

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

- Devlin, B., Fienberg, S. E., Resnick, D. P., & Roeder, K. (1993). *Intelligence, genes, and success: scientists respond to the Bell Curve*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.

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: jbc Carroll@email.unc.edu

PII: S0160-2896(01)00092-7

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

Richard R. Valencia and Lisa A. Suzuki (2001). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 0-7619-1230-4 (hbk), pp. xxvii+416

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, researchers, 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.

Arthur R. Jensen
30 Canyon View Drive
Orinda, CA 94563-1504, USA
Fax: +1-707-279-8221
E-mail address: nesnejanda@aol.com