

scale is hollow buncombe. As a matter of fact, there is no argument in favor of limiting the use of intelligences tests to trained psychologists which does not apply equally well in the case of pedagogical tests like those of Courtis, Ayres, Thorndike, etc. These tests, fortunately for education, teachers are specifically urged to make use of. No one has sought to envelop them in tabus for the glorification or personal advantage of the élite who have been initiated into their mysteries. Let us abandon pretense and take the same common-sense attitude toward the Binet scale. When we have taken this attitude I believe we shall find that to understand and apply a well planned and well written Binet guide is as much within the power of the average teacher or school principal as it is to decipher and apply with technical correctness any reasonably complete set of directions for current pedagogical tests. Certainly there should be nothing in such a guide to compare in difficulty with the puzzling features of the Courtis manual.

LEWIS M. TERMAN.

Stanford University.

Ten years spent chiefly in making mental inventories of men, women and children of many sorts have emphasized for me several facts and problems as important to an efficient clinical application of psychological data. I here present them, necessarily rather tersely, for the consideration of the readers of the symposium.

1. Mental tests are of use in appraising an individual only when the one using them is able to psychologize in reference to the results, only when he is able to translate simple responses into terms of mental process involved, only when he is able to avoid confusing mental content with mental process.

This limitation carries with it the implication that the appraiser of the individual must make the tests himself, or at least watch the procedure, as a response can be fairly judged only as a part of the whole circumstance which produced it.

2. Mental tests are of use in appraising an individual only when a *rapport* is established between the experimenter and the subject. If the subject is intimidated or repelled by the examiner or by the surrounding conditions a true estimate of his ability can not be made. On this account rapid examinations for diagnostic purposes are unjustifiable.

These two facts are not grasped by that large body of public spirited men and women who are making a sincere effort to evaluate the con-

tribution which clinical psychology is offering toward the solution of certain social problems. On this evaluation the clinical psychologist's opportunity for social usefulness in the near future largely depends. It seems the part of wisdom and fairness to let it be more generally known that a mental appraisal of an individual is even more dependent upon the adequate training and quality of the examiner than upon the standardization of the tests used. In further emphasis of the large field in social service now opening before the clinical psychologist I shall add that during the last six months twenty social agencies of Chicago and its environs have sent problem cases to the Orthogenic Clinic at the Rush Medical College for mental evaluation and advice as to course to pursue.

3. In the examination of adult subjects I have long used a series of selected tests designed to give an approximately complete mental analysis. The series is arranged in four sections in accordance with the recognition of three fundamental mental processes—sensation, reproductive memory, and apperception—and their final expression in volitional movements. These sections are subdivided rather extensively, each subdivision being provided with one or more tests. The arrangement is convenient in that tests bringing into play the same mental processes but calling for less mental content may be substituted when necessary.

4. The final Binet-Simon revision of the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale, I have found of unequalled value in diagnosing and classifying defective children. There are of course many cases, especially cases of children with defects as opposed to defective children, to whom this series of tests is absolutely inapplicable. I believe that the series is a valuable tool when used by an adequately trained person, who knows when to use it and when to lay it aside for other more appropriate tools. In less expert hands, far from being a valuable tool, it is even a dangerous one, owing to the popular belief in its innate and almost uncanny power of detecting the subnormal child.

5. I find a distinct need for tests which require the controlled interplay of disparate mental processes, and yet call for no rich mental content. There are many tests for complicated mental activities adapted to persons of culture, but not many which call for equally complicated mental work while making no demand on mental content. Many of our adult subjects are densely ignorant and yet capable of sustained controlled mental effort. We need tests to bring this out.

Tests of learning ability which require practically no apperceptive background are also needed. Such tests are of great value in the examination of those who do not speak our language.

I also find a definite need for tests to determine the ability to oppose suggestion by a critical self-reliant survey of the situation. Extreme suggestibility is the trait which more often than all others brings the subnormal person into conflict with society and with the law.

At present I am endeavoring to develop tests along the three lines just indicated.

CLARA HARRISON TOWN.

Psychologist, Orthogenic Clinic,
Rush Medical College.

1. One of the greatest needs at the present time in the field of psychological diagnosis is an extensive experimental and critical study of the relative value for purposes of practical diagnosis of the larger number of individual tests which are now available; and, once this value has been satisfactorily determined, we need to establish norms for these tests and to determine the best method of arranging the norms or the tests.

We must determine by critical studies what criteria can be employed for determining the value of the tests which should be included in a measuring scale. Shall we use as a criterion the degree of correlation which exists between different tests or between a given test and the child's success as judged by social or educational criteria? Shall we select the tests on the basis of their elemental character in accordance with Professor Seashore's suggestion? Or shall we prefer the more complex tests, which more nearly resemble the actual complexities of the life situations? Shall we seek tests which systematically explore the fundamental traits of any given phase of mentality, say, of intelligence or motor capacity? Or shall we merely assemble empirically a series of loosely related tests which meet the pragmatic test—which seem satisfactorily to measure the different functional levels from infancy to maturity? That is, will the ideal scale be eclectic in character, including any tests that prove of value, whether or not such tests fit logically into a predetermined system? Shall we include only tests which are easily and rapidly administered? Or shall we include cumbersome tests which require 5 or 10 minutes to give? One of the recent scales contains lengthy,