METHODS OF OFFICER SELECTION IN THE ARMY.*

By SIMEON W. GILLMAN, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.P.M.,

Deputy Medical Superintendent, Central Hospital, Warwick; Late Major, R.A.M.C., Senior Psychiatrist, Middle East Officer Selection Board.

IN June, 1940, the first Area Psychiatrists in the United Kingdom, of whom I was one, were appointed. Although at first we were told that there were not many psychiatric cases, and in spite of the lack of encouragement in some areas, clinics were set up, and very soon the psychiatrists were overwhelmed by the number of patients sent, both officers and men. It became apparent to all of us who were doing the work that many of the men could have been eliminated at the source, for by going into the history of the individual patient, and giving him intelligence tests, one could have foretold fairly accurately his future in the army, i.e. whether he would be able to be trained as a soldier in a particular arm, and his length of service before his breakdown. But the process was that of elimination. The psychiatrist working alone managed to sort out the soldier, but there was at that time no disposal method except to hospital, which was not very useful for the dull and backward, and the chronic anxiety states. At the end of 1940, at the suggestion of a Command Psychiatrist, a Directorate of Officer Selection Personnel was set up, so that men joining the army would have their intelligence tested, and be interviewed by a personnel selection officer, and the dull and backward and the difficult cases interviewed by the psychiatrist, either for rejection from the army or for transfer to the unarmed or armed Pioneer Corps, or to any arm which was considered suitable. This process has continued since then, and has made great strides. At present no man is posted to any particular arm, but he comes into the army to primary training centres, where he is tested and interviewed, and after six weeks' general training is then posted to the arm most suitable for him. This procedure helped the problem of " other ranks," and it was hoped that the incidence of psychological illnesses in the army would be lowered, and the number of men sent to the psychiatrist brought within reasonable limits. Till then, the psychiatrist in the army had been working very fast, seeing as many as thirty to one hundred men a day.

But the problem of officers still remained, for the numbers of officers seen at psychiatric clinics were comparatively high, and they differed in no way from other ranks in that their destiny could have been foretold by an interview by the psychiatrist, plus intelligence tests, but it was not until December, 1941, that anything was done. At that time, production of officers was

* A Paper read at the Spring Meeting of the Northern and Midland Division, held on April 25, 1946, at the Central Hospital, Warwick.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

insufficient to meet the army's requirements. Not nearly enough candidates were coming forward, and some 20 to 40 per cent. of cadets were returned to their units from OCTU after varying periods of abortive training. This high rejection rate could not go on, and it showed that the method of selection was faulty. The method consisted of picking men from units and sending them for a short interview by Command Selection Boards, which consisted of a colonel and two lieutenant-colonels brought in from surrounding units. It was quite obviously a " hit or miss " method. One colonel made a list of " officer qualities," and gave marks for intelligence, experience, leadership, captain of cricket, etc., and then added up the result at the end.

A new method was put forward by the Command Psychiatrist of the Scottish Command, who, by means of intelligence tests, psychological tests, and psychiatric interview, had found it was possible to predict accurately which candidates would do well at OCTU, which would be satisfactory, and which would be rejected. This method of selection was submitted to the Adjutant-General, and the first new type Officer Selection Board was set up in Edinburgh experimentally at the end of 1941. An ex-OCTU commander acted as President. In order to validate the procedure, the entire intake of two OCTU courses and a senior officers' course was passed through the Board, and a prediction made. At the end of the courses it was found that the reports of the commandants of the respective courses and those of the experimental board coincided to an astonishing degree. With the addition of practical out-door tests, conducted by military testing officers, the new system was approved and a number of similar boards were set up in each command. At this stage various modifications were introduced, and the position of the Boards was as follows :

President.
Deputy President.
Two Psychiatrists.
Three Military Testing Officers.
Three Personnel Selection Staff (N.C.O.'s, but later commissioned as " psychological officers "), who were educational psychologists.

This establishment was found to be sufficient for a Board coping with 80 candidates in a week. How were we going to set about bringing all the candidates to such a Selection Board ? First, the Army acquired a number of large country houses, because it was necessary to test the total personality of each candidate, and as far as possible to get them out of their army environment and assess their ability to become good officers.

