PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND PSYCHIC PRIVACY

With the widespread use of psychological testing as a screening device for the school, for industry, and, more recently, for the seminary and the convent, growing concern has been expressed that this kind of assessment constitutes an invasion of the privacy of the individual. You have invited me to discuss with you today the extent to which this concern is justified. Before I can do so, however, it seems necessary for me, by way of introduction, to say something about psychological testing in general, including the kinds of tests employed, and the sort of information secured about the individual through the use of these tests. With this background briefly established, we can turn to a consideration of the question of the possible invasion of the privacy of the individual by these testing procedures.

What Are Psychological Tests?

One of the recent texts in the field of psychological testing offers the following definition: A psychological test is essentially an objective and standardized measure of a sample of behavior.[1] Let us look briefly at the several portions of this definition.

In the first place, a psychological test, like any other test whether in strict science or in simple classroom examination, is based upon a sample of performance. The kind of behavior sampled will be determined by the variable, trait, or characteristic which the testing instrument is designed to measure. Thus, very different samples of behavior would be found in a clerical aptitude test than in an adjustment inventory. The sample of behavior employed is the most crucial feature of a test because the sampling determines the *validity* of the test, i.e., the extent to which it actually measures what it purports to measure, e.g., clerical aptitude or psychological adjustment in the two examples given above. Likewise important is the *reliability* of the test, which refers to its stability or consistency, i.e., the extent to which the same persons would get the same scores when retested.

[1] A. Anastasi, *Psychological Testing* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1961, p. 21.

As indicated in the above definition, the psychological test is also a standardized measure, which implies uniformity in administration and scoring. Uniformity of administration is achieved by prescribing the precise conditions under which the test is to be taken, including time limits, instructions to subjects, preliminary demonstrations, and so forth. Uniformity of scoring is obtained by providing scoring keys, and uniformity of interpretation is achieved by the test norms which furnish the basis for interpretation of test scores. Percentiles and standard scores are the forms in which most standard tests interpret the significance of raw scores.

Finally, the definition quoted above indicated that a psychological test is an objective measure, meaning thereby that two independent observers would assign the same (or very nearly the same) final score to the performance of a given individual on the test. On standardized tests, as already indicated, objectivity is built in by rendering the administration, scoring, and interpretation of scores uniform and independent of the subjective judgment of the individual examiner.

The characteristics of psychological tests described above, namely their validity, reliability, objectivity, and standardization are the goals sought in test construction. These goals are achieved, however, in varying degrees by different tests, and this is the reason why some tests are better than others.

A succinct but authoritative guide for the evaluation of psychological tests is to be found in the *Technical Recommendations for Psychological Tests and Diagnostic Techniques*,[2] prepared and officially adopted by the American Psychological Association. This document, acknowledging the responsibility of the psychological profession in the development of psychological tests, summarizes the procedures which should govern test construction, according to the current state of knowledge in the field. The test producer (author and publisher) is admonished of the responsibility ". . . of providing sufficient information about each test so that users will know what

2 American Psychological Association. *Technical recommendations for psychological tests and diagnostic techniques.* Washington: American Psychological Association, 1954.

reliance can safely be placed on it."[3] Test users are further aided in their selection of psychological tests by such sources as the series of *Mental Measurements Yearbooks,* edited by Buros.[4]

Kinds of Psychological Tests

There are a large and even bewildering number of psychological tests available. The number of tests "in print" given by Buros,[5] as of June 1, 1961, was 2,126. By "tests in print" Buros meant those that are available to potential users, those namely which ". . . can be bought, borrowed, rented, or obtained on request."

A frequent division of psychological tests is into the four following categories: intelligence, aptitude, achievement, and personality tests. *Intelligence* tests, also called general ability tests, are designed to estimate the overall level of intellectual functioning. These tests were among the first psychological tests developed, and they remain among the best in terms of validity, reliability, and standardization. *Aptitude* tests came next and were first developed to fill the obvious gap left by the general intelligence tests. Today these tests are used to predict success in some occupation or training course, and are available for a wide variety of purposes. They range from very specific and simple measures of sensory acuity or finger dexterity, to complex tests of musical aptitude and aptitude for law and medicine. They are used chiefly in vocational guidance and personnel selection in industry. The third type of test is the *achievement* test. It is designed to assess the effect of training in a given field. Various kinds of educational tests for the various subject matter areas are examples of achievement tests. These tests are sometimes called

[3] *Ibid.,* 1.

