Summer 1949

Racial Differences in Intellegence Between Whites and Negroes of Similar Social and Economic Status in Saline and Graham Counties

William F. Kluge
Fort Hays Kansas State College

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN INTELLIGENCE BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES OF
SIMILAR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS IN SALINE AND GRAHAM COUNTIES

being

A thesis presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the Fort Hays Kansas State College in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science

by

William F. Kluge, A. B.

Fort Hays Kansas State College

Date _July 20, 1949_   Approved _H. B. Reed_
Major Professor

F. Jacbertso
Chairman Graduate Council

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to Dr. H. B. Reed,
under whose direction this thesis was prepared, for his helpful
suggestions and constructive criticism, and to Dr. F. B. Streeter,
for his willingness to obtain literature not immediately available
to the writer, and for his willing cooperation at all times.
Acknowledgment must be made to Mr. Charles E. Hawkes, Superin-
tendent of Schools at Salina, Mr. D. C. Easter, principal of
Dunbar Grade School, Miss Agnes Entz, principal of Hawthorne
Grade School, Mr. B. Brookshire, Superintendent of Schools at
Hill City, Mrs. Edna Goss, Hill City Grade School principal,
and Mr. Cecil Smith, principal of Bogue High School, for their
cooperation and willingness to offer their help as well as the
time consumed in testing and interviewing the children. To
Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Mueller, who so unhesitantly offered their
time and hospitality while working in Salina, and to my wife,
who has worked long in scoring and tabulating data, special
appreciation is given.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SAMPLES OF TESTS USED IN STUDY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF RACIAL DIFFERENCES
IN INTELLIGENCE BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES
OF SIMILAR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS
IN SALINE AND GRAHAM COUNTIES

Up to the beginning of the twentieth century there was hardly a voice raised against the statement that there was a definite mental difference between races, the same as there was a difference in the physical aspects. All this was taken for granted and not much else was done about it. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, however, and with the total amount of research that has been done on the problem, there has been a decrease in the degree of certainty with which it is possible to hold such a view.

In working with such a topic as this, one is apt to run across several difficulties or problems.

The first difficulty that we are most likely to encounter is that very seldom are we able to carry out psychological studies on what we term pure races. It is true that we could carry out studies on black and white races here in the United States, but even then it would be difficult to make sure that we are testing two "pure" races; the reason being due to the large number of intermarriages in this country. "Time" magazine quotes the Negro picture magazine "Ebony" as follows: "The elusiveness of the U. S. color line is so great that possibly as many as 5,000,000 people with a 'determinable part' of Negro blood are now 'passing' as whites".[1] Thus it is easy

---

1. Time Magazine, LI (February 16, 1948), 25.

to see how difficult it is to make a study of pure races.

The language used may also present difficulties in studies such as these, especially in certain areas. This difficulty would tend to diminish, however, as the white and Negro races intermingle more with one another.

Still another difficulty enters in the sampling used in the study. That is, does the group used in the experiment actually portray the group that is to be represented? Unfair samplings are too often used as a basis for arriving at conclusions on an extensive topic such as this particular one.

Another problem that makes it difficult for us to measure races on an equal basis is that of different historical and economic backgrounds. The above two mentioned factors have brought about a social structure in which persons of different heritage are subjected to entirely different environmental influences which last throughout their lives. It is these two factors, I think, that produce the biggest obstacles in the comparison of race differences. We know from our own experiences that, as a general rule, Negroes usually have a much lower standard of living, in the North as well as in the South. This lower standard often prevents the proper education at home and forces Negro children to drop out of school earlier than usual to help support themselves and their families; or, being deprived of occupational opportunities, they drop out of school for the simple reason that educated or not, the average Negro is still forced to accept menial labor which may well be accomplished with only a primary education or less.

It would seem, then, that since there is such a difference between the white and Negro social and economic levels, the difference in intelligence between the two races might disappear, or if not, the gap between the two would be narrowed to a certain degree, if the two groups were equated as to social and economic status.

It is the purpose of this paper to discover whether or not the intelligence of the Negro is equal to that of the whites when the two groups are placed on an equal social and economic status.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The amount of work that has been done concerning the differences between races in regard to intelligence is far too numerous to enable the writer to mention all of it here.

The biggest share of the work that has been done on this question stems from about 1920 up to the present date.

The largest amount of data that has been collected on this question has come about from the result of the army tests given during World War I.

In connection with this data, the work done by Montagu[1] will be mentioned here.

Included in Montagu's subjects were the following groups of men:

TABLE I.   DIFFERENT GROUPS INCLUDED IN MONTAGU'S STUDY[2]

Group I White:	The White Draft of the United States at Large.
Group II White:	Additional White Draft.
Group IV Negro:	The Negro Draft of the United States at Large.
Group V Negro:	Additional Negro Draft from the Northern States.

1. M. F. Ashley Montagu, "Intelligence of Northern Negroes and Southern Whites In the First World War", The American Journal of Psychology, LVIII (April, 1945), 161-188.

2. M. F. Ashley Montagu, ibid., p. 162.

Three types of tests were given to the men in service. Army Alpha, Army Beta, and Individual tests were administered. The Alpha was given to all men who were not eliminated for illiteracy. The highest number of points possible on this particular test was two hundred twelve. The Beta test was given to most of the men who had been eliminated from the Alpha because of relative illiteracy, and to those men who scored less than one hundred on the Alpha examination. The highest possible number of points on the Beta test was one hundred eighteen. No mention was made of the results of the individual tests.

The method used was to compute the medians for all the groups mentioned in order to determine how the scores of northern Negroes compared with those of southern whites.

For the Negro, data were available from fourteen southern states, nine northern states, and the District of Columbia. This included 25,575 Negroes from the twenty-three states and the District of Columbia. Data were available on the whites from all forty-eight states and the District of Columbia. The number of whites came to a total of 55,838.

Montagu's method consisted of taking the available number of men of a certain state and comparing them with the available number from another state, without regard to comparative size of the groups.

Using this method, he discovered that the median score for the Negroes on the Beta test was 19.34. For the whites on the same test, it was 40.70.

Within the Negro group, however, it was discovered that those Negroes from the southern states and the District of Columbia had a median of 17.58. On the other hand, those Negroes from the northern states had a median score of 32.72. For the whites on the same test, it was found that those from the southern states fell into the lower half of the order of scores for the forty-eight states and the District of Columbia. Altogether, then, there were twenty-four states in which the median Beta score of whites was lower than the second highest median Beta score achieved by the Negroes.

For the Alpha test, approximately the same results were obtained. With the exception of the Negroes from Virginia and the District of Columbia, the lowest scores were made by the Negroes from the southern states. The Negroes from the South had a median score of 21.31, while those from the North had a median score of 39.90. The same again holds true for the whites. All fourteen of the Southern states fell in the lower rank order of scores.

On all the tests, and in practically every state, the whites did better than the Negroes; the exception being on the Beta tests where the Negroes of Kentucky, with a score of 17.20, did better than the whites from the same state with a score of 12.30, and Ohio, where the Negroes obtained a score of 39.65 on the Beta test, while the whites' score from the same state was 35.45. For the rest, however, the whites always did better than the Negroes from the same state.

Montagu concludes, then,

That the evidence indicates that there exists no significant
inherent psychical differences between Negroes and whites;
hence differences in performance on these tests between Negroes
and whites, whether intra-state or inter-state, are best ex-
plained as due to the action upon native development of dif-
ferences in socio-economic history. And that is the conclu-
sion which may most legitimately be drawn from the analysis
of the data present in this paper. Northern whites and Negroes
did better on these tests than southern whites and Negroes
because socio-economic conditions in the North were, when the
tests were made in 1917, superior to those which prevailed in
the South for both Negroes and whites. For the same reason,
it may be assumed that Negroes from certain northern states
did better than whites from certain other states in addition
to those from the South.[3]

Garrett,[4] writing in the same Journal as that reporting

Montagu, contends that Montagu did not understand the sampling prob-

lems in the army data and that his method of comparing Alpha and Beta

medians is invalid and misleading.

