

It is too much of a temptation for a man who is offered an important post with an important Government agency, asked to formulate or find a written short-answer test that will solve all of the agency's problems, it is too much of a temptation to him to pick up the nearest available test and start giving it wholesale.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do you think high-level Government officials fall back on this as an easy way to solve otherwise difficult personnel problems?

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think that is part of the difficulty, and I think also there has been simply uncritical acceptance of the purported scientific conclusion that these tests work.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Take the case of the Peace Corps, and you referred to Dr. Carp's testimony, which I remember well. The Peace Corps started from scratch. They had to have an enormous program of enlisting people and, of course, Congress was interested in them getting bright, dedicated, zealous young people who would promote a good image of the United States overseas and they had to recruit a large number of people in a hurry.

I assume their position is that this mass testing permitted them to eliminate those people who wouldn't fit the general category of the type of person they were interested in, and that had they had to resort to individual interviews, they would have been years in getting cranked up a program that they got started in a matter of months.

In this case, didn't the testing, assuming it has some degree of validity, serve a useful purpose?

Mr. FREEDMAN. On the basis of your assumption, perhaps, but we will never know whether the people who were screened out were the worst or the best.

In addition, the fact is that the Peace Corps has a 3-month training program under which the volunteers are under the most intensive scrutiny. Of all the agencies in the Government that do not need this kind of half-baked written short-answer machine-graded test, the Peace Corps is the one that needs it least, because they have the fullest kind of FBI investigation, interviews, and a 3-month training program.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I want you to realize for the moment I might be the devil's advocate for the sake of developing the record here, but they contended that one of the reasons that they had such a low grade of failures on the job was their high degree of selectivity they used to which the testing contributed substantially.

Mr. FREEDMAN. That, they don't know. They had a high degree of success and I am very happy for it, but in my judgment the test was, at most, of minimal assistance, a makeweight on the scale when you consider the full field investigations that were made on these people, the 3-month training program under scrutiny, and the opinions that were solicited from the people who were supervising the training as well as from the volunteers about each other.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Maybe they eliminated large numbers of trainees from the training program, which was probably a very responsive kind of program. In other words, after we had invested 2 months of training in an individual, to then exclude him from the program, we would have lost a great deal of money.

Mr. FREEDMAN. That may or may not be true. Again, we don't know because it has never been proven out. It was an assumption.