of the nature and origins of social inequality and will repay careful study by psychologists, even if they incline (as some doubtless will) to disagree with the book’s main tenets.

References


John B. Carroll
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
409 N. Elliott Road Chapel Hill, NC 27514-7628, USA
Tel.: +1-919-929-6587
Fax: +1-919-962-2537
E-mail address: jbcarrol@email.unc.edu

PII: S0160-2896(01)00092-7

Intelligence Testing and Minority Students: Foundations, Performance Factors, and Assessment Issues

The authors state that their book, the third volume in the ‘Racial and Ethnic Minority Psychology Series,’ is intended to “meet the needs of scholars, researches, students in graduate courses, and testing personnel,” and they note that there are over 1000 references (the book’s most valuable feature, in this reviewer’s opinion). The 10 chapters focus on topics germane to cognitive abilities viewed from a “minority psychology” perspective: the history and ideology of the testing movement, multicultural perspectives of intelligence and measurement, socioeconomic status (SES), home environment, test bias, heredity, special education, the gifted, a multicultural review of cognitive tests, and future directions toward nondiscriminatory assessment.

The book’s dominant tone is sounded in a Preface by Ernesto Bernal, referring to the “gatekeeping potential” of IQ tests, which “was not lost on politicians, segregationists, and ideologues.”

The most contentious chapters concern test bias and heredity. Culture, SES, and caste are viewed as the chief explanations of test score differences between social classes and racial or ethnic groups. A review of 62 bias studies shows 18 findings of bias versus 42 findings of “nonbias.” These box scores are based on four different criteria of bias, of which content
validity is a purely subjective judgement and predictive validity more often than not shows
test scores overpredicting the criterion, i.e., intercept bias favoring the lower-scoring minority
group. The 62 studies reviewed are hardly representative of the published empirical literature
on bias, and there are no references to the two-volume work on test bias commissioned by the
National Academy of Sciences (Wigdor & Garner, 1982) or the studies by Hunter and
Schmidt, the leading contemporary researchers on predictive bias. The authors also proposed
their own statistical test of predictive bias, declaring it to be more sensitive than the usual
indicators based on group differences in the regression of criterion measures on test scores.
They assume the existence of bias if the mean difference between the major and minor groups
on the test is significantly larger than their difference on the criterion. Of course, the groups’
difference on the criterion must necessarily be smaller than their difference on the test unless
there is a perfect correlation between test scores and criterion measures. The authors
repeatedly note that SES was not controlled in various studies of test score differences
between certain ethnic groups and urge that many other environmental variables should also
be controlled. But this is the “partialling fallacy” and it can prove nothing about causation.
Adoption studies show that SES is more an effect than a cause of individual or group
differences in psychometric $g$. Also claimed as a causal factor in IQ is “caste,” defined as
“involuntary immigrants” or their descendants. In the United States, this is virtually
synonymous with African-American—hardly a suitable variable to be statistically controlled
in studies of the white–black IQ difference.

The chapter on heredity is an easy target for critics with some background in behavioral
genetics. Although several pages are devoted to blasting The Bell Curve, only one short
paragraph is allowed for the more relevant transracial adoption study by Scarr et al. (1976) and
its important 10-year follow-up study (1992). The latter receives only one sentence, without
even a hint of its essential finding, which is crucial to the main issue introduced by the authors.

My chief criticism of this book, however, is not its heterodoxy or dissent from generally
accepted findings, but the didactic inadequacy of its superficial presentation of central issues.
The exposition much too often consists of brief quotations or summary statements by
different writers on opposite sides of an issue, a capsule claim by one writer being followed
by another’s capsule contradiction, without evidence, analysis, or argument on either side that
would help readers evaluate the critical issues. Hence, the sum result is not even wrong and
peculiarly falls beneath serious criticism. The science, rather than the ideology, of the issues
addressed by this book will not be advanced by appeal to authority but by empirical evidence,
quantitative analysis, and logical reasoning.