That is, test medians, when compared state by state, may give

a decidedly inaccurate impression of the relative abilities of Negro

and white soldiers. These difficulties were recognized by the army

psychologists who preferred, therefore, to give comparative data for

Negroes and whites based upon stratified samples prorated by states.

The procurring of impartial cross samples is a very important require-

ment.

Army psychologists, from records of the total population of

---

3. M. F. Ashley Montagu, ibid., pp. 187-188.

4. Henry E. Garrett, "Comparison of Negro and White Recruits
On the Army Tests Given In 1917-1918," The American Journal of
Psychology, LVIII (October, 1945), 480-495.

white soldiers, drew 100,000 cards, prorated by states. The prorata basis was one man per 100 white male population; census 1910.

The same method was used for Negroes. The sample was set at 20,000, prorated on the basis of one man per 250 Negro male population; census 1910. An additional group from northern states was prorated on a basis of one per 50 Negro males.

Montagu, instead of following a similar method, took, for example, twenty-eight Negroes from Kansas and one hundred eighty-eight whites from Kentucky and compared them without any regard to prorating the men.

The following tables show the results of Garrett's study, carried out on the basis as that used by army psychologists. It may be seen that most of the following scores differ from those obtained by Montagu.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF ALPHA SCORES MADE
BY WHITE, NORTHERN NEGRO AND
SOUTHERN NEGRO GROUPS[5]

Type	No.	Alpha Median
White Soldiers	51,620	58.9
Northern Negro	2,850	38.6
Southern Negro	1,709	12.4

5. Henry E. Garrett, ibid., p 492

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF BETA SCORES MADE BY WHITE,
NORTHERN NEGRO AND SOUTHERN NEGRO GROUPS[6]

Type	No.	Beta Median
White Soldiers	11,879	43.4
Northern Negro	1,737	32.5
Southern Negro	3,438	19.8

It is seen that these tables compare with other information
that has been presented so far; and that is, that the whites, as a
whole, achieved higher scores than did the Negroes.

The table below shows a comparison between Negro and white in-
telligence when the two groups have had equal education, as in the
first case, or when the Negro has had three years more education than
the whites, as indicated in the last two cases.

TABLE IV

ALPHA MEDIANS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
OF CERTAIN GROUPS OF NEGRO AND WHITE SOLDIERS[7]

Groups	Alpha Med.
555 No. Negroes who completed eighth gr.	50.00
14,899 Whites who completed eighth grade	64.70
457 No. Negroes who completed H. S.	74.50
3,793 Whites who completed H. S.	80.50
111 No. Negroes who completed college	97.00
1,060 Whites who completed 1 year of col.	106.70

6. Henry E. Garrett, ibid., p 492.

7. Henry E. Garrett, ibid., p 492.

It may be seen from the above information that the northern Negroes who completed high school scored lower on the Alpha test than whites who had completed only one year of high school. Also, northern Negroes who had completed college again scored lower than the whites who had completed only one year of college.

Garrett concludes,

That marked difference did appear twenty-five years ago is established beyond any reasonable doubt, and the inference is strong that such difference cannot be explained in socio-economic terms.[8]

Although the army tests seem to have furnished valuable material regarding matters such as this, I think these tests will soon be disregarded as a means of comparing the two races, the reason being that records from World War II should be available soon, and since economic conditions have improved somewhat since 1917-1918, it is quite possible that more valuable information concerning the two races may be obtained from this new source of information.

Birch[9] states, and is under the impression, that as cultural factors are controlled, the obtained differences in psychological characteristics among races tend to diminish to the point of insignificance.

Klineberg[10] concludes in his book on Negro migration that there

---

8. Henry E. Garrett, ibid., p 495.

9. Herbert G. Birch, "Psychological Differences As Among Races", Science, CI (April, 1945), 173-174.

10. Otto Klineberg Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), 62 pp.

is definitely a superiority of the northern Negro over that of the southern Negro. Also, there appears to be a tendency for the northern Negroes to approximate the scores of the whites. These results are due, then, as Klineberg believes, to the factors of the environment and not due to selective migration, as many writers believe. The method used to determine these findings was comparing the school records of those Negroes who migrated to the North with those of the Negro children who remained in the South. Also, the intelligence test scores of those Negroes who had recently arrived in New York showed no superiority over those of the same age and sex who were still in the southern cities.

There appeared to be an improvement in the mentality whenever there was a change for the better in environment, whether it was from a southern rural community to a large southern city or to a northern city.

Even here, however, under the better environmental conditions, the Negro children did not, on the average, quite reach the norms of the white children.

The following table by Pintner[11] shows the differences between whites and Negroes on the Binet Tests.

---

11. Rudolph Pintner, _Intelligence Testing_ (Second Edition; New York: Henry Holt and Company 1930), Chapter 20, pp 432-445.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF NEGRO AND WHITE BY MEANS
OF THE BINET TESTS[12]

| | Negro | | White | |
Author	Median IQ	No. of Cases	Median IQ	No. of Cases
Schsegler and Winn	89	58	103	58
Arlitt	83	71	106	191
Pintner and Keller	88	71	95	249
Arlitt	86	243	no white group	
Lacy	91	817	103	5,159
Graham	99	105	no white group	
Strachan	93	609	102	14,463
Strachan	92	375	101	6,063

It may be seen from the above chart that in every case, the
Negro IQ ranks below that of the whites. The Negro IQ appears to
have a central tendency around 90, while that of the whites centers
around 102.

Strong,[13] using the Goddard Binet, came out with the same re-
sults, although stated in a manner different from that above.

12. Rudolph Pintner, ibid., p 433.

13. A. C. Strong, "Three Hundred Fifty White and Colored
Children Measured by the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale of Intelligence",
Pedagogical Seminar, XX (December, 1913), 485-515.

TABLE VI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES
IN TERMS OF SCHOLASTIC RATING[14]

	Colored	White
More than one year backward	29.4	10.2
Satisfactory	69.8	84.4
More than one year advanced	0.08	5.3

Here again, as before, the colored children are more retard-
ed than the whites, even though the whites were rated as "poor"
whites represented by the children of mill workers.

Peterson and Lanier[15] report, as a result of their work on
the comparative abilities of whites and Negro adults, an enormous
and reliable superiority of whites over Negroes in all four group
tests which they administered.

Ferguson, after discussing the influence of education on the
army tests with reference to Negroes, and after making what he con-
siders a reasonable allowance for a difference in educational oppor-
tunity, sums up by saying "that probably the safest and most reason-
able expression of the relative intelligence of whites and Negroes
is that approximately 25 per cent of the latter equal or exceed the

14. A. C. Strong, ibid., p 501.

15. Joseph Peterson and Lyle Lanier, "Studies In the Compara-
tive Abilities of Whites and Negroes," Mental Measurement Monographs
(Series No. 5, February, 1929. Baltimore, Maryland: The Williams
and Wilkins Company, 1929), Pp 105-152.

average of the former".[16]

From this, we may conclude that there is considerable over-lapping between the two groups. Even with this, however, it appears that a real racial difference exists.

Garrett takes the stand along with the others that actual race differences do exist. "In fact, studies over a period of the last forty years have regularly and consistently found differences as be-tween the American Negro and the American white".[17]

Garrett admits that these findings may be subject to a number of interpretations, but the actual fact of their existence cannot be denied.

Garrett, after reviewing literature on the differences be-tween whites and Negroes, covering from babyhood to adulthood, con-cludes that,

On tests of mental ability, American Negroes rank consistently lower than American whites. The regular-ity of this result from babyhood to adulthood makes it extremely unlikely, in the present writer's opinion, that environmental opportunities can possibly explain all the differences found.

