

speed of decision, intellectual aptitudes and abilities, perception and visualization, and temperament and motivation; that is, personality, which were combined into a single score. All men who met the physical standards of the medical examination were accepted and sent into pilot training; their test records were sent to headquarters and were not made available to the training schools. These are the results:

Not 1 of the 125 men with the lowest combined aptitude score was successful in flying training.

Only 4 percent of the 391 men with low aptitude scores were able to complete the full course of flying training.

Of the 468 men with medium aptitude scores, 30 percent were graduated.

Of the 158 high aptitude men, 65 percent were graduated.

It is clear from these data, which constitute a rigorous "test of the tests," that important improvements in training efficiency resulted from the use of these objective selection procedures. The meaning of the scores on the test battery is reasonably clear. They were related to success in training. Incidentally, other studies demonstrated their relationship to bombing accuracy and to the accident rates.

This research investigation also illustrates that tests are not perfect but that they may lead to a marked improvement in personnel decisions over decisions made on the basis of conventional personnel procedures. In this instance, 25 percent of the entire group, selected by conventional methods, were graduated. If only men with high aptitude scores had been selected, 65 percent would have graduated. This represents a tremendous savings in time, materials, and money.

Obviously, I could also illustrate instances in which tests have not been effective. It is the responsibility of the test user to know from research what tests are effective for what purposes under what conditions.

I should like now to present our recommendations and views on the need for legislative action on these matters.

In our view, legislation may define the roles and functions of psychologists in the Federal Government; it should not dictate the methods and procedures for carrying out these roles and functions. These methods and procedures are more properly reserved to professional judgments. Such a canon of professional autonomy does not, of course, preclude the use of commonsense by the individuals concerned. Nor does it suggest an indifference to the important question of individual rights with which this committee is quite properly concerned—as are the members of our association.

It does seem to us, however, that there are several ways in which the Government could strengthen its assessment procedures and safeguard the rights of individuals subject to them.

The underlying theme of our recommendations or suggestions is that professional competence should systematically be put at the service of the Government to develop guidelines for psychological assessment practices, to carry out such procedures, and to review such programs and procedures.

Specifically, the Government might act to:

1. Insure that all nonresearch test use and psychological assessment such as is not under the direct cognizance of the Civil Service Commission should be under the direction of highly qualified staff psychologists directly responsible to operating or line administrators.