

THE SELF-ANALYSIS DEVICE AS AN AID IN GUIDANCE

JOSEPH V. HANNA, PERSONNEL DIRECTOR, JOLIET TOWNSHIP AND JUNIOR COLLEGE, JOLIET

The brief treatment of the subject of self-analysis herewith presented has grown out of the writer's experience in the development and use of self-analysis materials at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, supplemented by a rather thorough study of prevailing systems in use elsewhere. It is not the purpose of the present paper to evaluate the different angles of self-analysis in its relation to guidance, comprehensively. A limited background of practical experience, however, seems sufficient justification in raising certain questions with respect to prevailing conceptions and practices with respect to administration. In this brief experience the writer finds sufficient enthusiasm for self-analysis, conservatively used, to impel him to make certain criticisms which are in no sense meant to be unkind.

The self-analysis blank is a device which aims to arouse and utilize the interest of the individual in the analysis and solution of his personal problems. Since the principles of vocational guidance recognize that the individual himself must ultimately make educational and vocational choices, it can be seen readily that any device or plan which in any way stimulates and directs self-activity, and brings the individual to a realization of his personal responsibility, is valuable.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to deal with the historical side of analysis in any of its phases. It should be pointed out in the beginning, however, that in so far as content and technique of blanks and forms are concerned self-analysis makes no wide departure from the general subject of "analysis" or "rating". Self-analysis differs from other types of analysis, in the main, only in the methods of administration. The same blank is sometimes used by students and employees in rating themselves, and by teachers, foremen, etc., in rating those whose responsibility they share. A discussion of the minor differences as to form between self-analysis

blanks and other types of analysis blanks would avail little. The psychology and motives back of the two, however, are widely different. The present paper will consider only the problems involved in self-analysis.

A survey of printed matter on the subject of self-analysis reveals a chaotic status. Random and disconnected efforts over a wide field have resulted in no very uniform conception as to objectives, nor how such objectives should be reached. There is practically no standardization of terminology either in education or in business and industry. There are as many plans and forms as there are men with ideas. In the trial and success methods by means of which the many projects have been carried on, however, many helpful schemes have been revealed. Such schemes have aided in stimulating more serious introspections and observations on the part of those being rated, as well as to give less arbitrary and more wholesome points of view to those in charge of administration. Along with the saner administration of systems of self-analysis is the malpractice of those who have no clear purposes in mind, and who interpret results with a degree of finality which is wholly unwarranted. Among the latter class are those who for mercenary motives reduce to absurd formulae series of hypothetical principles which they sell to an unsuspecting, yet concerned and needy clientele. Such faddists as the phrenologists, physiognomists, etc., are typical of this group.

Items which may be classed under the heads of "disadvantages" and "advantages" of self-analysis, with certain modifications and additions, will be taken up in order. The disadvantages in the use of self-analysis fall naturally under two divisions,—first, the disadvantages inherent in the blank form; second, disadvantages which result from arbitrary and careless use of the blank. Preeminent among the disadvantages of the first order is the introspective nature of any reactions secured. The introspective process does not yield objective or highly accurate results. This cannot be considered so definite an objection where results are not to be taken at their face value. Since such direct use of results of self

analysis is one of the less important uses, it may be felt that the introspective nature of the self-estimate should not be pressed as a definite disadvantage. One important reason for so classifying it, however, is given in the paragraph which follows.

Self-bias of the student is a characteristic which prevents the utmost frankness and which undoubtedly gives colored results. *Two rather careful and important studies of college juniors in this connection are indicative. The findings of these separate studies agree in all essential details. They may be summed up as follows:

1. Error in the judgment of the self is much greater than in the judgment of others. The tendency is for the junior to think he is as he should be. There is a tendency for him to think his fellow-junior is not what he should be. He places himself above the "typical" junior.

2. In the case of undesirable traits there is a constant tendency for the junior to underestimate himself; in the case of desirable traits (beauty excepted) there is the constant tendency for him to overestimate himself.