Approximately twenty-five per cent of Negroes do better than the average white, and many make higher scores.[18]

16. S. O. Ferguson, "The Mental Status of the American Negro", Science Monthly, XII (June, 1921), 533-543.

17. Henry E. Garrett, "'Facts' and 'Interpretations' Regarding Race Differences", Science, CI (April, 1945), 406.

18. Henry E. Garrett, "Negro-White Differences In Mental Ability In the United States", Science, LXV (October, 1947), 333.

McGurk,[19] after testing Negro and white children in the
Richmond Public Schools, implicated that there is a large and sta-
tistically reliable difference between the average scores of whites
and Negroes.

Although Negroes in general fail to reach the median of the
whites' IQ, we must not think that this holds for every Negro.
There are Negroes that rank just as high as whites, just as there
are whites that rank just as low as Negroes.

The study by Therman and Witty[20] gives evidence to the fact
that some Negroes rank just as high as the highest whites.

The article by the above authors concerns two gifted Negro
children who were discovered when 8,000 Negro children were tested
in a metropolitan center in 1934.

"B", a Negro girl, was described as one of the most precocious
and promising children in America. When only nine years of age, her
IQ was given as 200.

"E", a Negro boy, had an IQ of 163, and although there were
several others who ranked above him, he was by all odds the best stu-
dent and the most promising child academically in the entire group.

---

19. F. C. J. McGurk, "Comparative Test Scores of Negro and
White School Children In Richmond, Virginia", Journal of Educational
Psychology, XXXIV (November, 1934), 473-484.

20. Viola Therman and Paul Witty, "Case Studies and Genetic
Records of Two Gifted Negroes", The Journal of Psychology, XV (January,
1943), 165-181.

"B", when last reported, had entered college, but was losing interest in school. "E", on the other hand, received his bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago when he was sixteen years of age and, at that time, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He received his master's degree in 1941, and in December, 1942, he received his Doctor of Philosophy Degree. After this, he received a fellowship in mathematics as a research worker in the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey.

It might be mentioned here that another study by the writer was carried out at the Boys' Industrial School at Topeka, Kansas. The purpose of the study did not parallel exactly with the one to be described here, but IQ's were obtained on most of the boys studied.

Of the two hundred case histories that were studied, IQ's were obtained on thirty-five Negroes and one hundred twenty-eight white boys. The mean Negro IQ was 82.20, with an SD of 14.90, while the mean IQ of the whites was 89.20, with an SD of 17.70.

The most noticeable thing is the deviation from the average for both groups. Delinquents such as these are usually found to have a lower IQ than the average.

Even here, however, and with both groups falling below the average, the Negroes still fail to reach the mean of the whites, although the difference between the two groups is smaller than is usually found in the general population.

The evidence presented here is only a portion of the material that has been written concerning the difference, if any, in intelligence between the white and Negro races.

The question of whether or not such a difference does exist has long been an issue. It is only within the last few decades that any great amount of research has been done on the problem.

The test results that were made available as a result of the testing done during World War I have been of some help along this line. The test results from approximately sixteen million men and women who were in service during the last war will offer great help in further research along this line.

From the material presented here, it is quite clear that there is a difference in intelligence between the white and the Negro races. The difference varies, but it may be assumed that the mean IQ score for the Negroes centers around ninety, while that for the whites, of course, centers around one hundred.

It cannot be said, however, that all whites score higher than the Negroes. This would be a fallacy, to be sure. The Negroes have their extreme deviates the same as the whites.

From the literature, it may be assumed, however, and with a fair degree of accuracy, that if our intelligence tests actually measure what we call intelligence, approximately twenty-five per cent of the Negroes equal or exceed the median of the whites.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The general plan of the investigation consisted of choosing
a group mental ability test and a test of social and economic status
that could be administered and scored without a great amount of dif-
ficulty, and yet yield a high enough score to be reliable and valid.

The intelligence test that was chosen was the Henmon-Nelson
Test of Mental Ability, Form B. The reason for using this particular
test was its facility in administering and scoring, and the validity
and reliability coefficients were approximately 0.80 and 0.90 re-
spectively.

The test used for estimating the social and economic status
of the child's family was the Minnesota Home Status Index.[1] The
test itself was designed so it could be administered in a minimum
amount of time, and it could be scored and converted into sigma
scores with little difficulty, due to the conversion table on the
front page of each test. By the Spearman-Brown formula, the reli-
ability of the test is 0.92. The validity of the test, with those
given by the Sims Score Card in a sample of two hundred cases yielded
a coefficient of correlation of 0.94.

The children tested were students in five schools, two high

---

1. Alice M. Leahy, The Measurement of Urban Home Environment
(Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press), 1936, 70 pp.

schools and three grade schools, located in Salina, Hill City and Bogue, Kansas.

In Salina, sixty-two Negro children were tested and interviewed in Dunbar grade school. This included all available students in grades three to eight, inclusive. Also in Salina, eighty-six white children were tested and interviewed in Hawthorne grade school. This included students in grades four to six, inclusive.

In Hill City, fifteen Negro and thirty white high school students were tested and interviewed. In the Hill City grade school, eleven Negro and thirty-nine white grade school children were tested and interviewed.

In Bogue, the high school had a population or enrollment of twenty-four students, twelve Negroes and twelve whites. These were all tested and interviewed.

It was the rule to include all the available Negroes in the schools visited and approximately twice that amount of white children.

The total sampling included one hundred Negroes and one hundred sixty-seven white students.

The time allotted for the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability was thirty minutes, while the approximate time per student for the interview on the social and economic status index was six minutes.

The intelligence test was administered first, and after this, each pupil was interviewed separately to obtain the information necessary to complete the social and economic test.

After the intelligence tests were scored, the IQ was determined

cleanliness and orderliness. Here, there were two rooms assigned to each grade, the reason being of course, the larger enrollment. Even here, however, there were approximately forty pupils per classroom. The rooms and halls were exceptionally clean, which was not the case at the Negro grade school.

In an interview with Mr. Charles E. Hawkes,[2] Superintendent of Schools at Salina, it was brought out that even with a college education, it was very difficult for a Negro to obtain employment in Salina, outside of such jobs as garage attendants and janitors. In fact, the janitor at the City Building, at that time, was a college graduate.

From this, then, it is seen that although the Negro and white selected group were exactly matched as to social and economic status, it is impossible to control certain factors that go to make up an individual's environment.

---

2. Charles E. Hawkes, Superintendent of Schools, Salina, Kansas, April, 1949.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF TESTS ADMINISTERED
TO WHITE AND NEGRO GROUPS

The results that were obtained from this particular study
appear to approximately parallel those obtained by other investi-
gators.

First of all, there was a significant difference in the in-
telligence between the two races, at least as measured by the tests
used in this study. The following table shows the results of the
intelligence testing between the groups.

TABLE VII

MEAN IQ, STANDARD DEVIATION, STANDARD
ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE
MEANS, t, AND SIGNIFICANCE AT % LEVEL
FOR NEGRO AND SELECTED WHITE GROUPS

Groups	Mean IQ	N	SD	SD_D	t	Significant at % level
Selected White	102.15	100	13.35			
Negro	91.70	100	12.80			
Obtained Diff.	10.45			1.85	5.65	1%

For the total Negro group, as seen above, the mean IQ was
91.70 with an SD of 12.80. For the selected white group, the one
that matched the Negro group in social and economic status, the
mean IQ was 102.15 with an SD of 13.35.

When the standard error of difference between the two means was calculated, it was found that the SD_D was 1.85, and the critical ratio was 5.65. Statistically speaking, then, we could expect differences larger than 10.45 to occur by chance less than once in every one hundred cases.

