Human Intelligence
Earl Hunt

Well written, well informed, modest in its claims, moderate, tempered,

 It is disappointing that such an important work has found no more reviewers. Hunt takes a middle position among the major figures in the field, whom he knows personally, from Jensen, Murray, Herrnstein, Rushton and Gottfredson on the more hereditarian side to Nesbett, Turkheimer and Gardner on the other.

I find Hunt to be easy to read despite the difficulty of his subject. Other researcher such as Lynn are rather one-dimensional, somewhat blind to what is going on outside their fields of interest. Hunt has a broad perspective.

He jumps into the deep end with a discussion of structural equation modeling, a powerful statistical technique for teasing out the relationships among multiple factors which cannot be measured directly. Statisticians call them latent variables, of which g, intelligence is primary. Others might be subfactors of g, called fluid and crystalized intelligence, and motivation. As powerful of a tool as structural equation modeling is, it has serious limitations:
. It depends on the reliability of the measures - ie, how well does an intelligence test measure what it purports to
. The models must simplify by omitting variables, tacitly or explicitly, or estimating values
. With more degrees of freedom than a simple correlation or regression, the models require a large number of observations

The most significant limitations on intelligence measurement have to do with the fact that the subjects are human instead of laboratory animals. It is hard to get a representative sample and hard to get the same sample to hold still to be resampled over time in a longitudinal study.

As imperfect as the real-world situation is for measurement, the work of all researchers in the field over the past century generally point in common directions, those reported by Lily Jan.