3. One who possesses a trait in high degree is a better judge of that trait than one who possesses such trait in low degree.

It has been the writer's observation that certain individual students who possess certain qualities in excellent degree are willing to place themselves somewhat below the point on the scale where they should be, to avoid being thought of as egotistical. There is always the danger of interpreting individual cases on the basis of group data, rather than to deal with each case separately. The general tendency toward overestimation, however, should not be ignored. We usually think of exaggerated egotism as typical of the adolescent youth, and, to a certain degree, wholesome. If such egotism persists to the end of the college course, as it seems to do, we should begin to inquire as to how far the college

* Knight and Frazen, "Pitfalls in Rating Schemes". *Journal Educational Psychology*, April, 1922.

L. C. Cogan and Others, "Experimental Study of Self-Analysis". *School and Society*, July 31, 1915.

is responsible for enhancing a characteristic which, apart from the period marked by lack of rational experience, has false values. This consideration becomes all the more serious in view of Cattell's findings that the tendency is for scientific men neither to underestimate nor overestimate themselves. It appears that the experience which brings individuals in contact with the real work of the world eliminates to a certain extent the tendency towards overestimation. Is it consistent, then, to inquire how far the institution which turns individuals out at the close of its period of instruction, egotistical and self-centered to an irrational degree, represents the real work of the world? While there is insufficient data for sweeping conclusion, still the studies referred to above are sufficiently indicative to warrant our raising several questions which can be answered only by the results of further experimentation. If the self-analysis blank can reveal conditions such as described above, it will be to this extent an advantage rather than a disadvantage. When dealing with individual cases the tendency of the individual, especially the individual with mediocre or inferior ability, to overestimate himself, should be held in mind. Self-rating on character qualities should be discounted in the case of the majority of students.

Another disadvantage of the blank form is the suggestiveness of terminology. In expecting the youth to represent his interests and abilities in terms which we specify we can easily defeat our own purpose. Our idea of simplicity of terminology may not be simple for the individual who is asked to rate himself. The opposite extreme of so presenting the form that the complacent individual can easily check a few words, phrases, etc., without thinking the situation through is quite characteristic of many blanks. It is easy for the novelty of the device to come in for prime consideration, rather than the experience of the individual concerning which a response is desired. Illustrative of such tendencies we find the practice of suggesting long lists of school subjects from which the individual is asked to check those he has found most interesting, those which he par-

ticularly dislikes, etc. Long lists of antonyms, phrases, etc., are presented, the rater being asked to check those which he likes, dislikes, which more nearly pertain to him, etc.

In a recent self-analysis blank designed for use with college freshmen at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, the writer included a list of school subjects from which the student was asked to check the three in which he found most interest. He was asked also to indicate in which fourth of his class he ranked while pursuing the courses checked. After brief experience the latter part of the scheme was abandoned because of its complexity. In the revised blank which is being used the present school year the list of school subjects does not appear. The student is asked to list the three school subjects in which he found most interest, in order of interest; also to list the three he disliked, or which gave him most difficulty, in order of undesirability. No subjects are suggested, the student being expected to remember those subjects which stand out in his experience, independent of any list. One reason for making the revision, as is implied above, is the feeling that the suggestiveness of the many terms—the elaborateness of the list—would take the interest of the indifferent rater off at a tangent. The possibility of selecting those subjects with high attention value on the list is an item to be considered in the case of the semi-concerned or unconcerned individual. Society, moreover, regards certain subjects as being more dignified and respectable than others. Favorite teachers have certain subjects which are their hobbies: these subjects are accepted by student admirers as being important independent of personal reaction toward such subjects. There arises the reasonable question as to whether the indicated response is the real choice of the rater, or whether he has indicated a preference which is rather in accord with criteria suggested above. It was felt that to have the rater assume responsibility for thinking thru the situation, and for making his own selection without having a list before him would give results which would less likely be colored by factors which are foreign to his real convictions. A second reason for making

the indicated change is the difficulty in presenting a list of subjects sufficiently inclusive to represent the varied curricula of secondary schools. This disadvantage is discussed at greater length in a different connection.