The mean IQ of the unselected whites was calculated at 103.50 with an SD of 10.30. Lowering the selected group of whites to the economic and social level of the Negroes apparently made little difference in the IQ of the whites.

The correlation between intelligence and social and economic status was computed for all three groups, (Negro, selected whites and unselected whites), in an attempt to ascertain whether or not the immediate environment as measured by the social and economic status index played a significant part in determining the child's intelligence. The following table shows the results of this calculation, along with the probable error of the correlation.

TABLE VIII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN
IQ AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS
FOR NEGROES, SELECTED AND UNSELECTED WHITES

Group	N	Correlation	Probable Error
Negro	100	0.28	.06
Selected White	100	0.35	.01
Unselected White	167	0.37	.04

We may assume, then, from the above information, that the social and economic status of the family plays a rather significant part in determining the child's intelligence, or at least that part that was measured by the particular test used in this study.

The white group as a whole ranked above the Negroes in regard to social and economic status. Figures supporting this fact are shown in the following table:

TABLE IX

MEAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS
OF NEGROES, SELECTED WHITES, AND
UNSELECTED WHITES ACCORDING TO
THE MINNESOTA HOME STATUS INDEX

Groups	N	Mean Social and Economic Status	SD
Negro	100	138.50	35.20
Selected White	100	138.50	34.40
Unselected White	167	149.30	43.60

The whites and Negroes were subdivided into city and rural groups to determine whether or not there was a difference in the IQ's of these groups. The subjects from Hill City and Bogue constituted the rural groups, while those subjects from Salina made up the city group. The obtained data are shown in the following table:

TABLE X

MEAN IQ, STANDARD DEVIATION,
STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN, t,
AND SIGNIFICANCE AT % LEVEL
BETWEEN CITY AND RURAL WHITE;
CITY AND RURAL NEGRO

Groups	N	Mean IQ	SD	SD_D	t	Significant at % level
Whites:						
City	86	105.60	16.20			
Rural	81	101.55	11.15			
Obtained Diff.		4.05		2.14	1.89	6%
Negroes:						
City	62	92.80	13.60			
Rural	38	89.75	10.90			
Obtained Diff.		3.05		2.36	1.27	20%

The mean IQ of the white city group was calculated at 105.60 with an SD of 16.20. The white rural group had a mean IQ of 101.55 with an SD of 11.15. The standard error of the difference between the two means was calculated as well as the critical ratio between the groups. The standard error of the two means was 2.14, while the CR was 1.89. We could expect, then, differences larger than 4.05 to occur by chance only six times in one hundred comparisons.

For the Negro city group, the mean IQ was calculated as 92.80 with an SD of 13.60, while the mean for the rural Negroes was 89.75 with an SD of 10.90. Here again, the standard error of the differ-

ence between the means was calculated as well as the critical ratio. The standard error for these two groups was 2.36, while the CR was 1.27. We could expect differences larger than 3.05 to occur by chance approximately twenty times in one hundred comparisons.

By taking the number of Negroes that equaled or exceeded the mean IQ of the unselected white group, it was found that twenty per cent of the Negroes equaled or exceeded the mean of the whites.

The percentage of Negroes that equaled or exceeded the mean of the white social and economic status was found to be thirty - three per cent.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

There appears to be, from the material presented by other
writers, and from the new data shown here as a result of the test-
ing in Saline and Graham counties, a statistically significant
difference in intelligence between the white and Negro races.
This difference appeared in the study carried out at the Boys' In-
dustrial School at Topeka and between the groups used in this study.
The unselected white group scored above the Negroes in regard to
intelligence, as well as the selected white group, while both city
and rural white groups scored above the city Negro groups, as well
as the rural Negro group.

Even with this evidence, however, there is one factor that
cannot be overlooked. That is, although the white selected group
was matched almost exactly with the Negro group, there were probably
certain uncontrollable factors that were unaffected by this method;
for example, the social and economic position held by the Negro race
in our present day society. Although the two groups were matched in
regard to social and economic status, there is still the fact that
the Negroes, as a race, are not given full opportunity to exploit
their abilities, whether or not they are equal or superior to the
whites. Being a Negro is a mark against an individual, no matter
what social and economic position he may hold within his own race.
This may be an uncontrollable factor that may not be corrected. It
is true that certain Negroes excell in certain fields, but in order

to do this, as a rule, they must be superior members of their race and have an excessive amount of determination to push themselves forward; much more so than of the population as a whole.

It is often mentioned that because our tests are usually standardized on whites alone, it is unfair to base a conclusion on any differences that are found to exist between the two races in regard to intelligence. This may be true, but it must be remembered that the Negro race has been a part of the American culture for over three hundred years; and, during this time, has certainly absorbed the greatest part of that culture as their own, including the English language. From this viewpoint, it does not appear to be unfair to base conclusions, or at least assumptions, on the results of comparing the intelligence of the two races on our standardized intelligence tests. From the writer's observations and experience, this would not be a limiting factor in this particular study.

The same question arises as to the adequacy of the social and economic test. This test, like the intelligence test, was standardized on white subjects alone, and, as a result, may not be an accurate measure of the environment of the Negro child. In all fairness, however, the writer is of the opinion that the areas covered by the test would vary little between the two races. That is, since each question as to social and economic status is given a numerical value, it does not seem too unfair to use the test as a comparison between the two races.

Conclusions from this particular study, however, should not

be used to base an absolute conclusion on the difference in intelligence between the whites and Negroes for the population as a whole, due to the small number of subjects and the limited area covered by the study.

TABLE II

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF UNSELECTED WHITE GROUP

APPENDIX

	f	x'	fx'	fx'²
150-159	1	7	7	35
140-149	0	6	0	0
130-139	5	3	15	45
120-129	13	2	26	52
110-119	34	1	34	34
100-109	54	0		
90-99	39	-1	-39	39
80-89	20	-2	-40	80
70-79	7	-3	-21	63
60-69	4	-4	-16	64
	187		-34	457

AM = 104.50 $u = \frac{-17}{187} = -.180, u^2 = 1.86$
ci = -1.00

M = 103.50   i = 10

ci = -1.00

$SD = \sqrt{\frac{457}{187} - 1.00} \times 10 = 10.30 \times 100$

TABLE XI

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF UNSELECTED WHITE GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^2
150–159	1	5	5	25
140–149	0	4	0	0
130–139	5	3	15	45
120–129	13	2	26	52
110–119	34	1	34	34
100–109	54	0		
90–99	32	−1	−32	32
80–89	20	−2	−40	80
70–79	7	−3	−21	63
60–69	1	−4	− 4	16
	167		−17	347

$AM = 104.50$ $c = \dfrac{-17}{167} = -.10$; $c^2 = 1.00$

$ci = \underline{-1.00}$

$M = 103.50$ $i = 10$

$ci = -1.00$

$SD = \sqrt{\dfrac{347}{167} - 1.00} \quad x \quad 10 = 10.30 = SD$

TABLE XII

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF CITY WHITE GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^2
150–159	1	5	5	25
140–149	0	4	0	0
130–139	5	3	15	45
120–129	10	2	20	40
110–119	19	1	19	19
100–109	20	0		
90–99	18	–1	–18	18
80–89	7	–2	–14	28
70–79	6	–3	–18	54
	86		9	229

$AM = 104.50 \qquad c = \dfrac{9}{86} = .11; \quad c^2 = .0121$

$ci = \underline{1.10}$

$M = 105.60 \qquad i = 10$

$ci = 1.10$

$SD = \sqrt{\dfrac{229}{86} - .0121} \quad x\ 10 = 16.20 = \ SD$

TABLE XIII

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF RURAL WHITE GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^2
120–124	3	4	12	48
115–119	8	3	24	72
110–114	7	2	14	28
105–109	16	1	16	16
100–104	18	0		
95–99	9	−1	− 9	9
90–94	5	−2	−10	20
85–89	10	−3	−30	90
80–84	3	−4	−12	48
75–79	1	−5	− 5	25
70–74	0	−6	0	0
65–69	1	−7	− 7	49
	81		− 7	405

