

Commentary

Common Ground and Differences

William T. Dickens¹ and James R. Flynn²¹*Economic Studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, and* ²*Department of Political Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*

Rushton and Jensen (2006, this issue) 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 standard deviations. They concur that the Black-White IQ gap rises with age. Using Shuey's 1966 data, Jensen (1998) estimated a gap of 0.70 standard deviations in early childhood, 1.00 standard deviations in middle childhood, and 1.20 standard deviations in early adulthood. Our current estimates are 0.31 (age 4), 0.63 (age 12), and 0.87 (age 18). Comparison of Jensen's pre-1966 values and our current values yields a Black IQ gain of 0.33 to 0.39 standard deviations. This equals 5.0 to 5.5 IQ points, close to the midpoint of our estimate that Blacks gained 4 to 7 points. Therefore, unless Rushton and Jensen 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 Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS), Stanford-Binet (SB), and Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT). They note that the samples we used were selected to be representative of Americans in general, but not the Black and White subpopulations. First, this is untrue of the sample used to norm the AFQT, as that sample is designed to give the military accurate data on the performance of various ethnic groups. Second, the samples we rejected all have the same defect, plus a host of others. To set the record straight, our argument (scorned) that the 1983 sample for the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children suffered from excessive variance is in fact not ours, but borrowed from Jensen (1984). Also, with respect to the Woodcock-Johnson, the following sentence should have been included in our Appendix B (Dickens & Flynn, 2006, this issue): Wicherts's (2005) analysis of the sub-

sample of the research sample shows that it is not representative of the U.S. population and that the subsample with data on all tests is a nonrandom subset of the research sample.

Rushton and Jensen call for values based on the totality of the evidence. We anticipated this objection by analyzing the samples we think flawed. These analyses are contained in our Appendix B, and every one of them confirms our projections for Black IQ in 2002. Rushton and Jensen do not dispute this contention. Rather, they cite Roth, Bevier, Bobko, Switzer, and Tyler (2001), who found a gap of 1.1 standard deviations based on 6,246,729 individuals from military, corporate, and higher-education samples. This massive meta-analysis does not challenge our main contention. If GRE (Graduate Record Exam) results are treated as a single source, almost 60% of the studies Roth et al. analyzed refer to pre-1980 data. As for the gap of 1.1 standard deviations, the median age in the meta-analysis of Roth et al. would not be under 24. Our Figure 3 projected to age 24.7 gives a current IQ for Blacks of 83.5, or exactly 1.1 standard deviations below Whites.

Rushton and Jensen quote Roth et al. (2001) as concluding that there has been no Black gain. However, Roth et al. explicitly stated that their own data left them "unable to assess the influence of time on standardized ethnic group differences" (p. 323). Instead, they directed the reader to three sources that they thought might be illuminating: Lynn (1998), which is a study of vocabulary scores and not IQ; Wonderlic data, which we have already analyzed in Appendix B; and Nyborg and Jensen (2000), in which there is no attempt to measure trends over time and which Jensen himself has not cited against us. If Rushton and Jensen wish to make a case based on analysis of these three sources, they should do so. Citing the conclusion of Roth et al. is simply an appeal to authority, and to imply that the conclusion of Roth et al. is based on the data that they analyzed is unhelpful.

Rushton and Jensen say they have applied simple arithmetic to our Table A1 and derived a prerise value for Black IQ of 86.44 and a postrise 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 1 year, or simply averaging it in would tend to drag gains down toward zero.

Address correspondence to James R. Flynn, Department of Political Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, e-mail: jim.flynn@stonebow.otago.ac.nz.

As for their postrise estimate, the subjects in Table A1 (the subjects Rushton and Jensen averaged) have a median age of 15. Putting current Black IQ at 89.88 for that age would actually give a higher value than we propose. Our Figure 3 gives a projection for age 15 of 83.9 circa 2002. If they believe in their postrise value, the fact that Black IQ was only at 86.44 some 20 years earlier is irrelevant. Jensen (1998) himself has given a prerise value for age 15 of 1.1 standard deviations, or 83.5, a value dating from some 40 to 50 years ago. Taken with Rushton and Jensen's postrise value of 89.88, this puts Black IQ gains on Whites at 6.38 points. This is somewhat higher than our own estimate.

We wish to underscore our main point: Questioning values for dates intermediate between 1960 and the present day is irrelevant—just so long as they let our current values stand.

Their points against our methodology are trivial. Our projection in Figure 3 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. Anyone who prefers actual values to projections may wish to look at our Figure 2. The terminal values afforded by the actual data average 87.55 for age 15, and the terminal dates average 1999. At the younger age of 12, Black IQ would stand at 89.36. This is only 0.709 standard deviations below the White mean. We have no great objection if that value is agreed to for 1999.

Rushton and Jensen say we sidestep the issue that IQ gains over time are not g gains (i.e., gains in general intelligence). In Table 2, we meet this issue head on by presenting data on the g gaps between Blacks and Whites in the WISC and WAIS standardization samples. Those data show that the g gap between Blacks and Whites has narrowed in tandem with the IQ gap. The method is simple: You compare the g gap between the races at one time with the g gap between the races at a later time and see if the gap has narrowed. Rushton and Jensen seem to concede the validity of this method in their reply: They emphasize that at any given time, the Black-White IQ gap is factor invariant. In other words, at any given time, you can derive a

racial difference that measures how Blacks and Whites differ for factors like g .

No recent data pose a serious challenge to our current estimates for Black IQ: 95.4 at age 4, 90.5 at age 12, and 87.0 at age 18. Today, the IQ gap between young Blacks and Whites is far less than 1.1 standard deviations. The immutability of the Black-White IQ gap is a fiction and must be deleted from any body of evidence that genes play a causal role in producing this gap.

REFERENCES

- Dickens, W.T., & Flynn, J.R. (2006). Black Americans reduce the racial IQ gap: Evidence from standardization samples. *Psychological Science, 17*, 913–920.
- Jensen, A.R. (1984). The black-white difference on the K-ABC: Implications for future tests. *Journal of Special Education, 18*, 377–408.
- 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, F.S., III, & Tyler, P. (2001). Ethnic group differences in cognitive ability in employment and educational settings: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 297–330.
- Rushton, J.P., & Jensen, A.R. (2006). The totality of available evidence shows the race IQ gap still remains. *Psychological Science, 17*, 921–922.
- Wicherts, J.M. (2005). [Comparison of White and Black groups in the U.S. research samples for the Woodcock-Johnson-R and the Woodcock-Johnson-III]. Unpublished raw data.

(RECEIVED 3/29/06; ACCEPTED 3/29/06;
FINAL MATERIALS RECEIVED 4/18/06)