While efforts are being made to remove suggestiveness from terminology, and so to present lists, questions, etc., as to require more analytic thinking, it still remains that the rater finds complex and over-suggestive situations before him. Frequently there is little aid given by way of explaining the blank form, or in trying to have the subject in a proper frame of mind before self-rating is attempted. This criticism is not made with the feeling that lists of terms referred to are wholly bad. We cannot accept even the best self-analysis schemes without approving such lists. Efforts should be directed, however, to a further simplification, and amplification, of form.

The vague and general nature of descriptive terms and qualities used presents a further disadvantage, or limitation, of the usual self-analysis device. This vagueness and generality seem to result from two sources. Emphasis on the idea of formal discipline seems to be the basic explanation. As applied to the attempted analysis of character these general terms were enhanced by enthusiasm for various phrenological and physiognomical schemes in evidence in the early history of the rating movement. Certain terms in general usage are so general that they are meaningless. Objection to the use of other common terms is not in their generality, but in the evident lack of agreement as to meaning. The following lists of character qualities, taken from self-analysis blanks of the usual type, may be taken as sufficiently representative. The lists quoted from the Rugg Scale and from the New York Department of Labor Bulletin represent more recent efforts toward simplification, and toward more concrete terminology:

From Scale used in U. S. Army for rating officers and candidates for officers' training camps.

1. Aggressiveness
2. Appearance
3. Competitiveness

4. Control of Emotions
5. Initiative
6. Integrity
7. Health
8. Judgment
9. Openmindedness
10. Organizing ability
11. Perseverance
12. Sense of humor

From "Analysis of Interests and Ambitions", used at Bradley Polytechnic Institute.

1. Punctuality
2. Perseverance
3. Leadership
4. Interest in work
5. Self-confidence
6. Tact
7. Reliability
8. Temperament

From Rugg, "Scale for Rating Teachers". (Adapted also for students.)

1. Skill in teaching
2. Skill in mechanics of managing class
3. Teamwork qualities
4. Qualities of growth and keeping up-to-date
5. Personal and social qualities.

From scheme suggested in "Employment of Women in Five and Ten Cent Stores", N. Y. Department of Labor. (For more specific objective.)

1. Appearance of counters and shelves
2. Filling of counters and shelves
3. Supply of paper and cord
4. Merchandise displayed for selling
5. Order of under-counters
6. Proper place for price cards
7. Registering of money before wrapping
8. Politeness toward customers

Members of the faculty at Bradley Institute rated students on the general character qualities provided in

the self-analysis blank used. On several of these qualities there was very little agreement among faculty members. This agreement was less for certain qualities than for others. An interesting observation is that in the case of certain outstanding students there was fairly close agreement as to the possession of a quality in certain degree, upon which there seemed to be little or no general agreement in estimating the students as a whole.

Efforts toward generalizing situations which cannot be generalized are seen in the more modern tendency of stating situations such as "Would you rather be in a crowd?" or "Would you rather be alone?" "Do you like to stick to one job for a long time?" or "Do you like to change jobs often?" The writer's examination of analysis blanks filled out by high school seniors revealed to him the futility of attempting to generalize such likes and dislikes as those suggested. One student stated that he liked to be alone at times. Another stated that his remaining on the job depended entirely on the nature of the job. Certain versatile students are so stimulated as to be able to go beyond the provision of the blank, as was intended doubtless by the makers of certain of those blanks most worth while. One is inclined to question, however, the value of responses made by the majority who most probably accept the situation as presented in the blank, and respond to one of the two alternatives for the sake of system and regularity. Such indefinite questions cannot take into account the varying conditions under which different types of work are done; neither does it give to the individual a fair opportunity for stating his complete relationship to his crowd or group.

