Even after reading the entire Burisch (1984) article, I felt that this statement was too strong of a statement to make. However, I think the overall point he was trying to make was clear. Even before he makes this statement, he seems to favor the deductive reasoning to creating scales for many reasons. To start he mentions they are great in terms of administration of tests. If you create a test that is quick and to the point, then your scale becomes more efficient and people are more likely to take it.

In regards to this being the norm or the exception – I think it really depends on what the construct we are attempting to measure is, and additionally what population this is being used on. For example, Burisch (1984) mentions that short scales are especially good for populations of depressive individuals. If the test is too long and repetitive, then this population is less likely to fully answer the measure because of the resulting fatigue. Therefore, there are clear advantages to a short and simple scale. Furthermore, this reduces the *redundancy* of items. Burisch (1984) also points out that the longer scales are likely to do a worse job because the items may be too closely related. In my opinion, it was sort of like the concept of splitting hairs. These contribute to low discriminant validity and uneconomical redundancy.