

**Why do Black American Males
Earn Less than Black American Women?
An Examination of Four Hypotheses**

Richard Lynn

University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland

Wei-Cheng Mau

Wichita State University, U.S.A

Four hypotheses to explain why black men in the United States and Britain earn less than black women are examined. These are (1) Sowell's thesis black males have lower average intelligence than black females; this hypothesis is rejected; (2) black males have lower educational attainment than black females; new American evidence on the educational attainment of 8th grade students in reading, mathematics and science is presented that disconfirms this hypothesis; (3) black males have lower work motivation than black females; evidence on the amount of homework disconfirms this hypothesis; (4) employers are reluctant to employ black males; it is proposed that this is the most plausible explanation for the low earnings of black males compared with black females.

Key Words: Earnings, Academic Performance, Work Motivation, African Americans, Gender Differences

In both the United States and Britain blacks have lower earnings than whites, but the difference is greater for males than for females. The black-white earnings differences for men and women in the United States for the period 1949-1985 obtained from census returns have been calculated by Farley and Allen (1989) and are given in Table 1. The figures are for per capita incomes and show the incomes of black men and women as percentages of those of whites. It can be seen that throughout the period the earnings differential was substantially greater for men than for women. It can be seen also that both black men and women improved their earnings relative to whites from 1949 to 1969, but from 1969 to 1985 black men achieved only a very small improvement in their earnings while black women lost ground. A similar difference in the earnings of black men and women relative to whites has been found in Britain. In a study of a nationally representative sample of 2,867 whites and 1,205 blacks carried out in the mid-1990s it was found that among employees black men earned 91 per cent of white men, while black women earned 109 per cent of white women (Madood & Berthoud, 1997).

*Table 1 – Earnings of Black Men and Black Women
as Percentages of the White Population
in the United States of America*

Year	1949	1959	1969	1979	1985
Men	46	50	55	57	57
Women	66	79	91	88	88

There are four possible explanations that have been proposed, or could be proposed, for the fact that black men have lower earnings, relative to whites, than black women. These are that black men have a disadvantage in intelligence, in educational attainment, in work motivation, or that they are subject to discrimination from employers. The intelligence deficit version of the human capital theory has been proposed by Sowell (1994, p.171) who writes that “research findings have consistently shown that black females have higher IQ test scores, and most other test scores, than black males”. If this is so, it would explain some or perhaps all of the disadvantage of black men in earnings because intelligence is a determinant of earnings at a correlation of around 0.35 (Brown & Reynolds, 1975; Jencks, 1972; Murray, 1998), and also because intelligence is a determinant of educational attainment at around 0.58 (Jencks, 1972) to 0.72 (Yule, Gold & Busch, 1982), which also determines earnings. A variant of the human capital theory of the disadvantage of black men in earnings is that this is due in whole or in part to poorer educational attainment, caused either by lower intelligence, as maintained by Sowell or by some other factor such as lower work motivation or conformity. A second possible explanation for the lower earnings of black men is that black men have lower work motivation than black women. Some American ethnographic studies of the high rates of unemployment among black men in inner cities have concluded that a major factor responsible for these is unwillingness to work harder. Thus, Anderson (1980, p.75) writes that “there are many unemployed black youth who are unmotivated and uninterested in working for a living, particularly in the dead-end jobs they are likely to get.” Petterson (1997, p.605) writes that “it is commonly contended that young black men experience more joblessness than their white counterparts because they are less willing to seek out low paying jobs.”

A third theory of the lower earnings of black men, as compared with black women, is that they are subject to discrimination by employers. This explanation proposes that mostly white employers regard black

men as more of a threat than black women and as a result discriminate against them. This is suggested by Farley and Allen (1987, p.357) who ask "Do employers frequently assume that young black men are involved more in a street culture of drugs and violence, an assumption that is not made about whites or black women? Are black men viewed as competitors for the jobs of white men while women of both races are not?" Farley and Allen do not provide any answers to these questions.

In this paper we present evidence to test two hypotheses on possible causes of the earnings deficit of black males. The first is that black males may have lower educational attainment than black females, relative to gender differences in other racial and ethnic groups. The second is that black males may have lower work motivation than black females, again relative to other racial and ethnic groups.

Method

The data for this study are derived from the American National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88), sponsored by the U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 1990). The sample consists of a nationally representative sample of 8th grade students randomly selected from 1,052 schools stratified by size, urban vs. rural, regional, and percent minority population. Samples were weighted to compensate for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust for non-response rates. Asian-American and Hispanic students were over-sampled in order to ensure adequate sample sizes for subgroup analyses. The numbers in the sample consist of 1,527 Asian American (6.2%), 3,171 Hispanic (12.9%), 3,009 Black (12.2%), 15,692 White (63.8%), and 924 Native American (3.8%) students. The detailed sampling procedure is described by the National Center for Educational Statistics (1990). The students that participated completed an 85-minute battery of cognitive tests (reading, mathematics, science, and social studies). Students were also asked to give an estimate of hours of homework they did per week.