AM = 102.00 $c = \dfrac{-7}{81} = -.09$; $c^2 = .0081$

ci = ___−.45___

M = 101.55   i = 5

ci = −.45

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{405}{81} - .0081} \ \times 5 = 11.15 = SD$$

TABLE XIV

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF TOTAL NEGRO GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^2
120–124	2	6	12	72
115–119	2	5	10	50
110–114	7	4	28	112
105–109	5	3	15	45
100–104	8	2	16	32
95–99	16	1	16	16
90–94	17	0		
85–89	15	−1	−15	15
80–84	10	−2	−20	40
75–79	10	−3	−30	90
70–74	3	−4	−12	48
65–69	4	−5	−20	100
60–64	1	−6	− 6	36
	100		−6	656

AM = 92.00 $c = \dfrac{-6}{100} = -.06$; $c^2 = .0036$

c_i = −.30

M = 91.70 $i = 5$

c_i = −.30

SD = $\sqrt{\dfrac{656}{100} - .0036} \times 5 = 12.85 = SD$

TABLE XV

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF CITY NEGRO GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^{2}
120–124	2	6	12	72
115–119	1	5	5	25
110–114	6	4	24	96
105–109	4	3	12	36
100–104	5	2	10	20
95–99	9	1	9	9
90–94	10	0		
85–89	9	–1	– 9	9
80–84	4	–2	– 8	16
75–79	7	–3	–21	63
70–74	1	–4	– 4	16
65–69	4	–5	–20	100
	62		10	462

$AM = 92.00 \qquad c = \dfrac{10}{62} = .16; \quad c^2 = .0256$

$ci = \underline{\quad .80\quad}$

$M = 92.80 \qquad i = 5$

$ci = .80$

$SD = \sqrt{\dfrac{462}{62} - .0256} \times 5 = 13.60 = SD$

TABLE XVI

MEAN IQ AND STANDARD DEVIATION
OF RURAL NEGRO GROUP

	f	x'	fx'	fx'^2
115-119	1	5	5	25
110-114	1	4	4	16
105-109	0	3	0	0
100-104	4	2	8	16
95-99	7	1	7	7
90-94	7	0		
85-89	6	-1	- 6	6
80-84	6	-2	-12	24
75-79	3	-3	- 9	27
70-74	2	-4	- 8	32
65-69	0	-5	0	0
60-64	1	-6	- 6	36
	38		-17	189

AM = 92.00 $c = \dfrac{-17}{38} = -.45$; $c^2 = .2025$

ci = $\underline{-2.25}$

M = 89.75   i = 5

ci = -2.25

$$SD = \sqrt{\dfrac{189}{38} - .2025} \ \times 5 \ = 10.90 \ = \ SD$$

TABLE XVII

PERSONAL DATA

FOR

WHITE AND NEGRO SUBJECTS

Hill City Grade School — White

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	104	43	−.3	52	−.4	35	−.9	47	−.5	4	−.2	2	−1.1	−.56	144
2.	115	46	.1	55	.0	34	−1.0	48	−.4	4	−.2	6	1.3	−.03	197
3.	106	48	.4	57	.2	42	−.1	47	−.5	5	.0	3.5	−.2	−.03	197
4.	121	50	.7	60	.5	46	.3	53	.2	4	−.2	6	1.3	⨍.47	247
5.	119	46	.1	52	−.4	32	−1.2	45	−.7	4	−.2	2	−1.1	−.58	142
6.	103	33	−1.7	49	−.7	37	−.7	47	−.5	4	−.2	5	.8	−.50	150
7.	113	46	.1	55	.0	41	−.2	44	−.8	4	−.2	4	.0	−.18	182
8.	108	41	−.6	66	1.1	45	.2	51	.0	7	1.0	4.5	.5	⨍.37	237
9.	98	46	.1	66	1.1	50	.7	56	.5	7	1.0	5.5	1.0	⨍.73	273
10.	101	50	.7	51	−.5	35	−.9	41	−1.1	4	−.2	5	.8	−.20	180
11.	115	50	.7	72	1.7	46	.3	58	.8	7	1.0	5	.8	⨍.88	288
12.	123	54	1.2	52	−.4	40	−.3	43	−.9	7	1.0	5	.8	⨍.23	223
13.	119	49	.5	52	−.4	35	−.9	47	−.5	4	−.2	2	−1.1	−.43	157
14.	102	41	−.6	54	−.2	30	−1.4	44	−.8	4	−.2	5	.8	−.40	160

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
15.	112	49	.5	58	.3	33	-1.1	49	-.2	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.15	185
16.	112	52	.9	49	-.7	38	-.5	48	-.4	7	1.0	6.5	1.6	≠.32	232
17.	95	47	.2	52	-.4	37	-.7	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.45	155
18.	108	52	.9	61	.6	44	.1	55	.4	2	-1.2	5	.8	≠.27	227
19.	78	33	-1.7	52	-.4	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.75	125
20.	80	41	-.6	49	-.7	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.70	130
21.	123	49	.5	54	-.2	35	-.9	54	.3	4	-.2	6	1.3	≠.13	213
22.	89	50	.7	61	.6	43	.0	47	-.5	4	-.2	5	.8	≠.23	223
23.	90	41	-.6	61	.6	41	-.2	55	.4	7	1.0	4.5	.5	≠.28	228
24.	104	50	.7	55	.0	32	-1.2	43	-.9	4	-.2	5	.8	-.13	187
25.	108	48	.4	55	.0	32	-1.2	44	-.8	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.33	167
26.	100	33	-1.7	49	-.7	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	1	-1.8	5	.8	-1.05	95
27.	118	37	-1.1	52	-.4	35	-.9	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.80	120
28.	101	33	-1.7	45	-1.1	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.87	113
29.	81	33	-1.7	45	-1.1	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	3	-.5	-1.27	73
30.	99	36	-1.3	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.23	77

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
31.	98	39	-.9	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.18	82
32.	114	36	-1.3	49	-.7	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.85	115
33.	101	36	-1.3	52	-.4	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.68	132
34.	102	39	-.9	49	-.7	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.70	130
35.	108	33	-1.7	52	-.4	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.75	125
36.	90	33	-1.7	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	3	-.5	-1.25	75
37.	116	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	3	-.5	-1.13	87
38.	69	33	-1.7	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	46	-.6	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-1.07	93
39.	106	33	-1.7	52	-.4	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.75	125

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	94	43	-.3	49	-.7	35	-.9	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	3.5	-.2	-.83	117
2.	86	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	43	.0	44	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.37	163
3.	95	35	-1.4	46	-1.0	43	.0	44	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.43	157
4.	105	39	-.9	45	-1.1	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	-.60	140
5.	110	51	.8	46	-1.0	38	-.5	45	-.7	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.30	170
6.	82	36	-1.3	43	-1.3	36	-.8	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	3.5	-.2	-.98	102
7.	95	35	-1.4	45	-1.1	30	-1.4	38	-.5	4	-.2	5	.8	-.63	137
8.	75	36	-1.3	51	-.5	36	-.8	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.78	122
9.	98	51	.8	46	-1.0	38	-.5	45	-.7	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.30	170
10.	90	41	-.6	49	-.7	41	-.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5.5	1.0	-.30	170
11.	102	33	-1.7	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-1.10	90