[4] O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook.* Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1959. These "yearbooks" despite their titles have appeared only at irregular intervals. The first appeared in 1936, and the latest (the fifth) in 1959. The first two in the series were simply bibliographies of tests, but beginning with the third yearbook, issued in 1938, they have included critical reviews of tests by one or more test experts. These publications have become the best single source of critical evaluations of available psychological tests.

[5] O. K. Buros (Ed.), *Tests in print.* Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1961.

proficiency tests, when prescinding from the training involved, and when an attempt is made to measure the ability to perform a task which is significant in its own right, as reading German or typewriting. The final category of psychological tests concerns the measurement of *personality* characteristics. Included here are measures of emotional adjustment, social traits, character traits, and measures of motivation, interests, and attitudes.

Of the 2,126 psychological tests listed by Buros as being in print, 238, or 11.2 per cent, are classified by him as intelligence tests; 306, or 14.4 per cent, are personality tests; and the remaining 1,582, or 75 per cent, are aptitude or achievement tests. The approximately 15 per cent of psychological tests classified as personality tests are the ones which concern us in terms of our current topic, since they are the ones which furnish the basis for the charge that psychological testing is an invasion of the privacy of the individual. It behooves us, therefore, to look at personality tests more closely.

Personality Tests

Personality tests are often divided into two overall groups: (1) the self-report inventories; and (2) the projective techniques. This will be a convenient division for our present discussion so that we will consider each of these kinds of personality tests in turn.

Self-Report Inventories

Chronologically the first type of personality test to be developed was the self-report inventory, the prototype of which was the Personal Data Sheet, developed for use during World War I. At that time, the U. S. Army wanted to detect soldiers likely to break down in combat, but individual psychiatric interviews were out of the question when recruits were being processed by the thousands. The Personal Data Sheet was developed as an answer to this problem and was an attempt to standardize a psychiatric interview and to adapt it for mass screening purposes. Men who reported numerous symptoms on this test were singled out for further examination. The test proved valuable because it did succeed in detecting maladjusted soldiers in a situation where individual interviewing of every man was impossible.

The Personal Data Sheet of World War I has been followed by a number of adjustment inventories, which consist essentially of lists of problems, symptoms, or grievances to be checked or answered Yes — No — ? —. These inventories are designed to differentiate persons who are essentially normal psychologically from those who have notable psychological problems or neurotic tendencies.

Some of these tests attempt to measure only one type of symptom, as in the Cornell Medical Index which covers psychosomatic complaints. Sometimes the items are grouped by logical categories, as in the Bell Adjustment Inventory, which furnishes scores for home, health, social, and emotional adjustment, or in the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, which is scored for neuroticism, self-sufficiency, introversion, and dominance. Finally, some inventories like the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (as its name "Multiphasic" suggests) provides scores on a number of scales. Originally this inventory provided scores on nine scales, and subsequent research with the instrument now makes it possible to score it on a number of additional scales as well.

Some of the inventories put their items in the form of questions, as for example:

Has either of your parents frequently criticized you unjustly?
Do you get discouraged easily?

Others put their items in the form of statements, as for instance:

I believe I am being plotted against.
I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.

It makes no real difference whether the item is put as a question or as a statement. In either case the respondent answers "Yes" "No" or "Cannot say."

In the instructions accompanying these inventories the respondent is usually requested to give his own opinion of himself in response to the questions and is exhorted to respond "honestly" and "carefully." He is frequently assured that there are no right or wrong answers to questions in the inventory, and that it is only his own opinion of himself that is sought. He is often reassured that his answers to the questions will be treated in strictest

confidence, and even when this assurance is not formally given, it may certainly be assumed that the answers will be treated in this way.

