

viewer feels that the role will not be that of providing a clear, efficient and simple personality description.

By contrast, another reviewer speaking to the same test has a different outlook. He says:

By both objective and subjective evaluation the CPI appears to be a major achievement. It will surely receive wide use for research and for practical applications.

However, the reputation of the second reviewer is not so well known as the reputation of the first one. I submit this creates a problem unless someone——

Dr. BRAYFIELD. I interpreted they were both favorably disposed toward the CPI.

Mr. ROMNEY. No.

Dr. BRAYFIELD. The second person comes right out and says it. That is the difference

Mr. GALLAGHER. The other fellow doesn't come right out and say it?

Mr. ROMNEY. These are contrasting views.

Dr. BRAYFIELD. I think they are contrasting styles of writing more than views, but you will certainly get divergent opinions. There is no question. Just like the 200-to-200 vote in the House a few days ago.

Mr. ROMNEY. The first reviewer said:

It is conceivable there may be a role for personality inventory developed by the procedures in following the rationale on the CPI. However, this reviewer feels that the role will not be that of providing a clear, efficient, and simple personality description.

I don't read that as being favorable.

Dr. BRAYFIELD. It is a theoretical position and one person says the rationale is not a useful one from the standpoint of psychological theory. He doesn't say the test is no good. He is talking about the theoretical orientation of the man who developed the CPI. That is what he is doing.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What he is doing is really saying that he sees no real use for it, to boil it down. There may be a use but he hasn't found it.

Mr. ROMNEY. Another one quite commonly referred to is the Kuder preference record. A reviewer sums this one up in the following language:

In summary, because of the weaknesses discussed above, the reviewer is of the opinion that the Kuder preference record-personal is of only limited value. Counselors using it should guard carefully against overinterpretation.

We have the well-known Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory——

Dr. BRAYFIELD. Where was the second example by contrast?

Mr. ROMNEY. I didn't find one. Only one review is given.

The Minnesota Multiphasic is summed up by the first reviewer in the following language:

Another relevant question in regard to clinical use of the MMPI is whether the game is worth the candle in terms of time consumed in scoring and interpreting the test. Aside from literally scores of hours which a conscientious MMPI user must now take to acquaint himself with the theory and practice of the test, he must also spend from 2 to 3 hours checking, profiling, analyzing, and comparing each protocol in relation to the material in the manual, the atlas, basic readings, and various other MMPI researches. It is to be wondered whether the clinical