The candidates, having been recommended by the Commanding Officers, come to the Selection Board for three days. During this period they live in a mess resembling as closely as possible an officers' mess, and are treated as cadets. They go through a series of tests and interviews designed to throw light upon them from as many angles as possible, and their fate is settled at a Board Conference held on the final day. Each member of the Board contributes his views on the candidate and the President sums up and decides. The President, a colonel, is a regimental officer of good standing, young enough to make easy contact with the potential candidates. He, with the assistance

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of a deputy president, a lieutenant-colonel, interviews every candidate and presides over the Board Conference, as well as directing the general policy.

After the candidate had come to the country house and had settled in, he had a talk from the President and was then taken to testing rooms, where he was given the following psychological tests: (1) questionary; (2) intelligence tests; (3) psychological tests, sometimes with projection tests. The factual questionary was given first, and acted as a buffer for the more difficult intelligence tests.

The Questionary.

Part I of the questionary gives the military history (including length of service, promotion, and action), education, employment, and games. From this information it is not difficult to see whether the man has progressed or stagnated, whether he has had any experience of leadership in the Army or in civilian life, whether he has made the most of his opportunities, or accepted life passively without effort on his part. This part may be used by the President as a guide to his interview.

Part II of the questionary, the medical and personal section, is confidential to the medical and psychological staff. The questions in it are arranged to reveal, not only the physical make-up, but also the presence of any psycho-pathology. For example, youngest children, only children, and those brought up by step-parents or strangers may present problems, and it is important to discover whether successful adjustments have been made in such cases.

Part III of the questionary deals with interests and the way leisure has been spent. The sports played tend to indicate the individualist, the solitary man, the good mixer. This may be confirmed by the interests, which distinguish also the energetic from the quiet, the shallow from the profound. Finally, in this part of the questionary the candidate is asked to write a description of himself as a friend, and then as someone who disliked him would do so. This enables the psychologist to see what insight a man has into himself.

Intelligence Test.

Whatever qualities comprise the make-up of a good officer, it is certain that adequate intelligence is of prime importance. It is fortunate, therefore, that this is the one most easily measured objectively, thanks to pioneer work in the educational field. The main difficulty in using one of the conventional tests in the Army is their dependence to a greater or lesser extent on education. To overcome this, Raven's Progressive Matrices is used, where the candidate is asked to complete a pattern from a number of possible answers, only one of which is correct. Two versions are in use. Twenty minutes are first allowed; work is then stopped and a line drawn across to mark the point reached. A further twenty-five minutes are given for completion and correction of what has already been attempted—a corrected answer being circled to distinguish it. In this way a measure of performance under pressure (or speed test) is obtained, as well as the ultimate performance (or power).

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In addition to this, the candidate does a verbal test (V.I.T.), consisting of synonyms, opposites, analogies, and similar well-established types of question.

Note is made of any large discrepancies between scores in the two tests, or in the two versions of the Matrix. Such differences are of diagnostic value. A Matrix higher than V.I.T., for example, suggests that the subject's education has not kept pace with his intellectual possibilities. A higher V.I.T., on the other hand, suggests that the subject is rather more academically inclined. In the same way a higher grade at speed on the Matrix indicates the rapid, rather superficial worker, while a higher grade in the longer version picks out the slow, steady, accurate man.

The tests are marked on a percentile scale, which means the determination of the person's position in a hundred unselected people. If he falls in the top 10 per cent. he comes in Selection Group 1 (S.G. 1); if in the next 20 per cent., in S.G. 2; in the middle 40 per cent. (i.e. he is average), in S.G. 3; in the next 20 per cent., S.G. 4; and in the bottom 10 per cent., in S.G. 5. It is considered that an officer should be in the first two groups, or the top 30 per cent. of the general population. This figure was reached only after it had been found in practice that successful serving officers, such as those attending the Company Commanders' School at Edinburgh, are rarely below this standard. This officer intelligence range is then itself divided into similar percentile grades: "A" the top 5 per cent. of officers; "B" the next 20 per cent.; "C" the middle 50 per cent. (i.e. average officer); "D" the next 20 per cent., and D/E the bottom 5 per cent. Below is "E," in which a candidate is regarded as unsuitable, as his intelligence would not then be above the average of other ranks.