It is evident that these self-report inventories actually constitute a process of self-revelation on the part of the respondent. Of course, there is a degree of self-revelation in everything that an individual does. The way we talk, the way we walk, our tone of voice, our gestures—all reveal in varying degrees the personality behind the behavior. This is the basis which each of us has for our concept of the personalities of our friends and acquaintances. Some persons, of course, can read these behavior manifestations of personality more effectively and more astutely than others,[6] but the signs are there to be read. What the individual reveals of himself in this way may be referred to as his public self-concept. Most people are willing to amplify this public self-concept, which is the concept of how they think they appear to others and are willing to appear in the eyes of others, particularly if there is some reason for doing so. It is evident that some people do not even require a reason and need only an occasion to expatiate on themselves at length. There is, however, for each of us a private self-concept which we are much less willing and sometimes frankly unwilling to reveal.

Much of the self-revelation asked for in self-report personality inventories pertains, in my opinion, to the public self-concept, or at least to the amplification of it, which most people are willing to provide, given a proportionate and justifying reason. And the information which the individual thus furnishes about himself in a personality inventory is provided in a form very useful for diagnosis, guidance, and counseling, in a word, in a manner which can be quite beneficial to the individual. However, on most personality inventories there are, in my opinion, some items which undoubtedly enter into the area of the private self-concept. We are in this area,

[6] Cf. G. W. Allport & P. E. Vernon, *Studies in Expressive Movement.* New York: Macmillan, 1933. It is sometimes matter for astonishment how much a skillful and trained interviewer can discover about a person in a single interview. Not all of this information is derived, of course, from the verbal communication of the person interviewed, but is inferred from his general behavior and deportment during the interview.

I think, when we inquire into matters about which we would have no information at all, apart from the self revelation of the individual. Here would be included such information as to behavior on the part of the individual witnessed by no one, inner feelings, say of resentment or hostility or love, and unexpressed thoughts and desires. This is the inner world of the psyche of which Pope Pius XII spoke in his Address on Applied Psychology,[7] given to the Congress of the International Association of Applied Psychology, on April 10, 1958.

While there are no right or wrong answers on personality inventories, as indicated above, there are, however, psychologically favorable or psychologically unfavorable responses. Sometimes it is quite clear, even to the untrained and unsophisticated respondent, that he can, to a considerable extent, present himself in a favorable rather than in a true light on these inventories, if he is inclined to do so. In some instances, as for example in employee selection, it would be to the advantage of the respondent to fake a "good" profile, whereas in other circumstances, as for instance for an Army inductee, it might be advantageous to fake a "bad" profile.

Faking is a problem which has plagued the constructors of personality tests from the beginning, and they have gradually elaborated procedures which attempt to deal with it. One method is the forced-choice technique. In this method, a respondent is offered a choice between two alternatives (forced-choice) which have antecedently been equated for social desirability. Thus the respondent who would wish to appear in a socially desirable rather than in a true light is outwitted by being compelled to choose between equally desirable traits. Thus he is compelled to indicate *which* good statements are most characteristic of him and *which* faults are most typically his.

A second method for dealing with faking on personality inventories has been to conceal the purpose of the test. A particularly effective method of concealment is to state a plausible purpose for the test which is not the tester's real center of interest in giving the

[7] Pope Pius XII, "Applied Psychology," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 50, 268-282. This address is also available in an NCWC pamphlet.

test. Cronbach, who was chairman of the committee responsible for the development of the *Technical Recommendations for Psychological Tests* referred to above, says that such a procedure ". . . skirts the edge of unethical practice."[8]

A third method for controlling faking is by means of so-called verification and correction keys. A good example of the use of such control keys is furnished by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, where there are four such keys.

The first is the ? score which is simply the number of times a person replies "cannot say" to a test item. Excessive evasion of questions makes it impossible to compare the responses of a given subject with the standardization group and such profiles are recognized as invalid.

The second of the control keys on this test is the L (Lie) scale, composed of test items so worded that a person who answers them negatively is almost certainly not evaluating himself frankly. One example is the item: "I sometimes put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today." A high L score indicates that the answers are untrustworthy, and would suggest that the respondent is attempting to "fake good" on the test. Such a test record would consequently be rejected as invalid.

The third control key is the F (False) score. This consists of responses given extremely rarely. A high F count suggests carelessness, misunderstanding, or otherwise invalid answers. A high F score would, therefore, also invalidate the test record.