E

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	98	45	.0	52	-.4	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.47	153
2.	103	51	.8	49	-.7	38	-.5	48	-.4	4	-.2	6	1.3	⨍.05	205
3.	88	50	.7	55	.0	40	-.3	40	-1.3	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.22	178
4.	101	42	-.4	49	-.7	44	.1	43	-.9	4	-.2	4	.0	-.35	165
5.	87	47	.2	52	-.4	36	-.8	44	-.8	1	-1.8	4.5	.5	-.52	148
6.	105	44	-.2	49	-.7	42	-.1	44	-.8	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.37	163
7.	108	42	-.4	55	.0	40	-.3	47	-.5	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.27	173
8.	116	46	.1	49	-.7	36	-.8	50	-.1	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.32	168
9.	83	44	-.2	46	-1.0	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.78	122
10.	90	45	.0	52	-.4	43	.0	41	-.2	2	-1.1	4	-.2	-.32	168
11.	94	46	.1	45	-1.1	33	-1.1	40	-.3	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.52	148
12.	88	42	-.4	55	.0	43	.0	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.37	163
13.	103	42	-.4	46	-1.0	41	-.2	45	-.7	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.60	140
14.	104	42	-.4	49	-.7	33	-1.1	49	-.2	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-.88	112

42

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
15.	104	42	-.4	46	-1.0	38	-.5	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.72	128
16.	102	42	-.4	46	-1.0	39	-.4	38	-1.5	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.77	123
17.	86	49	.5	52	-.4	42	-.1	46	.3	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.17	183
18.	89	44	-.2	52	-.4	37	-.7	43	.0	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.43	157
19.	106	44	-.2	52	-.4	35	-.9	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.70	130
20.	86	41	-.6	43	-1.3	35	-.9	43	-.9	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.83	117
21.	116	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	49	.6	43	-.9	4	-.2	4	.0	-.42	158
22.	92	44	-.2	61	.6	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.43	157
23.	106	55	1.4	46	-1.0	45	.2	38	-1.5	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.10	190
24.	108	44	-.2	60	.5	50	.7	46	-.6	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	.00	200
25.	97	44	-.2	49	-.7	54	1.2	47	-.5	1	-1.8	3	-.5	-.42	158
26.	87	50	.7	55	.0	47	.4	53	.2	4	-.2	3	-.5	≠.13	213
27.	101	37	-1.1	43	-1.3	35	-.9	44	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.58	142
28.	97	35	-1.4	43	-1.3	37	-.7	47	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.63	137
29.	105	50	.7	61	.6	38	-.5	41	-.9	1	-1.8	4.5	.5	-.23	177
30.	86	44	-.2	52	-.4	40	-.3	51	.0	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-.63	137

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	98	43	-.3	49	-.7	39	-.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.45	155
2.	81	42	-.4	48	-.8	30	-1.4	43	-.9	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.80	120
3.	91	38	-1.0	50	-.6	33	-1.1	51	.0	4	-.2	5	.8	-.35	165
4.	73	42	-.4	54	-.2	38	-.5	43	-.9	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.55	145
5.	87	42	-.4	46	-1.0	37	-.7	47	-.5	2	-1.2	3.5	-.2	-.67	133
6.	64	41	-.6	46	-1.0	41	-.2	44	-.8	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.55	145
7.	85	48	.4	58	.3	43	.0	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	∤.03	203
8.	82	39	-.9	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	43	-.9	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.92	108
9.	72	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	41	-.2	44	-.8	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.62	138
10.	83	45	.0	52	-.4	41	-.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.50	150
11.	83	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	34	-1.0	40	-1.3	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.83	117
12.	89	39	-.9	51	-.5	46	.3	44	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.22	178
13.	117	52	.9	45	-1.1	43	.0	56	.5	1	-1.8	3	-.5	-.33	167
14.	98	42	-.4	42	-1.4	30	-1.4	48	-.4	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.98	102
15.	93	47	.2	51	-.5	31	-1.3	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.65	135

Bogue High School - White

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	111	46	.1	49	-.7	44	.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.30	170
2.	96	49	.5	61	.6	41	-.2	43	-.9	4	-.2	5	.8	⨍.10	210
3.	95	39	-.9	52	-.4	40	-.3	47	-.5	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.47	153
4.	105	45	.0	49	-.7	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	5	.0	2	-1.1	-.72	128
5.	103	41	-.6	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	47	-.5	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.67	133
6.	86	37	-1.1	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.85	115
7.	105	38	-1.0	55	.0	41	-.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.60	140
8.	110	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	47	-.5	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.73	127
9.	108	45	.0	49	-.7	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.56	144
10.	103	46	.1	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.65	135
11.	114	51	.8	49	-.7	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.43	157
12.	108	53	1.1	60	.5	46	.3	44	-.8	4	-.2	5.5	1.0	⨍.32	232

Bogue High School - Negro

	IQ	Children's Facilities raw	sigma	Economic Status raw	sigma	Cultural Status raw	sigma	Sociality raw	sigma	Occupation Status raw	sigma	Education Status raw	sigma	Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
1.	86	48	.8	48	-.8	35	-.9	38	-1.5	4	-.2	4	.0	-.43	157
2.	90	44	-.2	46	-1.0	43	.0	43	-.9	4	-.2	4	.0	-.38	162
3.	75	36	-1.3	45	-1.1	40	-.3	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.85	115
4.	80	36	-1.3	46	-1.0	33	-1.1	43	-.9	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.93	107
5.	89	39	-.9	52	-.4	35	-.9	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.77	123
6.	104	49	.5	46	-1.0	37	-.7	40	-1.3	4	-.2	5	.8	-.32	168
7.	103	42	-.4	43	-1.3	40	-.3	43	-.9	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.43	157
8.	97	36	-1.3	43	-1.3	32	-1.2	45	-.7	4	-.2	4	.0	-.78	122
9.	94	36	-1.4	55	.0	35	-.9	45	-.7	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.70	130
10.	91	36	-1.4	55	.0	35	-.9	45	-.7	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.70	130
11.	96	36	-1.4	55	.0	35	-.9	45	-.7	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.70	130
12.	76	33	-1.7	45	-1.1	40	-.3	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.92	108

Hawthorne Grade School – White

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	103	35	-1.4	40	-1.6	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	4	.0	-1.18	82
2.	96	38	-1.0	52	-.4	33	-1.1	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.05	95
3.	126	41	-.6	49	-.7	34	-1.0	47	-.5	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.42	158
4.	71	41	-.6	46	-1.0	34	-1.0	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.57	143
5.	95	48	.4	52	-.4	39	-.4	42	-1.0	4	-.2	5	.8	-.13	137
6.	91	35	-1.4	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.82	118
7.	100	38	-1.0	54	-.2	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.85	115
8.	101	43	-.3	49	-.7	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.75	125
9.	122	40	-.7	52	-.4	35	-.9	44	-.8	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.53	147
10.	86	38	-1.0	49	-.7	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.13	87
11.	82	41	-.6	40	-1.6	30	-1.4	44	-.8	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.95	105
12.	109	35	-1.4	52	-.4	38	-.5	47	-.5	5	.0	3.5	-.2	-.50	150
13.	111	44	-.2	52	-.4	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.77	123
14.	99	36	-1.3	49	-.7	30	-1.4	42	-1.0	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.85	115

