

the 2 to 4 range as well as the diminution of smaller sized families but not by a return to the large families of earlier years. Some evidence is mounting, however, that five-child families are becoming more prevalent and within a few more years the proportions with six children will probably also increase. If this happens the definition of "large" families may be problematic.

The authors also include a very sophisticated analysis of the effects on period rates of shifts in the patterns of child-spacing. On the whole, this volume embodies the most refined empirical techniques of population forecasting.

Professors Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell are to be heartily congratulated for their work. It is good news indeed to learn that another survey of a similar sample will be conducted in 1960, five years after the first.

CHARLES F. WESTOFF

Associate Professor of Sociology
New York University

ELI GINZBERG and others. *The Ineffective Soldier, Vol. I: The Lost Divisions*. Lessons for Management and the Nation. Pp. xx, 225. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. \$6.00.

ELI GINZBERG and others. *The Ineffective Soldier, Vol. II: Breakdown and Recovery*. Lessons for Management and the Nation. Pp. xvii, 284. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. \$6.00.

ELI GINZBERG and others. *The Ineffective Soldier, Vol. III: Patterns of Performance*. Lessons for Management and the Nation. Pp. xix, 340. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. \$6.00.

These three volumes comprise a comprehensive review and evaluation of the manpower selection and assignment procedures of the ground and air forces during World War II. They are the final reports of the "Conservation of Human Resources" project established at Columbia University under the directorship of Dr. Eli Ginzberg and represent the results of an elaborate research program carried out from 1950 to 1958 by a team of specialists representing psychiatry, personnel research, social psychology, history, and statistics.

While the study covers ground well known to specialists, it is of importance because it supplies definitive documentation. The major conclusion is that psychiatric screening did not operate effectively to meet the personnel requirements of the armed forces in World War II. The armed forces sought to develop a procedure which would eliminate ineffective soldiers and thereby facilitate the efficiency of combat units. Screening for ineffective soldiers, those who suffered psychological disabilities, illiteracy, and general inaptitude, employed the stringent criterion that all recruits should be potentially combat soldiers. In addition, the manpower planners operated as if the sources of manpower were unlimited and only later in the war modified their requirements.

As a result, many persons were excluded from military service, even though there would have been suitable occupational specialties for them within the military establishment. The screening system was defective because of shortages of trained personnel, pressure of the crisis, and lack of clarity of standards. With the exception of screening psychotics, the psychological standards were unable to distinguish between those who would and those who would not perform effectively in combat.

The authors seek to demonstrate that such screening procedures have inherent limitations for the military establishment and for industrial organizations. They argue that the effectiveness of a soldier is a function of his psychological predispositions, environmental stress, and the practices of management. Since psychological screening only measures one dimension, and this incompletely, it is at best a partial approach. Instead, they emphasize the need for training, placement, and organizational practices which will maximize the effectiveness of borderline personnel. This study is another example, and clearly the most comprehensive, in the growing body of literature which seeks to place psychiatric and psychological testing in its proper perspective as a device of administrative management.

MORRIS JANOWITZ

Professor of Sociology
University of Michigan