The fourth control key, the K, measures the test-taking attitude of the respondent, i.e., the degree of frankness or defensiveness, and "corrects" certain of the scale scores accordingly. This is an effort to accept the test-taking attitude of the respondent, but at the same time to control its effect on test scores. It is evident that this is a relatively sophisticated attempt to meet the problem of faking on personality inventories.

These attempts on the part of test constructors to deal with faking have succeeded more in detecting faking on personality

[8] L. J. Cronbach, *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper, 1960, p. 453.

inventories than in preventing it. It is, of course, important that the tester be not deceived into accepting a false profile for a real one. When everything is said and done, however, the psychologist will secure as much information about the individual from the self-report personality inventory as the individual is willing to furnish and very little more. The psychologist may draw certain inferences from a respondent's failure to answer, or his evasiveness in certain areas, but this is all that he can do. There are, nevertheless, several questions about personality inventories pertinent to our consideration of the privacy of the individual, but I should prefer to reserve the discussion of these points until we have looked at the other type of personality assessment, that furnished by the projective techniques.

Projective Techniques

The chief distinguishing feature of projective techniques is to be found in their use of a relatively *unstructured* task, i.e., a task that permits an almost unlimited variety of possible responses. In order to allow free play to the individual, only brief, general instructions are provided. For the same reason, the test stimuli are usually vague and equivocal. The underlying hypothesis is that the way in which the individual perceives and interprets the test material or "structures" the situation, will reflect fundamental aspects of his psychological functioning. In other words, it is expected that the test material will serve as a sort of screen upon which the subject "projects" his characteristic ideas, attitudes, strivings, fears, conflicts, aggressions, and the like. Projective techniques are divided in various ways, and the division that we shall present briefly for purposes of illustration considers projective techniques in terms of the manner of response. On this basis, projective techniques may be divided into the following five categories:[9]

1. *Associative techniques.* In this case the subject is required to respond to a stimulus by giving the first word, image, or percept that occurs to him. The Rorschach Inkblot Test would be the best-known example of this class of projective test. The Rorschach

[9] Anastasi, *op. cit.*, 566-590.

utilizes ten cards, on each of which is printed a bilaterally symmetrical inkblot. As the subject is shown each inkblot, he is asked to tell what he sees—what the blot could represent. The subject's responses on the Rorschach are interpreted according to responses found to be typical of various diagnostic and other psychological categories for this test.

2. *Construction procedures.* Here the subject is required to create or construct a product, such as a story. A typical example of this category of projective techniques is found in the Thematic Apperception Test. The original test, developed by Murray and his staff at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, consisted of 20 cards containing vague pictures, the subject being asked to make up a story to fit each picture.

3. *Completion tasks.* In this approach, the subject is called upon to complete some material as, for instance, sentences or stories. An example of this type of projective technique is to be found in the Sentence Completion Test where the opening words of a sentence are provided, the subject being required to write the ending. A few typical examples would be:

I feel . . .
What annoys me . . .
My mind . . .
If I had my way . . .
Women . . .

4. *Choice or ordering devices.* These techniques call for the rearrangement of pictures, the recording of preferences, and the like. An example in this category is the Picture Arrangement Test. This test consists of 25 items, each item containing three sketches. The subject's task with each of the three sketches is to indicate the order of the three pictures "which makes the best sense," and to write a sentence for each of the three pictures to tell the story. All items in this test deal with interpersonal relations.

5. *Expressive methods.* This approach differs from the preceding in that the subject's style or method is evaluated as well as the finished product. An example here would be the Draw-a-Person

Test. In this test, the subject is provided with a letter-size sheet of paper and a pencil, and told simply to "draw a person."

From even the brief description given above of these various projective techniques, certain features of them may be readily discerned. In the first place they represent a *disguised* testing procedure, inasfar as the subject is rarely aware of the type of psychological interpretation that will be made of his responses. Projective techniques are likewise characterized by a *global* approach to the appraisal of personality. Attention is focused upon a composite picture of the whole personality, rather than upon the measurement of separate traits, as is the case in many of the self-report personality inventories. Another more technical but certainly not less important feature of these techniques is their lack of standardization both with respect to administration and scoring, together with a deficiency in norms, characteristic of many of them. Consequently, from the point of view of psychological test construction, the projective techniques are inferior to the self-report personality inventories. They likewise require a large measure of individual training, experience, and skill on the part of the examiner, and rest for their validity very largely upon the interpretative skill of the examiner.