Later on a "Reasoning Test" was added to the battery of tests.

Psychological Tests.

These are given by the psychologist or the sergeant tester.

Word Association Test.

The questionary provides information about the life-history and career of the candidate as he himself regards it, but it is necessary to probe a little deeper. For this two tests are used. It has been known for some time that if a person is given a word and told to reply with the first thought that comes into his head it is possible to tap the "unconscious level." This technique, originally devised by Jung, has been modified and adapted for use on a group. A series of cards, each of which has a word on it, is shown in rapid succession, and the candidate has to write down his immediate reaction on seeing the word. The responses are then scrutinized by the psychologist. For example, from the answers to certain key words such as Mother, Afraid, Home, Worry, he can distinguish the anxious, spoiled, homesick youth from the stable, well-balanced man. Again, a number of words can be interpreted either in a war or non-war sense—Butt, Barrel, Desert, Arm, Front. The man with drive who is war-minded tends to seize on the military meaning and reject the other. All these points are valuable clues to personality.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thematic Apperception (Story) Test.

The second test referred to above is an adaptation of Murray's Thematic Apperception Test, again modified for group work. The candidate is shown a slide projected on a screen, depicting an ambiguous social situation, which he is told to consider as an illustration to a story. He is then invited to write the story, showing what events have led up to the situation, what the characters are thinking, saying, and doing, and what the final outcome will be. The slide is shown for 30 seconds, and then 3½ minutes are allowed for writing. Here the candidate tends to project himself into the picture, identifying himself with the principal character. For example, one slide shows an elderly woman standing with her back turned to a young man who is fingering his hat, both of them looking depressed. The tendency is for the candidate to expose unwittingly his own relations with his home. Care must be taken with the interpretation of these stories, but with experience valuable information can be brought to light, enabling an opinion to be formed in the case just cited, for example, as to whether there is still parental dependence or whether the subject is independent. If all the stories end happily, with the hero overcoming his difficulties, it is likely that the writer is well balanced and energetic. On the other hand, where the hero is helpless, victim of his circumstances, and passive, there is a strong suspicion that the writer himself is an ineffectual person with little drive.

The work of the Psychologist on an Officer Selection Board consists of two parts: the measurement of a candidate's intelligence, and a tentative assessment of his personality. The tentative nature of the second part is stressed, because nothing more is attempted than to find Personality Pointers, which are hints or suspicions derived from paper work for the Psychiatrist to confirm or refute by interview.

This testing took a long time—something like three-and-a-half hours or more. At the end the sergeant tester and psychologist made "personality pointers," and assessed the total personality of the candidate without seeing him. After some experience they got very close to it, and it took a very brave psychiatrist to go against what the psychologist said.

The Psychiatrist on the Officer Selection Board interviews each candidate and makes an assessment of his personality. In England only 50 per cent. of the candidates were sent to him, but in the Middle East all candidates were seen by a Psychiatrist. In his interview he is aided by the "personality pointers" which the Psychologist has prepared for him.

To find out what a man really is, it is necessary to know something about his early life, his upbringing, his family background; to discover what sort of a person he has been at each stage of his development; to know what use he has made of the opportunities presented to him, and how he has dealt with the obstacles which have fallen across his path. The Psychiatrist must also enquire into the man's contact with others, his sociable and solitary tendencies, his day-to-day moods, his attitude to life. When all this is known of any individual, the story of his life becomes a reasonable whole. One has a vivid feature film in place of a disconnected series of flat and uninteresting stills.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Of his knowledge of what the candidate has been in the past and what he is at present, the Psychiatrist is able to prophesy fairly accurately how he may be expected to react in similar situations in the future. A man's basic personality seldom changes much in adult life. Occasionally some remarkable development takes place, but there is usually a special reason for this, and one which the Psychiatrist can detect. Indeed it is not uncommon for the Psychiatrist to say that given greater opportunities this man may well surprise everyone, revealing latent abilities which hitherto have had no chance to develop.

