth grade and increased to a magnitude of 3 to 4 years at the 12th grade level.

Reading test results indicated that the Negro-white achievement differences, which amounted to almost 2 years at grade 6, increased steadily until at grade 12 the difference in reading level was over 3 school grades. This widening gap in achievement between the two groups is apparent on both vocabulary and comprehension subtests as well as for the total reading scale.

The pattern in arithmetic is the same as for reading. In the 6th grade white-Negro differences were just over one grade for the areas covered by the California Achievement Test. In the 8th grade the two groups maintained relative positions in arithmetic reasoning but on the tests of arithmetic fundamentals the Negro group was now nearly two grades behind the white pupils. Six years after the first test when both groups were examined during the second semester of the 12th school year there was a difference in arithmetic achievement of almost four grades between the two groups. The arithmetic grade placement of the average Negro 12th grade pupil was below the 8th grade national norms while the white group tested above the 11th grade on the same norm group. In other words, in terms of arithmetic skills, especially fundamental operations involving only numbers, white children in the 8th grade were not only significantly above the 8th grade Negro group, but they were also superior in arithmetic skills to 10th and 12th grade Negro pupils.

Growth patterns of mental ability placement for the two groups were also studied. The difference in mental maturity of over two years at the 6th grade (1954) was slightly attenuated at the 8th grade testing (1956), but by the second semester of the 10th grade (1958) the means of the two groups were separated by over 3 years. The same relative position of the two curves was maintained through the last testing period of the experiment, 12th grade (1960). By the time the students were examined at the 10th grade there was practically no overlap in I.Q.; that is, only one 10th grade child in the white group earned an I.Q. below the median I.Q. of the Negro children in the same grade. At the 10th grade only 1 percent of the Negro pupils equalled or exceeded the median I.Q. of the whites.

The differences in school achievement and mental ability of the two groups (white and Negro students) which these studies established were sufficiently sig-

<sup>2</sup> California Achievement Tests (1950 ed.); California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity (S-Form). Los Angeles: California Test Bureau, 1950.

nificant in an educational sense that different curricula, different standards, training and otherwise should reasonably be expected to be given to the two groups. The results of these studies, and the tests and differences described, would indicate the desirability of separate educational treatment of the two groups.

#### SEVEN YEAR STUDY OF WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS MATCHED FOR I.Q. IN THE SIXTH GRADE

Since the possibility existed that the differences in scholastic achievement described under the prior study were the natural result of the difference in measured intelligence level of the white and black students, I considered it necessary to conduct a parallel research which would take white and black students who had first been matched for equal intelligence in the 6th grade and follow the academic performance of these matched pairs through the next six years of their schooling. The study was made in the same area and with many of the same children as in the research just described.

In an effort to understand school achievement variations, two groups of white and Negro 6th grade children were experimentally matched in 1954 for intelligence and sex. In order to match the 140 pairs of students it was necessary to select the majority of the children from opposite ends of the two distributions. The white children in the equated group were considerably below the average of their white classmates while a majority of the Negro children were above the 75th percentile of their group.

Mental ability growth curves showed the records on the two matched groups of 6th grade children of the same age, same sex, and of equal initial mental test performance. When these children were examined two years later, differences were slight but apparent. When all members of the group were again tested in the 10th and 12th grades, the white-Negro differences in mental test performance ranged from one to two grade placement years.

When white and Negro children were initially equated for sex, mental ability, and school grade placement, and later examined at regular intervals of their school history, reading achievement differences were not as great as mental ability differences. The Negro child seemed to be weakest on the vocabulary section of the California Reading Test. Comprehension and total reading were within one grade of the matched white group at most test periods. As is the usual case, girls in both groups tended to read better than boys.

It is in the area of arithmetic achievement that the Negro child seems to be most deficient. Negro children of mental age grade placement equal to that of white children were unable to learn mathematical skills at the same rate as their white experimental partners. The Negro children, a majority of whom were selected from the top fourth of their group in terms of mental age grade placement, were unable to keep pace with the group of white children, most of whom were drawn from the lowest fourth of their class. Over the 6 year period of the study the rate of learning new arithmetical skills for Negro children was about 50 per cent that of the standard norm rate and about 68 per cent that of the rate of the equated white experimental group.