Projective tests are employed by psychologists because they are generally considered as supplementing the information supplied by the self-report inventories, and because they are considerably less subject to faking than are the inventories. The claim is frequently made, although not accepted by all psychologists, that projective techniques also give indications of the unconscious forces at work in the personality. To the extent to which the latter claim is true, such techniques would obviously supplement the information provided by the self-report inventory, which would be limited to the conscious image an individual had of himself.

In the projective techniques there occurs, of course, a self-revelation of the personality. The respondent does not have the same feeling of self revelation here as in the self-report inventories, but this is only because he knows nothing of the *inferences* which the examiner will draw from his responses with respect to his person-

ality. It can truly be said, therefore, that an individual in taking a projective test gives information about himself to the examiner that he is *unaware* of giving. It is possible also that he may give evidence from his test responses, for instance on the Rorschach, of tendencies of which he himself is unconscious, e.g., of latent homosexuality, or aggression, or hostility. This, therefore, can be a profound revelation of the self.

It should be noted, I think, that in the self-report inventories, no less than in the projective techniques, the respondent is unaware of what inferences the psychologist will draw with respect to his personality from his test responses. In the self-report inventory the subject has some insight into the import of his responses to individual items—which he usually does not have in the case of projective tests—but he does not know how these items will be combined into scales, and consequently he does not know what inferences will be drawn with respect to his personality from his responses to the test items. In this sense, then, in both types of personality tests the subject is furnishing information about himself which he is unaware of giving. I might observe, however, that the same would be true also in an interview situation, as already noted above.

We are now prepared, I think, to consider the central matter which concerns us, namely, the extent to which the kind of psychological testing described above would constitute an invasion of the psychic privacy of the individual.

An Invasion of Privacy?

I would agree fully with Cronbach in the book already referred to when he writes: "Any test is an invasion of privacy for the subject who does not wish to reveal himself to the psychologist."[10] The psychologist, therefore, must have the *consent* of the person to be tested before he may legitimately gather this information about his personality. And the subject must know to what he is consenting, if the consent is to be valid. Pope Pius XII in the discourse already referred to is explicit on this point:

[10] Cronbach, *op. cit.*, 459.

> If the consent is unjustly extorted, any action of the psychologist will be illicit; if the consent is vitiated by a lack of freedom (due to ignorance, error, or deceit), every attempt to penetrate into the depth of the soul will be immoral.

The above quotation from Pope Pius XII would, it seems to me, suggest that a consent obtained by concealing the nature of the test in the manner previously indicated, would be an invalid consent (because obtained by deception) and would render "immoral" the information secured. On the other hand, it is hardly possible without destroying the spontaneity of the subject's responses (which would invalidate most personality tests), to tell the respondent in detail what personality traits will be tested and what measures employed, nor does it seem to me that such is necessary. What appears to me to be essential and sufficient is an honest presentation of the testing situation and of the relationship to obtain between the respondent and the psychologist. I think that the following introduction to testing, a sample one recommended by Cronbach for a clinical situation, will be recognized as a very honest statement:

> It might help to solve your problem more rapidly if we collect as much information as we can. Some of our tests use straightforward questions whose purpose you will readily understand. Some of our other tests dig more deeply into the personality. Sometimes they bring to light emotional conflicts that the person is not even conscious of. Few of us admit, even to ourselves, the whole truth about our feelings and ideas. I think I can help you better with the aid of these tests.[11]

When an individual consents to the testing after such an explanation, he has obviously given a valid consent, and one may predict that the testing will be conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

I would see a second requirement for the legitimate entrance of the psychologist into the inner psyche of the subject to consist in a *warranty* or a proportionate and justifying reason. The reason should be the graver, the deeper the psychologist would delve into

[11] *Ibid.*, 461-462.

the inner psyche of the individual. In this connection, a basic question would seem to be: What is the purpose of the testing?

