

S 2358

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 21, 1967

per capita dues of 25 cents to \$1 to finance rebuilding of the union. He said the funds would provide the means to make NFFE a "real union," and take it out of the "sewing circle" image some people have of it.

Wolkomir plans to invite all independent Federal employe unions such as those that represent the Rural Letter Carriers, postal supervisors, internal revenue, customs and other employes, to form a federation to work for employe legislation and other matters.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 5, 1966]

PRIVACY RIGHTS UNIT PROPOSED

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Creation of a small independent agency headed by a distinguished citizen to oversee invasions of Federal employe privacy was suggested yesterday to the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee.

Alan F. Westin, a Columbia University professor of public law and government, proposed that the agency be sort of an "ombudsman" where employes could go with complaints that their constitutional rights were being threatened or violated. His plan impressed Chairman Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.) and Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.).

As Westin saw it, and agency would be a "sifting body" to determine legitimate complaints. It would limit the use of lie detector and psychological tests; give complaining employes hearings and the like.

The professor didn't believe the Civil Service Commission could objectively handle employe complaints because it fixes many of the policies which produced employe charges that their constitutional rights of privacy are being violated and which resulted in Ervin's bill, co-sponsored by 34 other Senators, to protect these rights.

But Westin also thought that some provisions of the Ervin bill were too broad and sweeping and, at the Chairman's invitation, he promised to help rewrite the measure.

Ervin said the language in his bill was intended to prevent these among other abuses which he said had occurred:

A supervisor who called five employes under him at their homes to pressure them to donate to a charity fund. He told them he was compelled to meet the quota set for his unit.

A supervisor in another agency who coerced employes to participate in their local PTA's.

The indoctrination of employes on political goals of the Johnson Administration, and pressure placed on the employes to work for those goals, such as open housing.

John A. McCart of AFL-CIO's Government Employees Council, gave general endorsement to the Ervin bill. He agreed that the public has a right to know about possible conflicts of interest but he said "overzealous scrutiny" of personal finances of employes could result in "loss of dignity and fear."

Hatch Act: The President signed into law yesterday a bill to set up a 12-man commission to review the Hatch Act which restricts partisan political activities by Federal employes. The signing was applauded by the influential National Civil Service League whose president J. Edward Day, commented in part:

"We believe that the political neutrality of the public service must continue to be protected, and yet recognize that we as a nation may be approaching the point where we cannot afford to place so large a portion of our mature voters in a political 'no man's land'."

Kathryn H. Stone, a former member of the Virginia House of Delegates, was appointed chairman of a League committee of political activity of public employes to study possible changes in the Hatch Act.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1966]
PERSONALITIES RESENT TESTING—TOUTED MMPI SYSTEM OF DETERMINING EMOTIONAL STABILITY RIDDLED BY INVASION OF PRIVACY CHARGES

(By Alfred Friendly)

"The whole field of personality testing is in both disrepute and disrepair." That harsh charge against one of modern psychology's most prideful constructions was thrown in the practitioners' faces earlier this month by a distinguished legal scholar and political scientist.

Addressing the American Psychological Association, Prof. Alan F. Westin of Columbia University told the members something they already knew and were worrying about, but he put it in particularly blunt terms: There is a large and growing antagonism to personality tests, not merely on grounds of their doubtful effectiveness but principally as gross invasions of privacy.

The hostility to psychological testing for emotional and personal stability (as distinct from aptitude, vocational and even intelligence testing) is demonstrated by a provision of a bill Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.) introduced last month. One section forbids any interrogation of any Federal employe about his personal relationships with his family, his religious beliefs and practices and his sexual conduct and attitudes. All three categories are at the heart of psychological and psychiatric examinations for mental posture.

ALREADY CURTAILED

Sen. Ervin's bill followed extensive investigations by Senate and House Committees on invasion of privacy by, among other things, personality testing. Meantime, there has been a drastic curtailment of the use of such tests by Government agencies.