#### SUPPORTING RESEARCH

I understand that a detailed review will be given to the Committee by Dr. Henry Garrett on four important Government studies, Burket,<sup>3</sup> Coleman,<sup>4</sup> Kennedy,<sup>5</sup> and the military classification test scores.<sup>6</sup> I call the Committee's attention to the fact that the test data in those studies is fully consonant with my own research and conforms to substantially all other research in this field as summarized by Dr. Shuey in the exhibit to Dr. Garrett's statement.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, my research on the racial variation by subject directly correlates with the published work of Dr. Lesser<sup>8</sup> of Harvard on racial learning patterns.

<sup>3</sup> Project Talent, G. R. Burket, et al., Selected Pupil and School Characteristics in Relation to Percentage of Negroes in School Enrollment, 1963.

<sup>4</sup> Coleman, J. S., Equality of Educational Opportunity, 1966.

<sup>5</sup> Kennedy, Wallace A., Van de Riet, Vernon, White, James C., Jr., "A Normative Sample of Intelligence and Achievement of Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States," Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 90, 1963/Vol. 28, No. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Source: American Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, October 1966.

<sup>7</sup> Shuey, A. M., The Testing of Negro Intelligence, Social Science Press (New York, 1966).

<sup>8</sup> Lesser, Gerald S., Fifer, Gordon, Clark, Donald H., "Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups," Monograph of Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 102, 1965, Vol. 30, No. 4.

On July 8, preliminary results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress covering 100,000 school children were released. As reported in the *Washington Star* of that date (p. A-6): "The most controversial result of the comparative data is that black children scored 6 to 25 percent lower on seven of the 10 questions than did all 17-year-olds tested." There is clearly nothing "controversial" about this finding. It is fully in accord with all known studies including my own research.

Just how non-controversial this result is was illustrated only three days later when Washington newspapers reported easily predictable achievement test results in arithmetic and reading for Washington's largely black school system. Following a well-established pattern, Washington students scored about a quarter of the way below national norms. Ninth grade students averaged 2.2 grades behind national norms in reading scores and 2.1 years behind in arithmetic scores with a widening gap in test scores with each additional year of school attendance.<sup>9</sup>

The constant refusal to accept the obvious fact of racial difference in academic matters prompts my statement today.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The findings of my studies were part of a comprehensive study of ethnic differences in mental growth and school achievement. The populations were unselected and represented a broad cross section of sociological and economic aspects of a large county in the Southeastern United States. Our group was unlike those used in most previous longitudinal studies where populations were relatively small and considerably above average in intelligence.

The results of this 6-year longitudinal growth study support McGurk's thesis that, contrary to the position held by the environmentalist, racial differences are greater in non-cultural areas than in cultural areas. At the 10th and 12th grade levels, median scores on vocabulary, reading comprehension, and arithmetic reasoning subtests were significantly above the mean for arithmetic fundamentals. On the culturally weighted verbal tests Negro children held their own but on non-verbal items involving only number combinations the overlap between the two groups was virtually eliminated at the last testing.

When Negro children were experimentally matched with white children in terms of intelligence, sex, and school grade placement, significant achievement differences were apparent in the basic school subjects. Even for the group matched in terms of mental ability it is in the non-cultural areas that the Negro child lags behind.

With the Chairman's permission, I would like to file with the Committee, as Exhibit A, my article entitled "Racial Difference in School Achievement," explaining in detail the above-mentioned Southeastern county school achievement study.

There are several primary mental abilities—verbal, numerical, space and reasoning—found in mental tests. Those abilities vary from one ethnic group to another and from one age group to another.

The significant racial differences in school achievement shown by the studies which I have discussed, indicate the existence of a practical educational problem heretofore ignored by those who demand that schools be balanced in terms of factors other than mastery of basic educational objectives. The school administrator who is charged with the responsibility of providing meaningful educational experiences for all children in his district is not too concerned with Klineberg's explanation that significant racial differences in mental ability and school achievement can be attributed to cultural and environmental factors,<sup>10</sup> nor is it likely to be of much comfort for the school leader to know that some psychologists believe achievement variations are the result of genetically conditioned experience producing "drives."