At this point a distinction should be made between individual and institutional testing. The first is testing undertaken for the benefit of the individual, at his request, and for his personal information and guidance alone. The second is testing undertaken for the benefit of an institution, organization, or religious order, to which the individual belongs or wants to belong. In the first case the psychologist acts in the name of the individual and *per se* owes duties only to him. In the second case the psychologist acts primarily in the name of the organization or religious order. He is their agent and owes duties primarily to them. In the first case it is understood ahead of time that the procedure is primarily for the benefit of the subject tested and that the results will not be used "against" him, so to speak. In the second case it is obvious ahead of time (or ought to be, because otherwise the subject's consent to the procedure would scarcely be valid) that the procedures are carried out primarily for the benefit of the organization or religious order which employs the psychologist, and that in the case of a conflict of interest as between the individual and the organization the material can be used "against the subject."

There seems to be little difficulty about a proportionate justifying reason for psychological testing and for the entrance of the psychologist into the inner psyche of the subject in the case of individual testing. Such testing is undertaken, by definition, at the request of the individual and for his benefit. The individual feels that the psychologist can help him in this way, and the psychologist concurs in this expectation. Consequently, the testing in this case is undertaken under a mutually satisfactory expectation of benefit.

The case with institutional testing is much more difficult and much more complex, and I would like, therefore, to distinguish several instances of it, in order to elucidate the principles as I see them.

The first case of institutional testing which I would consider would be that of a candidate for admission to a religious order. May such an applicant be required by the admitting Superior to take a

series of personality tests? I believe that the answer is: Yes! An applicant is required to demonstrate his suitability for admission. This is a positive asset which is to be demonstrated, not assumed. Experience has sufficiently well shown that psychological suitability is often not indicated by the traditional sources of information about candidates, so that a Superior, burdened with the obligation of satisfying his own conscience as to the positive suitability of applicants, is justified in requiring the demonstration of personality suitability which would come from psychological test results. It is further to be observed that this testing is not only for the benefit of the Order, but is also for the benefit of the applicant. If test results demonstrate the applicant's unsuitability, it cannot be said that the results are used against him if he is refused admission, because it is distinctly to his advantage not to embrace a way of life for which he is unsuited.

The case is different, I believe, for one who has already been admitted to a religious order, because here a provision of positive law becomes operative. It has been suggested, and I think rightly, that the information secured from personality tests is the equivalent of a manifestation of conscience. Since Canon 530 forbids Superiors to demand a manifestation of conscience from their subjects, it will also prevent them from requiring a subject to undergo a series of psychological tests, particularly personality tests. If a Superior cannot require that a subject make a manifestation of conscience to himself, he cannot *a fortiori* require that he give this equivalent information to a layman, in this case a psychologist. It may indeed be to the advantage of a subject to undergo such a series of tests, and a Superior might urge a subject to consent to such testing, but he could not legitimately require him to do so.

Another instance of institutional testing is in industry, where personnel departments are administering personality tests to job applicants with increasing frequency, and where promotions to higher executive positions are often made partially dependent upon the results of psychological tests. Valid information about personality would presumably be of genuine value to employers, but is an employer justified in requiring a man to bare his inner

self to qualify for a job or for a promotion? Many people feel that this is an unjust requirement and that the psychologist functioning in this context is an intruder and an invader of privacy. William H. Whyte has given eloquent expression to the resentment felt by employees over this "snooping" into their private lives on the part of industry. He writes:

> When an individual is commanded by an organization to reveal his innermost feelings, he has a duty to himself to give answers that serve his self interest rather than that of the organization. In a word, he should cheat.[12]

Whyte implements this advice by providing an appendix to his book: "How to cheat on personality tests." "The trick," he says, "is to mediate yourself a score as near the norm as possible without departing too far from your own true self."[13]

I think that the resentment felt against the use of personality tests in industry is justified. Employees and job applicants when they submit to this kind of scrutiny do so only under duress. The consent they give is extorted from them under penalty of loss of job or promotion. It seems disproportionate to require a man to bare the secrets of his soul in order to qualify for a job. In my opinion this kind of personality testing is an intrusion and violation of the privacy of the individual and is difficult to justify, particularly as a routine procedure. There may be special cases in industry when testing of the kind mentioned would be justified, but it seems to me that the instances would be rare.

I would consider the situation of testing in schools in connection with guidance and counseling programs very similar to that in industry. Intelligence and aptitude testing creates little difficulty, I think, but I find it difficult to justify the routine, compulsory personality testing of students. I do not think that a student should be required to bare his own secrets and those of his home, just for the privilege of attending school.