The American Psychological Association acknowledges that the "attacks upon psychological testing and upon psychologist-guided selection methods reached a new height in 1965" and that "this . . . barrage is the most serious attack that has ever been launched by citizen groups or by Government against any part of psychological research and services."

There is a multitude of personality tests, but the one that appears to have become the principal target of the critics and to epitomize what they object to is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The psychologists seem to be stuck with it, and for the time being their case for personality testing, as an aid in determining emotional stability or as a screening device or a warning flag to call attention to potential or future psychotics, rises and falls with it.

It consists of 556 true-false questions, some of them inconsequential and serving, so to speak, as the inert matter in a prescription. The more significant questions focus on the intensity of the subject's religiosity, his attitudes about sex and his own sexuality and his views about his physical and psychic health and emotions.

AN EMERGING PATTERN

The rationale of the MMPI, based on much experience and testing, is that people with mental disturbances consistently tend to answer the questions differently from those whose mental state is healthy. The distinction does not come in single answers to single questions, but in general patterns. Thus, in a whole series of questions on religiosity, a psychotic will tend to score differently in toto than a normal person.

The stock phrase of the defenders of the test is that the examiners "could not care less about what answer is given to a particu-

lar question." They are unconcerned with whether the respondent is Jew or Gentile, whether he has frequent headaches or not or professes to like his father better than his mother. It is, rather, the degree of variance in the totality of the responses from those of the "norm"—or the degree of similarity to those who are clearly mental cases—that is supposed to provide the clue.

The logical jump inherent in the procedure is, however, formidable. Does it always, or even often, follow, because patients in mental institutions have, on the average, a different pattern of answers from those people, again on the average, who are running loose, that the test will usually spot someone who is actually or potentially emotionally unstable?

Moreover, despite enormous experience with the MMPI—it was initiated in 1937—there seems to be meager empirical evidence that the MMPI is really an accurate predictor. The charge has been made that the MMPI has never been "validated" in the sense of having been shown to do what it is supposed to do.

The response has been remarkably feeble. Although the literature on MMPI is voluminous, the evidence for its "validation" is largely technical in context: it has been "validated" for consistency, so that one tester will get the same results as another, but not in the more persuasive sense. There seems to be no evidence, for example, that an impressive percentage of those tagged as potentially unstable in, say, 1958, have actually become unstable ten years later.

But in the last couple of years, the heaviest criticism has come on another score: invasion of privacy. The barrage was heavy in the 1965 hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and in a special inquiry of the House Government Operations Committee. Prof. Westin's attack was only the most recent in a series.

BATTERING RAMS

In a sparkling analysis of the anatomy of privacy and the mechanics of its invasion, Westin discusses in particular the battering ram of "extraction"—the "entry into a person's psychological privacy by requiring him to reveal by speech or action those parts of his memory and personality that he regards as private."

The devices by which that invasion is accomplished are polygraphs (lie detectors) and personality tests.

"It is one of the basic functions of privacy," Westin argues, "that it protect the individual's need to choose those to whom he will bare the true secrets of his soul and his personality."

In this matter, Westin notes, psychologists enjoy intimate trust when they function as counselors and clinicians but are not accepted when they function as testers for an institutional client. Thus, "when personality tests began to be used by the Federal Government for civilian selection in peacetime, all the privacy and liberty issues in personality testing were raised to the forefront."

The trouble, Westin continues, is compounded by the fact that test psychologists have not successfully explained how their questions on sex, political ideology and religion achieve the results they are said to, but somehow do not depend on the specific answers to specific questions. Part of the invasion of privacy, he implies, is the unexplained magic of the test; if respondents knew how one answer here and another answer there about a very deeply held private matter would disclose a helpful piece of knowledge, their sense of invasion might be lessened.