Results

Table 2 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the four racial and ethnic groups and for the total sample for reading, mathematics, science and homework. It can be seen that girls obtain consistently higher mean scores than boys for reading and for the amount of homework, while boys obtain consistently higher mean scores than girls on mathematics and science. We examined whether there are sex differences in these measures and found that black boys obtain lower

scores on these measures than black girls, but the difference wasn't as great relative to the sex differences in the three other groups. Table 3 shows the raw score sex differences and these differences expressed as *d* scores (the differences divided by the standard deviations of the total samples). The data set out in this table show that in general there are only small differences in all the measures and that there is no consistent trend for black boys to perform more poorly than black girls, as compared with the sex difference in the other three groups. Thus, in reading, the advantage of black girls is the smallest among the four groups. In mathematics and science, the advantage of black boys is not as great as that in the other three groups, but the differences are quite small. In homework, black girls have a smaller advantage over black boys, relative to Asians and whites, but a slightly greater advantage relative to Hispanics. The statistical significance of the *ds* is shown in Table 4. This shows that the only difference between the four groups is that Asian, Hispanic and white boys do significantly better in science than girls, whereas among blacks this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 2. – Means Scores of 8th grade students' Mathematics, Reading, Science, and Hours Of Homework by Race And Gender

Variables	Asian		Hispanic		Black		White		Male s	Fern.
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
Reading	49.81	/51.69	45.81	/47.29	45.34	/46.60	50.63	/52.96	49.57	51.58
Math	52.99	/52.77	46.67	/45.55	45.07	/44.96	52.04	/51.71	50.78	50.30
Science	52.64	/48.96	47.27	/45.54	45.29	/44.90	52.82	/51.03	51.45	49.68
Homework	3.88	/4.28	3.95	/4.06	3.91	/4.07	3.95	/4.21	3.95	4.18

Table 3 – Sex Differences in Raw scores and in (Effect Sizes) of Reading, Math, Science, and Homework Comparing Among Racial/Ethnic Groups

Variables	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	Total
Reading	-1.88 (-.18)	-1.48 (-.17)	-1.26 (-.14)	-2.33 (-.24)	-2.01 (-.20)
Math	.22 (.21)	1.27 (.15)	.13 (.02)	.33 (.03)	.48 (.05)
Science	3.68 (.35)	1.73 (.21)	.39 (.05)	1.79 (.18)	1.77 (.18)
Homework	-.40 (-.29)	-.11 (-.08)	-.16 (-.12)	-.26 (-.18)	-.23 (-.16)

Table 4 – Results of ANOVA

Variables	Sex F (df = 1)	Race F (df = 3)	Sex x Race F (df = 3)	Direction of Significant Differences
Homework	20.51***	2.28	1.53	Females (F) > Males (M)
Reading	26.05***	227.18***	1.79	F > M Asian, White > Hispanic, Black
Math	1.73	311.00***	.65	Asian, White > Hispanic, Black
Science	32.29***	303.15***	3.64*	Asian M, White M > Hispanic M > Black M Asian F White F > Hispanic F > Black F Asian M > Asian F Hispanic M > Hispanic F White M > White F

* p < .01; *** p < .0001

Discussion

This study set out to test the hypotheses that the low earnings of black men, in relation to those of black women, and as compared to sex differences in earnings among whites and other racial and ethnic groups, might be due to a greater sex difference among blacks in educational attainment or in work motivation, such that black males are disadvantaged on one or the other, or both, of these characteristics. The results provide little support for either of these hypotheses. The only result providing some support for the hypothesis that black males may have lower educational attainment relative to black females than is present in other racial and ethnic groups lies in the sex differences in science, where the advantage of boys is significantly greater among Asians, Hispanics and whites, but is not significantly greater among blacks. Nevertheless, considered in the context of the results as a whole, and in particular the relatively high achievement of black boys on reading, the results cannot be regarded as supporting the hypothesis that black boys have any disadvantage in educational attainment, relative to blacks girls, as compared with the other racial and ethnic groups.

The results do not address directly Sowell’s (1994) contention that black males have a lower average IQ than black females, and that this is not the case among whites. However, intelligence is so strongly associated with educational attainment that if Sowell’s theory were correct black males should perform significantly worse than females on


the tests of reading, mathematics and science reported in this study. The results show that this is not the case and therefore, provide indirect evidence against Sowell's theory. Furthermore, there is strong direct evidence against Sowell's thesis. There is no tendency for black boys to obtain lower IQs than black girls in the American standardisation sample of the WISC-R (Jensen & Reynolds, 1983) or in studies of large samples in Africa (Klingelhofer, 1967; Owen, 1992).