47

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
15.	100	41	-.6	55	.0	33	-1.1	42	-1.0	5	.0	4	.0	-.45	155
16.	111	52	.9	58	.3	33	-1.1	44	-.8	5	.0	4.5	.5	-.03	197
17.	95	53	1.1	52	-.4	38	-.5	49	-.2	4	-.2	6	1.3	ƒ.18	218
18.	102	47	.2	51	-.4	30	-1.4	44	-.8	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.52	148
19.	115	44	-.2	59	.2	37	-.7	47	-.5	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.42	158
20.	114	33	-1.7	49	-.7	35	-.9	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.18	82
21.	127	41	-.6	58	.3	33	-1.1	47	-.5	5	.0	3.5	-.2	-.35	165
22.	96	41	-.6	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.80	120
23.	95	38	-1.0	51	-.5	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.15	85
24.	80	38	-1.0	37	-2.0	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-1.13	87
25.	121	44	-.2	60	.5	35	-.9	44	-.8	5	.0	5	.8	-.10	190
26.	128	43	-.3	58	.3	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.42	158
27.	101	50	.7	49	-.7	38	-.5	47	-.5	4	-.2	5	.8	-.07	193
28.	112	65	2.7	61	.6	48	.5	57	.7	7	1.0	6.5	1.6	ƒ1.18	318
29.	93	40	-.7	40	-1.6	35	-.9	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.18	82
30.	121	56	1.5	58	.3	34	-1.0	46	-.6	1	-1.8	5	-.8	-.13	187

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
31.	115	33	-1.7	58	.3	33	-1.1	45	-.7	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.02	98
32.	116	33	-1.7	52	-.4	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.75	125
33.	88	33	-1.7	37	-2.0	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.47	153
34.	132	46	.1	52	-.4	36	-.8	47	-.5	2	-1.2	3.5	-.2	-.50	150
35.	125	40	-.7	55	.0	33	-1.1	38	-1.5	4	-.2	5	.8	-.45	155
36.	101	36	-1.3	46	-1.0	36	-.8	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.82	118
37.	107	41	-.6	49	-.7	39	-.9	44	-.8	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.67	133
38.	112	38	-1.0	44	-1.2	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.92	108
39.	88	40	-.7	55	.0	30	-1.4	44	-.8	7	1.0	4	.0	-.32	168
40.	115	46	.1	52	-.4	39	-.4	47	-.5	5	.0	4	.0	-.20	180
41.	118	42	-.4	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	44	-.8	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.72	128
42.	107	38	-1.0	49	-.7	35	-.9	43	-.9	1	-1.8	4	.0	-.88	112
43.	77	44	-.2	49	-.7	30	-1.4	44	-.8	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.00	100
44.	85	49	.5	49	-.7	33	-1.1	43	-.9	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.48	152
45.	105	38	-1.0	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	3.5	-.2	-1.02	98
46.	114	38	-1.0	52	-.4	41	-.2	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.90	110

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
47.	97	47	.2	46	-1.0	37	-.7	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.88	112
48.	118	48	.4	46	-1.0	36	-.8	44	-.8	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.48	152
49.	99	41	-.6	54	-.2	36	-.8	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.90	110
50.	98	41	-.6	48	-.8	32	-1.2	49	-.2	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.85	115
51.	114	36	-1.3	52	-.4	33	-1.1	47	-.5	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.03	97
52.	99	40	-.7	46	-1.0	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.75	125
53.	108	39	-.9	55	.0	36	-.8	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	-.37	163
54.	70	36	-1.3	49	-.7	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.30	70
55.	119	52	.9	58	.3	30	-1.4	50	-.1	5	.0	3	-.5	-.13	187
56.	102	49	.5	49	-.7	32	-1.2	49	-.2	5	.0	4	.0	-.27	173
57.	103	47	.2	55	.0	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.28	172
58.	138	39	-.9	49	-.7	39	-.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.55	145
59.	130	43	-.3	55	.0	33	-1.1	38	-1.5	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.55	145
60.	121	41	-.6	60	.5	30	-1.4	46	-.6	4	-.2	4	.0	-.38	162
61.	106	45	.0	60	.5	36	-.8	44	-.8	4	-.2	4	.0	-.22	178
62.	99	41	-.6	45	-1.1	36	-.8	49	-.2	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.67	133

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
63.	76	38	-1.0	43	-1.3	33	-1.1	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-1.10	90
64.	113	44	-.2	51	-.5	35	-.9	48	-.4	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.72	128
65.	125	50	.7	51	-.5	34	-1.0	51	.0	5	.0	6.5	1.6	≠.13	213
66.	93	38	-1.0	42	-1.4	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	3	-.5	-.93	107
67.	94	41	-.6	57	.2	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.82	118
68.	82	44	-.2	48	-.8	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.53	147
69.	103	47	.2	49	-.7	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.77	123
70.	90	46	.1	46	-1.0	39	-.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	-.30	170
71.	139	35	-1.4	57	.2	30	-1.4	43	-.9	4	-.2	4.5	-.2	-.53	147
72.	110	49	.5	51	-.5	38	-.5	47	-.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.55	145
73.	75	35	-1.4	51	-.5	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.12	88
74.	118	41	-.6	52	-.4	32	-1.2	44	-.8	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.72	128
75.	118	46	.1	52	-.4	39	-.4	49	-.2	4	-.2	5	.8	-.05	195
76.	99	41	-.6	52	-.4	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	5	.0	3.5	-.2	-.62	138
77.	74	36	-1.3	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	4	.0	-1.07	93
78.	113	47	.2	60	.5	33	-1.1	44	-.8	4	-.2	4.5	.5	-.15	185

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	status	raw	sigma		
79.	123	47	.2	51	-.5	36	-.8	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.58	142
80.	103	53	1.1	60	.5	36	-.8	41	-1.1	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-.27	173
81.	136	60	2.0	57	.2	37	-.7	47	-.5	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	+.10	210
82.	93	42	-.4	57	.2	38	-.5	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.37	163
83.	101	38	-1.0	49	-.7	32	-1.2	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	5	.8	-1.00	100
84.	100	44	-.2	49	-.7	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	-.47	153
85.	107	52	.9	54	-.2	32	-1.2	51	.0	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.15	185
86.	159	39	-.9	54	-.2	37	-.7	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.87	113

Dunbar Grade School - Negro

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
1.	82	47	.2	53	-.3	45	.2	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-.65	135
2.	107	53	1.1	55	.0	38	-.5	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	∤.02	202
3.	90	42	-.4	46	-1.0	38	-.5	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.62	138
4.	99	41	-.6	46	-1.0	41	-.2	43	-.9	1	-1.8	3.5	-.2	-.78	122
5.	90	43	-.3	42	-1.4	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	4	.0	-.95	105
6.	120	44	-.2	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	46	-.6	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.75	125
7.	87	43	-.3	49	-.7	35	-.9	44	-.8	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.62	138
8.	96	44	-.2	49	-.7	33	-1.1	47	-.5	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.70	130
9.	75	50	.7	55	.0	42	-.1	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	∤.02	202
10.	83	39	-.9	45	-1.1	36	-.8	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-1.00	100
11.	67	47	.2	58	.3	36	-.8	44	-.8	5	.0	5	.8	-.05	195
12.	103	52	.9	46	-1.0	41	-.2	43	-.9	1	-1.8	3.5	-.2	-.53	147
13.	87	52	.9	49	-.7	42	-.1	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.37	163
14.	92	35	-1.4	52	-.4	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.73	127

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
15.	113	44	-.2	46	-1.0	33	-1.1	46	-.6	1	-1.8	3.5	-.2	-.82	118
16.	112	53	1.1	57	.2	49	.6	54	.3	2	-1.2	6.5	1.6	⨍.43	243
17.	99	42	-.4	42	-1.4	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	4	-.2	2	-1.1	-1.00	100
18.	89	41	-.6	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	45	-.7	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.05	95
19.	65	36	-1.3	39	-1.7	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	4	-.2	4	.0	-.95	105
20.	102	38	-1.0	54	-.2	32	-1.2	44	-.8	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.60	140
21.	77	38	-1.0	52	-.4	30	-1.4	44	-.8	1	-1.8	5	.8	-.77	123
22.	96	44	-.2	49	-.7	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.08	92
23.	105	33	-1.7	46	-1.0	30	-1.4	44	-.8	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-1.10	90
24.	96	35	-1.4	42	-1.4	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	5	.8	-1.00	100
25.	114	35	-1.4	42	-1.4	36	-.8	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.18	82
26.	86	35	-1.4	51	-.5	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.18	82
27.	99	49	.5	55	.0	30	-1.4	46	-.6	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.63	137
28.	91	43	-.3	54	-.2	37	-.7	51	.0	2	-.12	5	.8	-.27	173
29.	100	36	-1.3	58	.3	33	-1.1	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.73	127
30.	109	44	-.2	58	.3	34	-1.0	46	-.6	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.37	163