Thus a patient may tell his physician some extraordinary intimate details about his body

and his habits without feeling that his privacy is assaulted because he senses how that information can contribute to the doctor's ultimate diagnosis.

Westin concludes:

"American society is unequivocally committed to the idea that religious notions are private and that no governmental or quasigovernmental authority (e.g., the corporation, the secular private university, etc.) should decide what is 'reasonable' in religious belief. Given this fact, how does the psychologist, say that adding up this and that question about religious belief ('I am a special agent of God,' 'I believe in the second coming of Christ,' etc.) to define personality disorders is not a judgment on what religious beliefs are 'reasonable' and 'not reasonable'?"

ALL TESTS CURTAILED

The consequence of attacks of that sort has been the virtual elimination of the MMPI from the arsenal of Government test procedures and, in fact, the near elimination of all personality tests as selection devices.

Chairman John W. Macy Jr. of the Civil Service Commission has forbidden their use for selection purposes throughout Government agencies where his writ runs and has ordered their application limited to adjuncts of medical and psychiatric examination.

The State Department forbids their use except where a question has first been raised about the mental stability of an employee and where the examination is under the direction of a psychiatrist.

The Job Corps claims never to have used the MMPI and to be using other personality tests in a very minimal way. The CIA doubtless uses every test, and its detectors to boot.

The Peace Corps also uses the MMPI extensively and in the 1965 hearings swore by its efficiency. There, however, it is not used as a selection screening device but only later as a "de-selection" aid when the Corpsman is in training, and in conjunction with extremely extensive use of other tests and experience evaluations.

LOOKING TO FUTURE

The critics argue that the reduction in the Government's use of personality tests is a response to the current attacks and no guarantee for the future. Hence, they urge the enactment of the Ervin bill.

Its basic trouble, however, would seem to be that it throws the baby out with the bath. Its language forbids any interrogation about matters of sex, religious and familial attitudes, thus barring even psychiatric examinations in which those items are highly significant. Surely at some times for some employees—aircraft traffic controllers, men in command of nuclear weapons systems, CIA agents, for example—a pretty extensive verification of emotional balance is essential.

In screening small numbers of candidates, there are doubtless better examination procedures—tough interviews, "game" situations and fine-comb reviews of how the applicant has behaved under stress and adversity in the past. But for large numbers, the temptation is strong to use a production-line system. The question remains whether any personality test fulfills that function—and how violently it affronts an increasingly recognized personal right.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1966]
 HOMOSEXUAL QUERY ASKED IN STATE DEPARTMENT

All male applicants for jobs in the State Department are being asked, "Have you ever engaged in a homosexual act?"

A State Department official disclosed this yesterday in the wake of testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee that 30 employees left the Department in 1965 as

security risks. Some resigned, others were dismissed.

In the testimony released over the weekend, Deputy Assistant Secretary G. Marvin Gentile said 28 left "for homosexual reasons" and two for other reasons "such as excessive drinking, bad debts, and excessive use of leave."

None of the persons involved in the investigations or dismissals were named. One was listed as a Foreign Service Officer of Class 2 with a salary of \$20,835 a year. Half a dozen others had salaries ranging above \$15,000 a year.

William J. Crockett, deputy under secretary for administration, told the Committee the State Department is now putting heavy emphasis on "preventive security" which he described as asking direct questions of applicants for the Foreign Service and the State Department's Civil Service so that those with adverse characteristics can be screened out before employment.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 7, 1966]
 CRITICISM GREETES CSC PROPOSAL TO KEEP DOSSIER ON EVERY EMPLOYEE
 (By Joseph Young)

A complete dossier on every federal and postal employe will soon be maintained in the government.

The program already is stirring up controversy, with Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, calling it another of the government's "big brother" moves to pry into the private lives of its employees.

The Civil Service Commission, which drafted the plan and is now asking various agencies for suggestions on how to implement it, says the system is needed to give government the necessary information about its manpower strengths and weaknesses.

