SIRHAN JURY TOLD TEST SCORES ERR

Psychologist, Final Witness on List, Doubts Psychosis

By DOUGLAS ROBINSON

Special to The New York Times

LOS ANGELES, April 7 — The last scheduled witness in the trial of Sirhan B. Sirhan took the stand today and immediately challenged the findings of several psychologists who have found the defendant to be psychotic.

The witness, Dr. Leonard B. Olinger, a clinical psychologist who is an instructor at the University of Southern California, took issue with the interpretations of the scores that Sirhan made on a number of personality tests.

Specifically, Dr. Olinger objected to the interpretation given six questions in the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory Test, which two previous psychologists had relied on to show that Sirhan had extensive paranoid tendencies.

The answers to the questions, the psychologist testified today, where those of a man "under the pressures of being in jail" and could not be interpreted necessarily as indicating a paranoid condition.

The elimination of the six answers from the test, he said, brought Sirhan's tendencies toward paranoia "well within the normal range."

Trial in 14th Week

Dr. Olinger was the 61st witness to be called by the prosecution in the trial, which today entered its 14th week. Summations are expected to begin within the next day or so and the jury may have the case by Friday.

In his testimony, Dr. Olinger, a thin-lipped, fussy man who spent a good deal of time at a blackboard covered with charts while he lectured the jury, contended that the other psychologists had not observed "absolute scoring integrity" and "proper scoring procedures" in evaluating Sirhan's test scores.

On the Minnesota Multi-Phasic, he said affirmative answers to such questions as "I've been in trouble with the law" and "I am sure I'm being talked about" were the responses of a man held for a long time in jail.

"The answers show that Sirhan is in touch with reality," Dr. Olinger told the jury. "They might indicate paranoia for a person not in jail but in this case they are normal responses."

Previous psychologists had interpreted Sirhan's answers to 16 questions in the test of more than 500 questions as showing that he had a high levela of paranoia.

Other Tests Questioned

Dr. Olinger, by classifying the answers to six questions as the typical responses of a prisoner, reduced the number of replies indicating paranoia to 10, which he said was within the normal range.

Dr. Olinger also took issue with the interpretations of other tests during his day-long testimony. He stressed that psychologists had to be continually on guard to keep their own preconceptions from affecting the test results.

Most members of the jury looked as dazed as bees in smoke as Dr. Orlinger talked on and on about the tests and what they meant. Sirhan sat at the defense table alternately trying on a pair of sunglasses and staring fixedly at the ceiling.

The jury has now heard seven psychologists and three psychiatrists describe Sirhan's mental state before, during and after the fatal shooting of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Seldom have these experts agreed with one another on just what their findings meant.

Two psychiatrists and one psychologist were on the witness stand for a week each. By now, no one on the jury should be unfamiliar with each and every ink blot in the Rorschach test or the enigmatic pictures in the Thematic Apperception Test.

In challenging the findings of his colleagues today, Dr. Orlinger said: "It appears to me that there is a great deal being read into the data which is unfair." On at least one occasion during the long day, he agreed with the prosecution that Sirhan was "not too far" from being a normal person.