Common ground and differences

William T. Dickens and James R. Flynn

Forthcoming: *Psychological Science*

Rushton and Jensen concede that the magnitude of the black/white IQ gap is not immutable but could have narrowed by as much as 3.44 IQ points or 0.23 white SDs. They concur that the black/white IQ gap rises with age. Using Shuey's 1966 data, Jensen (1998) estimates: 0.70 SDs in early childhood; 1.00 SDs in middle childhood; 1.20 SDs in early adulthood. Our current estimates: 0.31 SDs (age 4); 0.63 SDs (age 12); and 0.87 SDs (age 18). Comparison of their pre-rise values and our post-rise values yield a black IQ gain of 0.33 to 0.39 SDs. This equals 5.0 to 5.5 IQ points, close to the mid-point of our estimate that blacks gained 4 to 7 points. Therefore, unless they question our current values, our main contention is also conceded. All that is at stake is the timing of the steps by which blacks progressed from Jensen's values to ours, something we grant to be problematic. And yet, Rushton and Jensen never challenge our values for current black IQ.

They do argue that we exaggerate the qualitative difference between samples we consider suspect and samples we favor, namely, those used to standardize the WISC, WAIS, Stanford-Binet, and AFQT. They note that the latter are selected to be representative of Americans in general but not the black and white sub-populations. First, this is untrue of the sample used to norm the AFQT, one designed to give the military accurate data on the performance of various ethnic groups. Second, the samples we reject all have the same defect plus a host of others. To set the record straight, when we argue that the 1983 K-ABC sample suffered from too great variance, that argument (scorned) is not ours but borrowed from Jensen (1984). Also, with

respect to the Woodcock-Johnson, the following sentence should have been included in our appendix: Analysis of the sub-sample of the research sample done by Wicherts (2005) shows that it is not representative of the US population and that the sub-sample with data on all tests is a non-random subset of the research sample.

Rushton and Jensen call for values based on the totality of the evidence. Our Appendix B anticipates this objection by analyzing the samples we think flawed. We show that every one of these confirms our projections for black IQ in 2002. Rushton and Jensen do not dispute this contention. Rather, they cite Roth et al (2001) who found a 1.1 SD gap based on 6,246,729 individuals from military, corporate, and higher education samples. This massive meta-analysis does not challenge our main contention. Treating GRE (Graduate Record Exam) results as a single source, almost 60 % of the studies analyzed refer to pre-1980 data. As for the 1.1 SD gap, Roth et al's median age would not be under 24. Our data give a current IQ for blacks age 24 of 83.4 or exactly 1.1 SDs below whites.

Ruston and Jensen quote Roth et al as concluding that there has been no black gain. However, Roth et all (2001, p. 323) explicitly state that they " . . . were unable to assess the influence of time on standardized ethnic group differences." Instead, they direct the reader to three studies: Lynn (1998) which is a study of vocabulary scores and not IQ; Wonderlic data already analyzed in Appendix B; and Nyborg and Jensen (2000) which does not attempt to measure trends over time and which Jensen himself does not cite against us. If Ruston and Jensen wish to make a case based on these three studies, they should do so. To cite Roth et al's opinion of them is simply an appeal to authority. To imply that it is based on the data Roth et al analyzed is unhelpful.

Rushton and Jensen apply "simple arithmetic" to our Table A1 and derive a pre-rise value for black IQ of 86.44 and a post-rise value of 89.88. Table A1 contains raw data that must be adjusted, particularly for the fact that the data sets range from covering a full 30 years (the WISC) to covering only 16 years (the SB). It is fortunate we have no data set covering a period of one year, or simply averaging it in would tend to drag gains down towards zero. However, note the values Rushton and Jensen derive. For circa 1999, they put black IQ at 89.88 for subjects whose median age is 15, higher than our 2002 projection for that age. If they believe in that value, the fact that black IQ was only at 86.44 some 20 years earlier is irrelevant. They know that Jensen's value for age 15 some 50 years ago was 1.1 SDs or 83.5. Once again, questioning values for dates intermediate between 1960 and the present day is beside the point -- so long as they let our current values stand.

Their points against our methods appendix are trivial. Our projection does not cover more years than the data analyzed: the WISC data cover the whole period of 1972 to 2002. The other data terminate in 1995, 1997, and 2001 respectively. If anyone prefers actual values to projections, see Figure 2. The terminal values afforded by the actual data average at 87.55 for age 15 and the terminal dates average at 1999. At the earlier age of 12, black IQ would stand at 89.36. This is only 0.709 SDs below the white mean: we have no great objection if that value is agreed for 1999.

Rushton and Jensen say we side step the issue that IQ gains over time are not *g* gains (general intelligence gains). In Table 2, we meet this issue head-on by calculating the *g* gap between black and white for each standardization sample and showing has it has narrowed in tandem with the IQ gap. They seem to concede the validity of this in their emphasis that at any given time, the black/white IQ gap is factor invariant.

No recent data poses a serious challenge to our current estimates for black IQ: 95.4 at age 4, 90.5 at age 12, 87.0 at age 18. Today, the IQ gap between young blacks and whites is far less than 1.1 SDs. The immutability of the black/white IQ gap is a fiction and must be deleted from any list of arguments that genes play a causal role.

References

Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Lynn, R. (1998). Has the Black-White intelligence difference in the United States been narrowing over time? *Personality and Individual Differences, 20*, 999-1002.

Nyborg, H., & Jensen, A. R. (2000). Black-white differences on psychometric tests: Spearman's hypothesis tested on American armed services veterans. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*, 593-599.

Roth, P. L., Bevier, C. A., Bobko, P., Switzer III, F. S., & Tyler, P. (2001). Ethnic group differences in cognitive ability in employment and educational settings: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 54,* 297-330.