

BICAP 15.

To Whom It May Concern

I am writing in defense of Professor Helmuth Nyborg, my having heard that academically unfavorable and unjust treatment has been accorded him because of his published research and public comments on sex differences in mental abilities, particularly in general ability, technically referred to as psychometric g, or the g factor.

If this critical action against Professor Nyborg weren't so ludicrous, occurring now in the Twenty-first century, it would warrant utter contempt. Scientific interest in sex differences in mental ability is as old as empirical psychology itself, beginning in the Nineteenth century with the research of Sir Francis Galton, the venerable founder of differential psychology.

To the best of my knowledge, Professor Nyborg's empirical research on the question of whether an appropriate statistical analysis of a variety of mental tests indicates an average statistical difference in g between males and females was first presented in his lectures delivered at the 2001 and 2002 conventions of the International Society for Intelligence Research. These studies culminated in a book chapter [Nyborg, H. (2003). Sex differences in g (Pp.187-222).

In H. Nyborg, Ed, The Scientific Study of General Intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen, New York: Pergamon.] This work stands out as perhaps the methodologically most important and theoretically comprehensive scientific article that presently exists on the subject of sex differences in intelligence, especially with respect to psychometric g. If similar results were found in a number of such studies based on different population samples and diverse samples of psychometric tests, Nyborg's conclusion would be generally considered as definitive as are several other generally established and no longer seriously disputed facts concerning sex differences in cognitive abilities. These have their largest loadings on factors other than g, such as visual-spatial reasoning and clerical speed and accuracy. There is also a male-female difference in the variance of certain abilities. Although little is yet established concerning the causal basis or evolutionary significance of these cognitive sex differences, some plausible theories have been proposed. Nyborg's research holds a respected position in this arena. Condemning or restricting his particular research activity not only obstructs a larger field of research, but most especially it is absolutely wrong in principle.

Arthur R. Jensen  
Professor Emeritus  
Educational Psychology  
University of California, Berkeley