The apparently necessary limitation of scope of the self-analysis blank makes it distinctly incomplete as an opportunity for indexing preferences and abilities along all necessary lines. It is impossible to have a list of school subjects which is sufficiently inclusive to be representative of the varied curricula of secondary schools, without making this section of the blank cumbersome and unwieldy. Among those who first filled out the Bradley blank including such a list were two or three students whose preferred subject was not included in the list.

This observation served as justification for the revision referred to previously. It is plainly impracticable, if not impossible, to include a list of all possible professions and vocations which furnish a sufficient range for any large group of individuals in expressing their vocational likes and dislikes. One can only appreciate this limitation in attempting to arrange and use such a list. In leaving blank spaces for filling in any such vocation or profession in which the individual might express chief interest, but which is not given in the list, there is the danger of having the rater feel that any such "filled in" occupation is of minor importance.

Dr. Miner, formerly of Carnegie Institute of Technology, has suggested what seems to be a happy solution of the difficulty outlined above. In his blank entitled "An Analysis of Work Interests" he has included a list of activities which apply to several related occupations. These activities and characteristics are presented in groups. This makes possible an all-inclusive list. It places a somewhat larger portion of the burden of analysis upon the rater himself in that he finds it necessary to think of any occupation which he may have in mind in terms of the qualities listed. While the element of suggestion and lack of earnestness will so enter as to partially invalidate the process, still there seems to be no simpler or less suggestive way of getting necessity for such considerations before the rater:

* "Select the three Kinds of Activities listed below at which you think you would do best and at which you think you would be contented to work permanently. Place the figure '1' before that group which you would place first for yourself. Place '2' before your second choice, and '3' before your third choice.

"Remember the unpleasant features of the work and the conditions under which it would be carried on. Consider also whether you would have the necessary health and strength, whether you can get the necessary training, and whether this occupation will give you the opportunity to utilize your good traits and follow your interests.

* Taken from "Analysis of Work Interests", published by Carnegie Institute of Technology.

“Any occupation will involve a number of these activities, but number only those three groups which appeal most to you. Sometimes it is well to begin by excluding those you dislike. It may help you if you will also compare yourself with others of your own age.

- () Growing plants, as in farming, gardening, greenhouse, etc.
- () Care of animals, as in stock raising, care of horses, etc.
- () Operating engines, as locomotives, automobile, steam plants, etc.
- () Operating machines, as in manufacturing, using linotype, etc.
- () Installing equipment, as electrician, plumber, gas fitter, etc.
- () Construction work, as in building, concrete work, bridge construction, etc.
- () Delicate muscular movements, as dentist, surgeon, instrument maker, etc.
- () Discovering and repairing defects, as jeweler, automobile repairman, etc.
- () Transporting Activities, as railroad operation, express, mail, etc.
- () Meeting and Directing people, as secretary, floor manager, conductor, etc.
- () Teaching in school, shop, etc.
- () Welfare work, as in social settlements, industrial plants, Christian Ass'n.
- () Advisory Service, as physician, lawyer, consultant, banker, analyst, etc.
- () Organizing People, as in societies, in work gangs, industrial and business concerns, etc.
- () Influencing People Directly, as in selling, preaching, campaigning, etc.
- () Influencing People Indirectly, as in advertising, writing, newspaper, etc.
- () Organized Planning, as in business, managing institutions, in developing engineering projects, etc.
- () Scientific Work, as in laboratories, in museums, in research, etc.

- () Recording and Systematizing Records, as in office work, stenography, bookkeeping, library work, etc.
- () Entertaining People, as musician, actor, speaker, etc.
- () Artistic Skill, as in decorating, window dressing, millinery, costuming, printing arts, etc.
- () Artistic Creation, as in writing, designing, composing music, etc.
- () Field of Activity not on this list and described as follows:"

It is hoped that thoughtful consideration of the type rendered by Dr. Miner will enable us to overcome several obvious limitations of present blank forms.