In this paper we have examined four hypotheses for the explanation of the lower earnings of black males than black females, as compared with the differential among whites. We have not found any evidence to support the hypotheses that black males have lower educational attainment or lower work motivation than black females. The evidence does not support Sowell's contention that black males have lower IQs than black females. By default we are left with the fourth hypothesis that employers tend to be reluctant to employ black men but do not have the same reluctance to employ black women as the most likely explanation of the lower earnings of black men. This appears to be a reasonable explanation because black males as a group tend to have high average levels of aggression. Black male convictions for assault are five times greater than those of white males and for homicide 11 times greater (Taylor and Whitney, 1999). Many white employers are likely to be aware of this and as a result may tend to discriminate against black men while remaining quite willing to employ black women.

References

- Anderson, E.
1980 Some observations on black youth unemployment. In B. E. Anderson and I.V. Sawhill (Eds) *Youth employment and public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, W.W., & Reynolds, M.O.
1975 A model of IQ, occupation and earnings. *American Economic Review*, 65, 1002-1007.
- Farley, R., & Allen, W.R.
1987 *The color line and the quality of life in America*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jencks, S.
1972 *Inequality*. London: Penguin.
- Jensen, A.R., & Reynolds, C.R.
1982 Sex differences on the WISC-R. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 3, 423-428.
- Klingelhofer, E.L.
1967 Performance of Tanzanian secondary school pupils on the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices test. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 72, 205-215.

- Modood, T., & Berthoud, R.
1997 *Ethnic minorities in Britain*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Murray, C.
1998 *Income Inequality and IQ*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- National Center for Educational Statistics
1990 *National education longitudinal study of 1988: Base year sample design report* (Report No. 90-463). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Owen, K.
1992 The suitability of Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices for various groups in South Africa. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 149-160.
- Petterson, S.M.
1997 Are young black men really less willing to work? *American Sociological Review*, 62, 605-613.
- Sowell, T.
1994 *Race and culture: A world view*. New York: Basic Books.
- Taylor, J and Whitney, G.
1999 US racial profiling in the prevention of crime: is there an empirical basis. *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, 24, 485-509.
- Yule, W., Gold, R.D., & Busch, C.
1982 Long term predictive validity of the WPPSI: an 11 year follow-up study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 3, 65-71.



Will America Drown?

Immigration and the Third World Population Explosion

Edited by Humphrey Dalton

*“Two-thirds of all the babies born in Los Angeles county
are born to illegal immigrant parents.”*

- Pete Wilson, former Governor of California.

Includes: world population growth chart, historical Summary of immigration legislation and policies since colonial, figures of escalating Third World population explosion. An essential source book on the problem of mass human migration.

Paperback. 128 pps. ISBN 1-878465-05-8.

Price: \$16.00

P&P: \$3.50 USA – \$4.50 foreign
MasterCard and VISA accepted

Scott-Townsend Publishers

P.O. Box 34070, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20043
Tel: (202) 371-2700, Fax: (202) 371-1523, Socecon@aol.com

**Immigrants from the Middle East:
A Profile of the Foreign-born U.S. Population
from Pakistan to Morocco**

Steven A. Camarota¹

Center for Immigration Studies, Washington D.C.

The incorporation of persons of Muslim Middle Eastern origin into the United States of America has attracted heightened interest since the September 11, 2001. The author uses U.S. Census Bureau data to examine the increase in migrants from the Middle East as a share of currently growing total immigration into the United States and their consequent distribution, comparative educational attainment and socio-economic status within their adopted country of residence. The author perceives evidence for a further increase in the numbers of persons of Middle Eastern origin in the United States and of their share of total immigration into the United States in the near future. While noting inequity of treating migrant applicants of Middle Eastern origin differently to migrants of other ethnicities, he suggests that it would be more ethical to effect a reduction in immigration across the board combined with a more rigorous pursuit of illegal Middle Eastern immigrants in particular.

Key Words: Middle Easterner; immigration, Census Bureau, INS, education, socio-economic status, populations, America, Christian, Muslim, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Turkey, Levant, Arab peninsula, Arab North Africa.

In the aftermath of September 11, 2002, there has been heightened interest in the Middle Eastern immigrant population living in the United States. Their integration and incorporation into American society has come to be seen as increasingly important.

Based on an analysis by the Center for Immigration Studies of just-released data from the Census Bureau, this article is one of the first to examine the socio-demographic characteristics of Middle Eastern immigrants in a systematic way. For the purposes of this study, the Middle East is defined as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Turkey, the Levant, the Arabian peninsula, and Arab North Africa.²

¹ Correspondance to: Steven A. Camarota at center@cis.org

² We include Bangladesh in our estimates because in 1970 it was part of Pakistan, and thus it is unavoidably included in our Mideast estimates for that year. The entire list of Middle Eastern countries included in the study are: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, West Sahara, and Mauritania.

We do not include Somalia in our study even though it is officially part of the Arab League. We also included all persons who said they were born in Gaza, Palestine, or the West