Many of the young officers who have failed to make good in the past have turned out to be men who would never have been commissioned had they come before a Psychiatrist. The Psychiatrist is trained to detect and exclude not only the mentally unstable, but also all those who habitually evade their difficulties, unloading their rightful responsibilities upon others, or seeking refuge at times of crisis in a series of petty ailments which enable them to retire gracefully, surrounded by the misplaced sympathy of all their friends. He can detect the selfish individual so wrapped up in himself and his own affairs as to have no thought to spare for the welfare of his men. He can detect the aloof, solitary, isolated man, who lives in a dream world, out of touch with reality. He recognizes the feeble, ineffective individual who has never learned to stand on his own feet, always asking for support, always leaning upon others, as helplessly dependent as on the day he was born. He sees through the bluster of the showman and the bully who, knowing their own inadequacy, try to cover it with a glib tongue or a show of force.

The Psychiatrist is happy, too, to recognize true metal when he finds it. He seeks the man who comes of sound stock (in any walk of life), brought up by his parents to be responsible and self-reliant, happy in his contact with his fellows, robust in his attitude to adversity; the man who has shown in every phase of his career a strong urge to achieve something positive. Such a man is likely to have a firm sense of purpose in relation to the War effort. With that addition he will make a sound leader and a good officer.

The Work of the Military Testing Officer.

It is probable that a process of selection for any walk of life could be founded on intelligence and personality tests, coupled with psychiatric interviews, for these are tests equally applicable to any profession or calling contemplated by the individual tested. However, in addition it is necessary to apply special aptitude tests, appropriate only to the occupation for which the candidate is destined, and indicating more specifically his ability to adapt himself to its peculiar exigencies.

In the process of officer selection these special aptitude tests are represented by the tests carried out by the Military Testing Officer, which, broadly speaking, seek to provide that officer with opportunities for observing the reactions of a candidate for a commission when confronted with a situation calling for qualities of leadership and personality necessary to an officer.

In the earlier stages of officer selection, it was considered that the role of the M.T.O. was to test the candidate's basic military training, but it was soon

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

realized that this training could be imparted at OCTU, and that it was more logical to consider first the candidate's suitability to undergo such training at all. In considering this question the tendency at first was to take each candidate in turn and put him through an individual test, e.g. forcing him to assume command of a body of men and order them about the completion of an allotted task, or calling upon him to carry out some physical task on his own. It was seen, however, that conclusions based upon observing such activities were frequently founded upon false premises, and accordingly the basis of the M.T.O.'s tests underwent a complete change.

It was realized that a more reliable indication of a candidate's qualities could be obtained by observing him as a member of a group confronted with a variety of situations, all presenting different problems for solution. The indication was more reliable, firstly, because each candidate was under observation all the time, and secondly, because he was not forced artificially to take a lead, but was allowed to find his own level in the group.

The principle therefore applied by the M.T.O. at present is to put his candidates into a group and, without appointing a leader, to observe this group engaged in as varied a selection of activities as possible. Instances of their activities are as follows:

1. A Group Discussion in which the group is allowed to choose its own subject and discuss it without any interference from Testing Officers.

2. Group tasks which are practical problems, requiring a certain amount of ingenuity and organizing ability for their solution, as, for example, the construction of a bridge over a ditch.

3. Group Games in which the emphasis is on planning, quick thinking, and the ability to look ahead.

4. Team Activity in which the candidates work as members of a team, in competition with another team, and the interesting feature is their ability to sink their individuality and assist others of their side.

The activities outlined are regarded simply as a variety of "situations," in the course of which the qualities of the individuals taking part gradually become apparent, and by the end of which the Testing Officer has built up a cumulative general impression of each man from which he is able to assess one general grading of his "officer quality," and thus a correct picture of the function of the M.T.O. is obtained.

An important point is that while the candidates are under test they should live in a congenial and friendly atmosphere. Accordingly, any attempt at regimentation should be avoided, and they should live under "officers' mess" conditions. This latter arrangement enables Testing Officers to live with them, and produces an easy atmosphere in which even the most diffident candidate has time to settle down, and by the second day at least will show whether he has the necessary qualities in him.