The most serious drawbacks in the use of self-analysis are not due to the form of the blank, but rather to the improper mental attitude of those doing the rating, and woeful lack of proper objectives on the part of many who are responsible for administration. The state of mind of those putting in writing their life history, their ambitions and ideals, and their character qualities is not such as to secure accuracy, and in many instances, sincerity of statement. Unless a great deal of precaution is taken there is the natural feeling that the record is an indictment to be used against the raters if at all unfavorable. Such questions as, "Will this be counted on my grades?", "Will anybody else see results?", etc., were not uncommon among college freshmen. The degree of seriousness with which most students fill out the blanks indicates that there is much in their minds which they dare not express. This feeling is the more common where the use of self-analysis is a requirement. In this connection a psychological test record of a very brilliant girl is recalled. Not understanding the reason for very unusual and inconsistent answers to several exercises the young lady was called in for a consultation. It developed that she had accepted the test as a challenge,—that the test was made up of a series of catch questions; therefore she must be on the defensive from the very first moment. She would decide upon the answer which appeared to be correct, then would indicate the opposite response with an "I'll show you" attitude. It should be added that this young lady was a sophomore in college, and an un-

usual student both from the standpoint of scholarship and attitude. So serious was she concerning her scholastic work that she could not afford to be caught napping. This suggests the necessity of going beyond prescribed formulae in preparing the minds of the individuals for a favorable reception of test and analysis materials,—something which the teacher who is not of the proper temperament, and who is not especially trained, cannot do,—the theories of many who would reduce to mathematical formulae the analysis of human character, to the contrary notwithstanding.

* Mr. Earl B. Morgan in an excellent article on interviewing calls attention to the fact that many people do not represent themselves as they are when they apply for positions. The college student especially is ill at ease and artificial. This artificiality camouflages the real self to such an extent that a great deal of "spar-ring" is oftentimes necessary before the real qualities of the individual are revealed. There is the constant danger that the self-analysis record will not be a complete blue-print, or a correct blue-print of the individual. Subjectively, the individual will miss the point of self-analysis, going away under an illusion if such an artificial mental attitude predominates. These dangers become all the more apparent where self-analysis results are interpreted literally and used objectively. Self-analysis is the more sinned against, perhaps, in this tendency which is not at all unusual for those untrained in personnel problems to consider it a formula, the working thru of which, irrespective of limitations which have been pointed out, will do the individual good,—and will give a fairly accurate picture of his personal qualities. This attitude apparently is the result of no very definite understanding of individual differences. This evil can in part be overcome thru the recognition that the interpretation of self-analysis results, and the interviewing which must follow, should be the job of an expert who understands his responsibility.

* "Interviewing for Selection". Industrial Management Magazine, April 1, 1921.

Treatment of advantages and disadvantages or limitations has been taken up in reverse order because of the writer's enthusiasm for the advantages of self-analysis where conservatively and sanely administered. The final impression should be one of faith and confidence in a proper self-analysis device. There are many arguments in favor of self-analysis. First, it helps to place responsibility for important evaluations where it belongs,—upon the shoulders of the individual himself. A large portion of that "getting by" attitude which is obvious at most school levels is due to that spirit of rebellion which the student feels toward the system which places so little personal responsibility upon him. Self-analysis is an effort to have the student or employee analyze his own case. The rater should not have to be told his weak points by the interviewer. In consistently passing thru the experiences provided for in the blank the rater's weak points may be revealed to him. Illustrative of such benefits, the following example from the writer's experience is offered: Three young men desiring clerical work called at a placement office. It could almost be seen at a glance that none of them was suited for office work of any sort. After a courteous reception they were requested to write brief letters of application, describing that type of clerical work for which each felt himself best suited. The interviewer continued his work with other cases, noticing the progress of the three applicants incidentally. After a few minutes each applicant had decided that he didn't care to attempt clerical work. None had gotten far beyond the salutation in his crude attempt at writing the letter of application. The interviewer was free to aid the individuals after they had partially analyzed their respective cases.