CSC officials say the data will be used for promotion and training purposes as well as manpower requirement planning that federal managers need to operate their programs effectively.

The data will be computerized in data banks, which will make it available at a moment's notice to an individual agency or throughout the government as a whole.

The data will include an employee's age, sex, race and nationality, his patterns of sick leave use, education, training, experience, physical handicaps, awards received, appeals of adverse actions, etc.

Ervin expresses fear that some of this information will be used to discriminate against some employees and favor others.

CSC officials insist there is no ulterior motive in the computerized data program, that it is a large step forward in modernizing the government's personnel management program.

To start with, all employees in grades GS-5 through GS-18 will come under the program (this represents more than 90 percent of all government employees) and those below GS-5 will be included by a 10 percent sampling.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov 17, 1966]

FAILURE TO LIST GIFT OF BOTTLE CAPS BRINGS WARNING TO U.S. EMPLOYEE
 (By Joseph Young)

Because a Commerce Department employe felt that bottle caps received from a community welcome wagon was too trivial a gift to list on his financial disclosure form he was threatened with disciplinary action.

The situation is symptomatic of the Alice-in-Wonderland brand of madness in government these days regarding the requirement that employees disclose all financial worth, dealings, holding and gifts, no matter how trivial, as well as that of the members of their immediate families.

The Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee headed by Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., is receiving thousands of complaints from federal employes over the financial disclosure requirement.

The employes believe it is an unwarranted invasion of their privacy and also is irrelevant since most of the complaints have absolutely nothing to do with the awarding of government contracts or other Federal fiscal policy that could possibly pose a conflict of interest situation.

The Commerce case is a classic example of the government's "big brother" snooping attitude into the affairs of its employes, although Ervin says many other complaints are about situations just as outrageous.

The Commerce employe was told that he answered unsatisfactorily a section of the financial disclosure form asking to list all gifts received.

What had happened was that the employe, feeling it was unnecessary to list such gifts as bottle caps from the community welcome wagon, answered that section by replying: "None—except for minor gifts; if listings are required, more information as to value limit is necessary."

The Commerce Department apparently was outraged at the reply.

A Commerce personnel official wrote an official letter of warning to the employe:

"Your evident evasiveness indicates that you may have some conflict of interest which you are anxious to avoid disclosing. This is a very serious matter.

"This letter constitutes a formal warning that you have failed to comply with regulations.

"If the form is not correctly executed and returned by Sept. 20, 1966, I will have no choice but to propose disciplinary action against you."

And yet the Civil Service Commission and top officials of the Johnson administration wonder why it is becoming increasingly more difficult for government to retain able employes as well as recruit the cream-of-the-crop of college graduates.

Special session asked—Kenneth Lyons, president of the National Association of Government Employes, has asked President Johnson to call Congress into special session immediately to enact another pay raise for federal and postal employes this year.

Lyons blasted this year's 2.9 percent pay raise as totally inadequate, in view of the fact that "employes in private industry were realizing 5 percent or more in pay hikes."

Lyons blasted this year's 2.9 now lags from 3 to 45 percent behind private industry salaries. He said federal employes "are laboring under a Depression psychology, the argument frequently used that federal employes are paid less because they have steady employment."

"The government, for too long now has continued to pay government employes peasant wages as though they were in bondage," he said.

Of course, Johnson will not call Congress into special session to enact another federal pay raise this year.

Lyons is aware of this, but his statement was more of an opening blast in the campaign to secure an adequate pay raise for federal and postal employes next year. His statement was intended to dramatize the situation in which federal workers find themselves caught in inflationary spirals and yet are asked by the President to set an example for the rest of the country by not seeking pay raises that would raise them to the level of industry.

The NAGE is emerging as the third major nonpostal federal employe union, along with the American Federation of Government Employes and the National Federation of Federal Employes.

While the NAGE still trails far behind the AFGE which has 285,000 members, it has