

extent that unqualified people tend to be very naive. That is, a school guidance counselor, might tend to take bad scores completely at face value and say that the child is emotionally sick.

A very experienced psychologist, who is very intelligent, would tend to be less naive. He might not trust the test, but you could not rely on this.

It is quite possible for a qualified psychologist, with a Ph. D., to take the test quite seriously. Many of them believe the tests are excellent, yet a qualified person cannot give an unvalidated test and have it make sense. The qualification of the tester is not overly important in the use of personality tests because no one is qualified to use these instruments because there are no "qualified" tests.

I was disheartened by the one sentence in the statement of the head of the civil service, which was given to me this afternoon, in which he clarified the use of personality tests in the U.S. Government. Mr. Macy allowed the civil service a loophole, which I think is very dangerous, and will permit the use of personality tests in almost any situation in Government.

He says on the last page of his policy statement, "Use of personality test prohibited." The last sentence of that paragraph reads:

This does not, of course, relate to the proper use of such tests by a qualified psychiatrist, or psychologist when in his professional judgment they would assist in his total study of an individual in connection with medical determination for employment or fitness for future duty.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I might say, and then we will get back to it, this was on the question of invasion of privacy. This did not become part of his overall following file, that this remains part of the clinical relationship between doctor and—

Mr. GROSS. Could it not be used, though, for his discharge?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, it could, no question about it.

Mr. GROSS. I have overlooked one very significant thing, possibly the most significant thing that has been done in test evaluation. That was the Office of Strategic Services, headed by General Donovan, in World War II. They conducted the most extensive personality test program in history. Every prospective agent here at Fairfax, Va., was put through 3 days of personality testing, and every known instrument was used. In the book, "Assessment of Men," a report by OSS psychologists, published by Rinehart after World War II, they list the procedure in detail and I describe it in my book. The OSS book is written so optimistically that you expect that at the end the OSS psychologists are going to say that, as a result of this testing program, we found magnificent agents for use in Yugoslavia, France, et cetera. The book concludes that although their intent was good, and although the techniques seemed excellent, when the test scores were compared with performance ratings of OSS agents throughout the world during World War II, there was no worthwhile correlation. The test did not predict performance. This is simple admission, and they used almost every well known test.

Now, if an instrument is proven by various Government agencies, and by various institutions throughout our history, in carefully validated tests, not to succeed, it seems to me ridiculous that it should be used.

As I say, the greatest danger is the aura of clinical truth that some psychologists would use to surround MMPI. Of course, other