Self-analysis should cause the rater to feel responsible for courses he is pursuing, especially on the higher school levels, and for indicated vocational preferences and choices. Many college students can give no consistent reason for being in college except the vague impression that college training is held to be the most adequate preparation for larger responsibilities. A larger percentage of students are even more helpless when asked to

justify certain courses they are pursuing, above others. In the first blank used at Bradley Institute the question, "In what department are you enrolled at Bradley?" was deemed sufficient to secure a definite response. Tabulation of responses to this question revealed several instances where the student couldn't name a definite department. For irregular or special students to find difficulty in responding to this question was not considered unusual. For regular students to have difficulty, as several did, indicates manifest ignorance of college curricula and department organization. There occurs to the writer an instance of a college entrant's being in a dilemma as a result of two widely divergent objectives, this being typical of several cases coming under his observation. The student, as a result of his own selection, had two alternatives before him,—a course in business administration and the course for teachers of manual arts subjects. Coming from a small high school, he was face to face with the responsibility of choosing one of these widely variant courses within a twenty-four hour period. The matriculation machinery of the college was not designed to meet his need, or the needs of others in a similar situation. Some college agency must accept this serious responsibility. If self-analysis can reveal conditions which make special machinery necessary it will have performed great service. The pathos of this situation suggested the inclusion in the Bradley analysis blank of the following directions: "State three reasons for electing the course which you have checked", and "State three reasons why you think the vocation or profession which you have indicated is the best one for you". It is hoped that there may be encouraged a greater feeling of personal responsibility for life-career choices, and for courses elected and followed.

The self-analysis record will be suggestive of the problems which must be approached in the interview. There is usually an indication of unity or lack of unity in the rater's plans and habits. Brief description of two contrasting cases recently observed in analysis blanks handed the writer for evaluation are significant. CASE No. I was a high school

senior, a young man twenty-two years of age. He expressed preference for electrical engineering as a vocation. His record of reading habits revealed the fact that he was not interested in such current magazines as "The Scientific American" and "Popular Science", a musical journal being the only technical journal in which he expressed interest. He was interested in no club or social activities except as revealed by his membership in a young people's society of the church in which he was a member. He had no hobbies which were in any way connected with his vocational preference. His incidental occupational experience gave no evidence of a background suggestive of his vocational preference. His lack of leadership ability, absence of affiliation with social groups, and his over-age indicated that his ability was ordinary. He indicated his enjoyment of a book, "The Life of Edison", which was probably the basis for his vocational choice.

CASE No. II was a high school senior, a young man eighteen years of age. He indicated salesmanship of mechanical appliances as his desired vocation. He had been employed during several vacation periods in a wholesale house which handled mechanical appliances. He read "The Scientific American" and "Popular Science". As one of his hobbies he liked to "fool around" the physical laboratory at odd times and after school hours. He had elected scientific subjects as a major interest. His success in dealing with others was indicated in his position of leadership in several high school organizations. As a final response he indicated that he had already secured employment with the firm for which he had worked during vacations.

The first of these cases reveals an evident lack of consistency which is highly suggestive of unwarranted objectives. In the second instance the unified and consistent series of reactions give a record of an individual who has largely handled his own case. In the absence of personal contact experience with these two students it would be dangerous to take the analysis blanks as sole criteria for dealing with them; nor is this a necessary function of self-analysis. As an aid, the informa-

tion secured will point out in advance of any interview which may be found necessary or advisable, certain of the outstanding problems to be approached and dealt with, indicating the possible points of contact. The saving of time which accrue to both the interviewer and the interviewed is no small item. Where provision is made for periodic checking-up,—that is, giving opportunity for the rater to record changed and additional points of view from time to time, the self-analysis system falls heir to the advantages of the cumulative record.

One advantage of self-analysis which should not be overlooked is its value as a test of ability and of certain educational essentials. It indicates the individual's efficiency in meeting new situations. It could be inferred with considerable reason that CASE No. I would fall rather low on the mental scale for his group, while CASE No. II probably would fall rather high on such scale. It should be understood that all judgments based on self-analysis results should be tentative and elastic. The general tendency for records to be indicative of ability, however, is plain.