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
31.	76	41	-.6	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.25	75
32.	85	47	-.2	50	-.6	34	-1.0	44	-.8	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.63	137
33.	90	48	.4	49	-.7	35	-.9	42	-1.0	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-.65	135
34.	66	41	-.6	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.93	107
35.	80	46	.1	55	.0	33	-1.1	47	-.5	1	-1.8	4	.0	-.55	145
36.	69	39	-.9	49	-.7	32	-1.2	47	-.5	1	-1.8	4	.0	-.85	115
37.	104	44	-.2	55	.0	35	-.9	43	-.9	4	-.2	3.5	-.2	-.40	160
38.	100	36	-1.3	40	-1.6	34	-1.0	47	-.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-1.12	88
39.	90	47	.2	42	-1.4	30	-1.4	38	-1.5	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.88	112
40.	109	37	-1.1	52	-.4	35	-.9	45	-.7	5	.0	4.5	.5	-.43	157
41.	123	41	-.6	42	-1.4	30	-1.4	47	-.5	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.72	128
42.	84	41	-.6	43	-1.3	33	-1.1	44	-.8	4	-.2	5	.8	-.53	147
43.	111	53	1.1	57	.2	49	.6	54	.3	2	-1.2	6.5	1.6	⨍.43	243
44.	88	38	-1.0	55	.0	30	-1.4	47	-.5	2	-1.2	4	-.2	-.72	128
45.	87	41	-.6	58	.3	35	-.9	47	-.5	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.40	160
46.	78	44	-.2	49	-.7	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	1	-1.8	2	-1.1	-1.08	92

	IQ	Children's Facilities		Economic Status		Cultural Status		Sociality		Occupation Status		Education Status		Average Sigma Score	Converted Score
		raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma	raw	sigma		
47.	112	41	-.6	43	-1.3	34	-1.0	51	.0	1	-1.8	3.5	-.2	-.82	118
48.	87	41	-.6	45	-1.1	34	-1.0	40	-1.3	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.78	122
49.	91	47	.2	49	-.7	40	-.3	53	.2	2	-.12	6	1.3	-.08	192
50.	119	44	-.2	58	.2	36	-.9	51	.0	4	-.2	5	.8	-.02	198
51.	113	47	.2	58	.2	36	-.9	51	.0	4	-.2	5	.8	≠.05	205
52.	98	43	-.3	52	-.4	41	-.2	56	.5	2	-1.2	6	1.3	-.05	195
53.	86	47	.2	45	-1.1	34	-1.0	40	-1.3	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.65	135
54.	75	44	-.2	45	-1.1	34	-1.0	40	-1.3	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.72	128
55.	71	36	-1.3	43	-1.3	30	-1.4	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	3	-.5	-1.13	87
56.	95	36	-1.3	55	.0	33	-1.1	47	-.5	2	-1.2	2	-1.1	-.87	113
57.	65	38	-1.0	45	-1.1	30	-1.4	40	-1.3	1	-1.8	5.5	1.0	-1.27	73
58.	93	44	-.2	52	-.4	33	-1.1	48	-.4	2	-1.2	5	.8	-.42	158
59.	88	36	-1.3	55	.0	38	-.5	48	-.4	4	-.2	5	.8	-.27	173
60.	95	55	1.4	55	.0	38	-.5	41	-1.1	4	-.2	5	.8	≠.07	207
61.	92	41	-.6	52	-.4	33	-1.1	47	-.5	2	-1.2	4.5	.5	-.55	145
62.	91	49	.5	49	-.7	43	.0	41	-1.1	2	-1.2	4	.0	-.42	158

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Birch, Herbert G., "Psychological Differences As Among Races,"

    Science, CI (April, 1945), 173-174.

        Supports the claim that as cultural factors are controlled,
the differences in psychological characteristics tend to diminish
to the point of insignificance.

Ferguson, S. O., "The Mental Status of the American Negro,"

    Science Monthly, XII (June, 1921), 533-543.

        A study concerning the influence of education on the army
tests with reference to Negroes.

Garrett, Henry E., "Negro - White Differences In Mental Ability

    In the United States," Science Monthly, LXV (October, 1947),

    329-333.

        A comparison of the mental abilities between whites and
Negroes in the United States.

Garrett, Henry E., "'Facts' and 'Interpretations' Regarding Race

    Differences," Science CI (April, 1945), 404-406.

        A review of relevant literature and conclusions as to the
existence of differences between races in regard to intelligence.

Garrett, Henry E., "Comparison of Negro and White Recruits On

    the Army Tests Given in 1917-1918," The American Journal of

    Psychology, LVIII (October, 1945), 480-495.

        A criticism of Montagu's work along with the author's own
findings and conclusions.

Hawkes, Charles E., Superintendent of Schools, Salina, Kansas,

   April, 1949.

      A discussion concerning the employment opportunities for
Negroes in Salina, Kansas.

Jenkins, Martin D., "The Upper Limit of Ability Among Negroes,"

   Science Monthly, LXVI (May, 1948), 399-401.

      The writer attempts to give evidence that race is not a
limiting factor in psychometric intelligence.

Klineberg, Otto, Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration.

   New York: Columbia University Press, 1935. 62 pp.

      A study to ascertain whether or not it is only the superior
Negro that migrates from the rural section to the city or from the
South to the North.

Lanier, Lyle H. and Joseph Peterson, "Studies In the Comparative

   Abilities of Whites and Negroes," Mental Measurement Monographs,

   Series No. 5, February, 1929. Baltimore, Maryland: The

   Williams and Wilkins Company, 1929. 152 pp.

      A study contrasting the mental abilities of white and Negro
children and adults.

Leahy, Alice M., The Measurement of Urban Home Environment.

   Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1936. 70 pp.

      Describes the construction of the scale used in the test,
homes participating, findings, and evaluation of the Minnesota Home
Status Index.

McGurk, F. C. J., "Comparative Test Scores of Negro and White

    School Children in Richmond, Virginia," Journal of Educational

    Psychology, XXXIV (November, 1934), 473-484.

        Concerns the author's discovery of the difference found
between white and Negro children on all tests, all ages and at
all grades.

Montagu, M. F. Ashley, "Intelligence of Northern Negroes and

    Southern Whites In the First World War," The American Journal

    of Psychology, LVIII (April, 1945), 161-188.

        A study of the results of the intelligence testing carried
out during World War I between Negroes from the Northern states
and whites from the Northern states.

Pintner, Rudolph, Intelligence Testing. Second Edition; New York:

    Henry Holt and Company, 1930. Chapter 20, pp 432-445.

        Describes results of testing by different authors between
whites and Negroes in the United States.

Strong, A. C., "Three Hundred Fifty White and Colored Children

    Measured By the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale of Intelligence,"

    Pedagogical Seminar, XX (December, 1913), 485-515.

        Results of the author's testing of Negro and White children.

Therman, Viola and Paul Witty, "Case Studies and Genetic Records

    of Two Gifted Negro Children," The Journal of Psychology XV

    (January, 1943), 165-181.

        Case studies of two gifted Negro children who were discovered
as a result of the testing of eight thousand Negro children in a
Metropolitan center.

Time Magazine LI (February 16, 1948), p. 25.

An article discussing the approximate number passing as whites in the United States.