

CHOICE *connect*

A publication of the Association of College and Research Libraries
A division of the American Library Association
Editorial Offices: 575 Main Street, Suite 300, Middletown, CT 06457-3445
Phone: (860) 347-6933
Fax: (860) 704-0465
June 2017 Vol. 54 No. 10

MIT Press

The following review will appear in the June 2017 issue of CHOICE. The review is for your internal use only until our publication date of 01 June 2017

Psychology

54-4949 BF442 CIP

Stanovich, Keith E. **The rationality quotient: toward a test of rational thinking**, by Keith E. Stanovich, Richard F. West, and Maggie E. Toplak. MIT, 2016. 459p bibl indexes ISBN 9780262034845, \$39.00; ISBN 9780262336802 ebook, \$27.00.

Sophisticated, critical thinking is difficult. Therefore, it is no surprise that the measurement and modeling of rational thought will be just as difficult. In *The Rationality Quotient*, Stanovich (emer., applied psychology and human development, Univ. of Toronto, Canada), West (emer., James Madison Univ.), and Toplak (psychology, York Univ., Canada) have proposed and tested a comprehensive measure of individual differences in the degree of rational thought that people display. They report an extraordinary amount of data on myriad processes of decision making and on predispositions to reject facile, but less than optimal, thought processes. The data is compelling, although, as they note, their Comprehensive Assessment of Rational Thinking (CART) is a work in progress. The CART project has led to a long version whose practicality still needs to be established and a shorter version that shows psychometric promise. The result is a comprehensive measure of rational thought offered as a step toward a standardized assessment that stands independent of traditional measures of intelligence. The constructs are complex and multidimensional, but the authors are lucid in their explication of the test and its psychometric characteristics. Understanding their system requires significant background in statistics, cognitive research, and assessment, but the authors have provided fertile ground for further exploration.

—B. C. Beins, *Ithaca College*

Summing Up: Recommended. Graduate students, researchers, and faculty.