In presenting the following general outline of content for a self-analysis blank, no wide departure is made from several blanks already in use. The chief purpose of the present paper has been rather to raise certain questions with respect to the form in which essentials are presented, to question certain methods of procedure in administration, and to emphasize certain good features already employed by the more conservative and constructive enthusiasts of self-rating. Summaries on each general item submitted embody the principles already set forth. The following general divisions would seem essential for a comprehensive self-analysis device for college freshmen. With slight modifications they could be adapted for any school or industrial level:

1. Personal items,—age, sex, home address, school address, etc.
2. Family record,—nationality, religion, social, occupational, financial.

3. Education,—Schools attended, grades completed, subjects liked, subjects disliked, permanency or change of interests, course being taken up and why, etc.

4. Past vocational experience,—important jobs held, those liked and those disliked, and why.

5. Rating in character qualities,—those held to be of universal importance. In certain instances those making for success in particular job, school course, etc.

6. Outside activities,—clubs and organizations, social and literary activities, athletic and recreational activities, hobbies, reading habits, etc.

7. Indication of vocational likes and dislikes. Vocational preference or choice, with justification.

Responses to items "1" and "2" will furnish that sort of routine information necessary in any sort of counseling. Information pertaining to religion and financial status must be secured tactfully, where such information is necessary. The financial status of the family can perhaps best be secured indirectly through such items of information as "occupation of father", etc. Most individuals will not resent requests for personal information of this character if they have confidence in those in charge of administration and are "sold" to the advantages of the effort.

Content which should come under "item 3" has already been discussed at some length. A record of interest in school subjects should extend over the entire school period. The student should be permitted to have access to his record from time to time for the purpose of making note of any change of interest which he may have experienced. He should always feel responsible for courses pursued to the extent of justifying himself to his own personal satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of those of his advisors who are seriously interested.

Item "4" should provide suitable opportunity for listing all jobs of importance held: any preference for, or dislike of, any particular kind of work should be noted.

With respect to "character qualities" it should be added that the best modern practice points toward

greater simplicity with respect to number and character of qualities used. The qualities used should be stated in terms which are understood easily, and upon which there should be as much agreement as possible. There should be as little overlapping of meaning of terms selected, as possible. The number of such general qualities should perhaps not exceed five or six. A larger number necessarily involves more overlapping of meaning, and increases the complexity of the device. In stating the degrees of each quality, the increasing use of adjectives rather than numerals would seem justified. Each degree of general quality should be defined clearly, frequent use being made of simple, illustrative examples. All this should be done cautiously, with the idea of increasing complexity as little as possible. Where the analysis pertains to the relations of the student to some particular department, the qualities should be selected according to what is most important in such department.

Item "6" should place emphasis on activities such as are not emphasized sufficiently by most educational institutions. Information secured should bring a wholesome message as to what is not being done with respect to extra-curricular activities, to educational authorities. Perhaps thru contacts as a result of investigations in this regard the personnel department can "sell" itself to students as it could in no other way. Information as to reading habits will prove helpful.

Importance of serious thinking with respect to proper selections of life-career has been discussed. Any machinery for stimulating thinking should be as clear and simple as possible. Dr. Miner's contribution in this connection is doubtless the best yet proposed. The machinery should provide means for the student to justify any vocational selections or preference stated. His own responsibility should be kept clearly before him.

Advantages of self-analysis have been presented with the assumption that self-analysis systems will be administered, and results used properly. Responses secured cannot be accepted at indicated face value. The device becomes dangerous rather than helpful when used in any other than a supplementary way. Self-analysis

cannot be said to be scientific. The best that can be done is to "cast bread upon the waters", with hopes for as large a return as possible. Individual human character, so many are its variable qualities, baffles any sort of complete quantitative or qualitative determination. As a formula self-analysis cannot be a success; as a means of summing up hints and indications to be faced in the interview, it may be helpful. Perhaps the greatest value of conservative self-analysis, that of subjective effect on the rater, cannot be appreciated because it cannot be measured.