One final point needs emphasis. Any attempt to formalize the Testing Officer's opinion should be avoided. It has been impossible to agree upon a complete list of officer qualities, and therefore to make up such a list and insist upon the Testing Officer making a note on each quality in relation to

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

each candidate is profitless. The Officer's final opinion should be in the form of a report of his own composition, in which he records his impression in an informal way, and finally assesses a grading on officer quality as a whole.

That, in the main, is how officers were selected in the Army. Each test in itself could be an hour's lecture. And what was the result? There has been a follow-up system at the War Office ever since this "officer selection" has been going on, and up to a point it has been very successful. In February, 1942, 20 to 40 candidates out of every 100 were being sent back to their units through OCTU from the Middle East as of no use as officers. After the Board had been set up and was working, this figure came down to one candidate per hundred.

One of the difficulties of selection was that we had no adequate test of courage, even if you call it "war purposiveness." We were able to assess a quality like "courage" from the adverse reports of officers who had been sent back from the desert to Cairo after having failed to come up to the standard expected by their commanding officers. Amongst those who had been sent back were many who had psychotic breakdowns, and who could have been eliminated by this new technique of officer selection. One officer I saw, six weeks after commission, had acute schizophrenia. We went carefully into his psychological test and previous history and could find no reason for it. He appeared to be a normal individual who had developed schizophrenia. This type of illness happened quite frequently in the Middle East and in India. It seemed to clear up in about six weeks.

The follow-up procedure not only followed the candidate through OCTU and his unit, but also into battle, and it is hoped that it will be continued into civilian life, so that we may see whether these men who were picked by the Officer Selection Board have really come up to standard.

During all this time many doctors in the Army wanted to know why psychiatrists were being used in selection, and why they were not doing clinical work. The answer is that "selection" to a psychiatrist is almost "preventive psychiatry," eliminating the men who would break down under undue stress.

This method has now been accepted by industry, and by the Government in picking higher civil servants, and for A.T.S. officers. It is used in India for selecting senior officers and Indian Army officers. In the Middle East we had to deal with various nationalities—Palestinians, Southern Rhodesians, South Africans, Cypriots, Arabs—and for each nationality various alterations had to be made in the psychological tests. There is now an Officer Selection Board for "regular officers," but unfortunately there is no psychiatrist on this Board.

Selection of officers was the first positive approach to the scientific selection of leaders, and it is hoped that it will continue in other fields and levels as a branch of preventive psychiatry.

Additional Note by Major S. Yeldham, R.A.

The President was the head of the Selection Board; he was the judge, and took all recommendations from other people, weighing up various views, and making the decision.

As regards the "military testing" side, we wanted to look at the man in

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

action—to see his personality in contact with other people. In the end it was decided that it was better to form ten men into a group and give them a series of situations where they could show themselves as better or worse than the next man. We wanted to see them as individuals, members of a group, and as people in action, dealing with practical things and with people, and with a combination of both.

To begin with we had to get a good officer, of high intelligence, to act as Military Training Officer. He had to appreciate what others were doing and put the right construction on their actions. He had to be a man who had gone through the whole of the psychological tests, well balanced, and interested in other people. He need have no psychological training, for he was told what would emerge from various tests given. He was given a series of talks by the psychiatrist and shown men going through tests. When a Military Training Officer was trained he was given a group of ten men for two days, during which he was always in contact with them, ate with them, and gave them their tests, etc.

With regard to Group Discussion, the initial test was arranged as follows: ten men in a room, comfortably furnished, if possible, to put them at their ease. The M.T.O. tried to bring himself down to their level or raise them up to his. He tried to be one of the party. The group were told to discuss anything they liked, and suggestions were called for. Naturally three or four men in the group would suggest a subject. The M.T.O. would stay outside the circle formed by the group, and would sit and make notes on the interest in the type of subject proposed, how well it was received by the remainder, and how it was handled by the proposer. Once the discussion had started the M.T.O. would see how much each person contributed, how much confidence a man had in himself and other people, how easily he was led astray, how easily he could persuade others to take up his suggestions, no matter how impracticable they were. The M.T.O. watched people who were silent in order to discover why.