What I am opposed to is the *compulsory* administration of per-

[12] W. H. Whyte, Jr., *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1956, p. 179.

[13] *Ibid.*, 406.

sonality tests in school, where all students are required to take them. Personality tests can certainly be beneficial to students, and I would be one of the first to vindicate this claim. These tests have a genuine contribution to make, especially at the upper high school level and through the college years, particularly when their administration is joined to a good school guidance and counseling program. The potential benefit of personality testing under these conditions should be explained to the students, but they should be then left free to avail themselves of this opportunity or not, as they wish.

I see more justification for personality assessment in the case of the Armed Services, because a man who is likely to break down in combat would endanger not only his own life, but conceivably the lives of many others. This would certainly be true in war time, but I believe that it would obtain also in the present cold war period in which we live. Even more obviously, I think, personality investigation is justified in the case of those who would apply for special jobs and special assignments, where maturity and strength of personality are prime requisites. In this context, I would think of the FBI, the CIA, and special armed services assignments, such as those of the astronauts, crews of atomic submarines, and undoubtedly a variety of other special service assignments.

It seems to me that there is a genuine proportion between the kinds of military duties and assignments mentioned above and the detailed psychological information sought about the individuals entrusted with them. Consequently I see the psychologist as possessing a warranty in these cases justifying his testing. It is precisely this justifying proportion which I find lacking in routine school and industrial testing, and consequently why I think the psychologist lacking in warranty in these cases and the requirement of testing unjustified.

I have already indicated what I consider to be the two chief requisites for a legitimate investigation of personality by means of psychological tests, namely, consent and warranty. To these I would like to add a third, not equally necessary, but not to be disregarded. For want of a better term, I should like to call the third requisite *restraint*.

By restraint I would mean that the psychologist should refrain from probing any more deeply into the personality of the subject than is really necessary to achieve the purpose of testing. An analogy drawn from the medical examination of a patient may illustrate my point. It is obvious that such an examination sometimes requires the patient to strip naked before the eyes of the doctor. Where such is medically required, it is accepted by the patient. But there would be an obvious disproportion which would be resented by the patient were he asked by the doctor to disrobe just to treat a broken toe or a sore elbow. Similarly, a psychological examination should not require the subject to bare his soul any more than is truly necessary. Anything over and above the genuinely necessary is "snooping" on the part of the psychologist, and is justifiably resented by the subject.

Let me illustrate this principle in terms of what we have already said about psychological tests. Recall the distinction suggested above between an individual's public self-concept and his inner or private self-concept. It would be my contention that the self-report inventories should stay as clear as possible of the inner self-concept, and should restrict themselves to the public self-concept and the reasonable elaboration and explanation of the latter. It will probably not be possible to remain entirely clear of the inner self-concept in the use of such inventories, if for no other reason than that the extent of this concept will differ with different respondents. Whatever incursion is unavoidably made into the inner psyche by the self-report inventories should be made with reserve and restraint. The MMPI is, in my opinion, a good personality test, but there are six or eight entries among its 566 items which offend in the respect just mentioned. For this reason, I myself use a modified form of this test in my own work, in preference to the standard form. It is my opinion that a similar change in the content of some other personality inventories would be similarly appropriate.

Usually the self-report inventories are used as initial testing devices. When on a basis of these results, further testing is shown to be necessary, recourse may be had to the more penetrating projective techniques. The psychologist usually does not start with

projective techniques, but resorts to them in the individual cases in which there is need for them. This is an indication of the restraint of which I am speaking.

There is, of course, in both the self-report inventories and the projective techniques a very genuine and usually a very profound self-revelation on the part of the subject. It has been our task today to discuss the basic conditions under which this self-revelation may legitimately be sought by the psychologist and properly given by the subject. I hope that we have been able to shed at least some initial light on this complex question.

I have not discussed the question of the confidentiality of the information secured through psychological testing, and the fact that it would be a violation of secrecy were these results divulged to anyone not authorized by the subject to receive them. I have assumed that the confidentiality of test results would be respected, and I have addressed myself to what has seemed to me to be the central problem, namely, the justification for gathering this information about the subject in the first place.

WILLIAM C. BIER, S.J.
Fordham University
New York