What the administrator needs to know is how to assimilate into white school systems Negro children who, in spite of better trained and higher paid teachers,<sup>11</sup> still learn at a rate only one-half to three-fourths that of the white children in the same school district.

<sup>9</sup> *The Washington Post*, July 11, 1970, "Reading Scores of D.C. Students Below Norm of Big Cities, Nation."

<sup>10</sup> Klineberg, Otto, *Characteristics of the American Negro*, Harper Bros., 1944.

<sup>11</sup> Osborne, R. T., "Racial Difference in School Achievement," *Mankind Monographs*, pp. 13-14.

If public schools are integrated *en masse* there appear to be three possible courses of action:

1. Lower the educational standards and level of instruction in the formerly white schools to the present passing level in the former Negro schools. The net result of this would be to maintain for Negro pupils standards now existing in their schools, but lower educational achievement of white children two to four years below their normal expectation. If this plan were adopted, there would be few if any failures or repeaters among the white children because they would almost never do so poorly as to fail by present Negro standards. It goes without saying that no reasonable citizen would sanction such a plan to lower our educational standards at a time when there is a world-wide attempt to strengthen teaching and up-grade education at all levels. More importantly, such a lowering of standards would disqualify most children for subsequent entry into college.

2. Raise educational standards required of the Negro child to those required of white children and maintain the present level of instruction. This alternative would result in a 40 to 60 percent Negro failure rate in intermediate grades. At the high school level where achievement differences are of the magnitude of three to four years, failure rate for the Negro student would be 80 to 90 per cent with larger and larger numbers of Negro children piling up in the lower grades.

3. The final alternative would be a track system of levels of instruction applying differential marking and evaluation systems. This alternative would result in *de facto* segregation as noted in the Washington, D.C. example.

None of these alternatives represents a real solution to the problem. Each would result in classroom confusion and bring about an over-all weakening of the educational system. The school administrator who has the responsibility of providing effective scholastic training for all children must devise an instructional program that will provide realistic educational goals for all boys and girls regardless of race. But any single such program would necessarily fail with one group or the other—or both if a compromise were tried.

It would make for efficiency in instruction to have an instructional strategy which was matched to the different ability patterns of the different groups. The student's ability in a given factor of learning would affect the rate at which that particular subject was taught and would also affect the content and type of teaching that was done. Assuming that the difference between 43 and 58 is the maximum difference on the test, it would be difficult for children in the lower group to keep up with those in the upper group and use the same texts.

A child who goes to a school designed for a different ethnic pattern would be misplaced. His failure to conform to group norms would deprive him of his educational motivation and he would therefore not have a chance to realize his full potentiality.

If a child has a choice between a school or class that is matched to his ethnic abilities and one that is planned for the ethnic pattern of a different group, his best educational choice is obvious. A freedom to choose such a school or class is therefore not only desirable from an educational point of view, but is essential if "quality education" is the goal to be achieved.

Needless to say, the federal government—and quite possibly some of the Committee members—find themselves morally or politically committed to further integration as a cure for the scholastic ills which on the record appear to have had as their principal cause, integration itself. As each past and costly federal study reconfirms the established facts as to the learning characteristics of these children, the government continues to launch new studies in the hope that sooner or later by fortuitous chance or sufficiently narrow distinction of a test group, an affirmative learning result from integration can be shown. For all the millions spent so far not one such study has been produced.

I refer to this for the reason that Section 10 of this bill provides for evaluation of results. It does not provide any means whereby such an evaluation could be made truly impartial. I therefore strongly recommend that Section 10 be amended to require federal officials to conduct an open study, by nationally accepted objective testing, under the direction of a committee equally representing both points of view, to find out once and for all whether optimum education of minority students will be achieved by increased integration. That could prove to be the greatest service that Congress could perform in raising the standards of American education.