From a group discussion like this—emotional and theoretical aspects—the group had to proceed to where things had got to be done, e.g. make a large hole in the ground and carry heavy articles across it—a matter of intelligence and improvising all the time. Then the group would review the result in detail, two or three suggestions would be put forward and recommendations made, the M.T.O. observing the reasons for these—whether a man was aggressive, a man to be reckoned with, whether he could command attention, etc. Or maybe there would be a man who " worked out problems in the sand " and hoped the M.T.O. was watching. Others would start on a job without any consideration, and would be merely passive. The man who started the job was not always the leader. It was thus possible to get a good idea of a man's capabilities in controlling people, picking other people's brains, etc., and to obtain a general impression as to what sort of man he was. The group was given a series of tests like this.

It was found necessary to have one test where the M.T.O. would single each man out and observe him alone; he might often be good in a group but not alone. The M.T.O. would talk to him about anything he liked, whether he was interested in his own job, etc. Giving about 15 tests the M.T.O. collected quite a lot of information about him, meanwhile maintaining his confidence and keeping him feeling that he was a thoroughly good fellow!

At the end of the tests the M.T.O. wrote a report on each man's personality. The team met at the final board meeting, where every candidate was considered, and the President—who had interviewed the man so that he knew his appearance and had a fairly general picture of him—sat in judgment, also calling on the Psychiatrist to give his opinion. The President then welded together the reports of the Psychiatrist and M.T.O. and decided whether the man should pass.

The method could be used in civil life. It would have much the same result, particularly in regard to selection for executive positions. There is no reason why any person should not be made the subject of a selection procedure if he is to be in charge of people who have themselves been picked.

Discussion.

Dr. Van Someren: I would like to ask whether there could be selection for doctors, and more especially for psychiatrists.

Dr. Gillman: I consider there is a place for selection in the medical world.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Psychiatrists should be selected. There should be a type of selection for undergraduates and for children going to secondary schools. Although individuals should keep their ideas of what they wanted to be, they should be guided into suitable professions. Selection would also help doctors who wished to specialize in any branch of medicine—psychiatry, E.N.T., etc.

Dr. GOULD: There is a point which might be used as an argument against selection. Doctors, wherever they are, are usually very competent in their work. I think selection is desirable, but would suggest that there may be quite a definite point beyond which selection cannot go, except by the hard selection of "living it out." When it comes to selecting, the difficulties encountered in selecting doctors would be very much magnified, and only by eliminating the obviously useless would you get anywhere in selecting for high posts.

Dr. GILLMAN: I disagree—there is no proper judging of doctors' competence nowadays. In all selection people are graded, as they were in the army, into (*a*) those who are fitted to be future commanders in charge; (*b*) below that; (*c*) average; (*d*) below average; the poor officer and the bad officer. Doctors could be graded in the same way. Why should we have bad people in any profession? We should, by reasonable selection, following similar lines, be able to find the total personality in an individual—find his interests, and be able to guide him into a suitable profession or industry in which he is going to be happy. We cannot take away the fact that there are unhappy doctors—no one has investigated *why* they are unhappy in their work. If, with good intelligence, you are not happy in your work, you are usually unhappy because you cannot do it. We had to discharge one doctor from the Army—he should never have taken up medicine.

Dr. GOULD: I disagree.

Dr. GARMANY: I admire Dr. Gillman's methods of selection. We ought to sound a note of warning against accepting selection at the moment. It may well be that the excellent results which followed selection of officers were not ascribable to the accuracy of the method but to the closeness and prolongation of the examination. In the Navy we had a rather different set-up: men on the whole were in smaller groups; their attributes and difficulties were usually known fairly intimately by their officers. We found that on the whole not much was gained by personnel selection, and even our psychologists, who pretended to do personnel selection, knew that no one took a lot of notice of what they said. But we did find that the average executive officer, who was sometimes a most markedly stupid man, chose his fighting men with extraordinary accuracy, usually because he knew the men very well. We should not assume that because a man is unhappy in his work his difficulties are going to be remedied by changing it—the job is not always the cause of his unhappiness. I find that men who give trouble in one job usually give trouble in others.

Dr. GILLMAN: The Navy is a much more chummy service because they get the best personnel. The Army usually came last and had the worst material. So the Navy probably did not need selection in the same way. I do not, however, believe that anyone can say that a man would be a good officer because he knew him very well—this was tried in the Army and it failed.

