

Mr. REUSS. Well, either way, isn't the process of cross-examining, getting to the bottom of something, and the idea that a trained generalist, like yourself, is perfectly capable of making an independent judgment and doesn't have to rely entirely on the judgment of the so-called professionals, many of whom, as there was testified yesterday, may have an ax to grind because they may be making their living selling these psychological tests?

Wouldn't this seem to you a useful procedure?

Mr. LUCE. Well, it would seem that anyone in the position of having an agency should make a reasonable inquiry to determine for himself that these tests have validity.

I think I made a reasonable inquiry. Your question suggests I should have made a more detailed inquiry.

Mr. REUSS. I am not trying to rake up the past. But since you have before you the task of going before the Civil Service Commission and justifying what you are doing—and let me say parenthetically that perhaps unlike some of my colleagues here, I think you have presented a thoughtful piece of testimony here this afternoon—since you have to go before the Civil Service Commission, wouldn't it be an extraordinarily useful thing if you could spend some hours on making an independent inquiry in which you put your own good mind on the question of whether these tests are really efficacious for their purpose, sufficient to justify the admitted hazards, if they are misapplied, and I am not suggesting Bonneville has misapplied them.

Wouldn't this be a worthy use of some of your time?

Mr. LUCE. The more I know about my case, the better case can be made, the better judgment, the more accurate and more reasonable judgment can be arrived at. I really haven't thought out whether I will make some further inquiries of other psychologists or of anyone else about these particular tests. But I may do that if I think it is necessary.

Mr. REUSS. I would hope that in addition to inquiring among a broad spectrum of psychologists, you would put your own mind on it because I would hate to come to the conclusion that this subject was so occult that an intelligent and industrious administrator like yourself is incapable of grasping whether it is valid or not.

And indeed, I think one of the troubles of the last 25 years has been that everyone has been too ready to accept the fact that somebody else is using it.

For example, when I go to my fellow Episcopalians in a few days and say "Brethren, are we right in using this test?" they will say "Of course we are. Bonneville is using it." And so the picture goes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In fact, along the lines of suggested reading that Mr. Reuss has pointed out, it might well be in order if you saw fit to do this, before Mr. Rosenthal's law becomes effective, to read some of the writings of Mr. George K. Bennett, Ph. D., a psychologist, president of the Psychological Corp., which sells these tests. (See p. 65, supra.)

Mr. Bennett stated, and I quote:

Over the past 40 years a great number of self-descriptive inventories have been conducted and tried out. This reviewer is unable to recall a well-established instance of useful validity for a class of questionnaires against a criterion of occupational success.