Dr. MURRAY: Intelligence tests do not fluctuate, but emotional ones do—as the years go by there is sometimes a definite deterioration in medical men. Would you go so far as to say that one selection board is sufficient to plan a man's career for life?

Dr. GILLMAN: A doctor's intelligence is above the average intelligence of the population, but does not come up to the average officer. One selection board is not final—there should be a selection board at various stages—possibly three. In wartime the initial test had to be final on account of urgency. I believe that "selection" is going to become part of psychiatry, and that we shall need a lot of well-trained psychiatrists.

Dr. LADELL: I would like to ask whether there is any available literature about acute schizophrenia in wartime, as I have had cases referred to me as acute schizophrenics, and I could detect nothing but an "anxiety neurosis."

Dr. GILLMAN: When reports were made out by Medical Boards at home the typical symptoms were stated on the case sheet—auditory hallucinations, acute confusion, etc.—some of which resembled those of a toxic state. There is no doubt that everyone diagnosed "acute schizophrenia," and also no doubt that the condition cleared up in about six weeks, which would explain the absence of symptoms on arrival in England.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. GOULD: I have known cases as mentioned which have shown signs of unreality, and in one case post-encephalitic disorder. The acute schizophrenic is confused, but it usually clears up. Some Americans have been talking recently about the slight amount of dementia or mental defect following schizophrenic states. Have you any answer to give?

Dr. BAMFORD: This point is somewhat of a "red herring." I was interested in the condition about twenty years ago and contributed one or two articles to the *Journal of Mental Science*. I do not think it is a military condition at all—it does occur in civilian practice. In a large mental hospital, with a fair admission rate, it was found that some cases recovered, others pursued a very rapid downhill course and became emaciated, and died within nine to twelve months. They had a combination of pathological features, i.e., a very small and narrow aorta with a very small heart, and in conjunction with this a fibrosis of the major viscera, mainly the liver, kidneys and spleen, and in addition a very large brain—a brain above the average in weight. The number of cases was not investigated, but nevertheless I did feel that a certain number might be described as acute or malignant schizophrenia.

I think both speakers have given very interesting addresses, and I wish to thank them. It has lifted the veil of secrecy that has surrounded the last few years. I have met a number of army psychiatrists who have been intensely enthusiastic about personnel selection tests, and for their extension to civilian practice. I do feel, from what army psychiatrists have told me, that there is a big future for personnel selection. I would like to congratulate Dr. Gillman on a most stimulating address.

Dr. CUTHBERT (Secretary): I wish to ask whether the process of selection brought to light emotional circumstances which might in the course of time in any case have produced neurotic breakdowns, and also does Dr. Gillman know anything about the application of the Modified Rorschach Test, possibly with a view to discovering these latent emotional situations?

Dr. GILLMAN: Yes, emotional situations *were* found. But we were out to select officers who would give us twelve months' good service, and who might during that time spend only a few minutes in fighting. It was difficult to assess what would happen in a few years' time. Unless a man is showing frank symptoms I do not think that anyone can say that he will break down, unless he knows the stresses and strains and situations that the officer will undergo. A lot of people broke down who, with all our investigations, showed nothing from the psychiatric point of view, i.e., an apparently stable individual with a good personality was sometimes evacuated to the "Exhaustion Centres." These got better and went back to the fight—but we were not able to follow these up properly. The Modified Rorschach Test was tried out at Edinburgh and was a failure—candidates could not be trained and the environment was all wrong.

Dr. DRURY: It was brought up by the G.N.C. whether group tests for nurses was advisable before they joined the service at all; there were different opinions as to this. One speaker said that for the last ten years we have had a diminishing number of candidates for nursing, and that the next five years would be even worse. Opinions differ on this—probably a test would be very different after two or three years' training.

* * * * *

The Chairman in closing the discussion, proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Gillman and Major Yeldham for their interesting and stimulating papers. This was carried by acclamation.

Dr. Stern was thanked for his hospitality and kindness in arranging a very interesting meeting.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.93.390.101 Published online by Cambridge University Press