

plotted in different fashion, although diametrically opposite conclusions are drawn from them. (See conclusions (1) and (3) above.)

Isn't Dr. Baldwin thinking in a circle when he uses mental age as a measure of mental growth? Isn't he assuming that the mental growth from 5 to 6 is the same as the mental growth from 12 to 13? It may be that it is so, but no one has yet proved it. Until an absolute unit for measuring intelligence is devised it will be impossible to say that the curve of growth of mental age is similar to the curve of growth for height, or to any other curve for that matter. Theoretically, the curve should be logarithmic. And the records from a large number of group tests give indications of a logarithmic character. But until the absolute unit has been discovered such researches as this are quite beside the mark. What Dr. Baldwin has done is a good piece of work on the question of the constancy of the IQ. He shows conclusively that it is fairly constant though subject to fluctuations so far as the measurements made are reliable. He has also pointed out that the results of repeated examinations exhibit a definite practice effect. But he has *not* plotted a mental growth curve although it pains the reviewer to have to point this out. But if it will soothe Dr. Baldwin's feelings the writer confesses that he (as well as many others) has previously stumbled into this very error.

PETER SANDIFORD.

---

2. *A Study of Superior Children.*—The gradually increasing number of studies dealing with superior children shows that psychologists and educators are beginning to realize the importance of knowing more about this type of child. The author of the monograph under consideration<sup>1</sup> presents in sociological and psychological study of a small group of children of superior intelligence. The children were selected from among those reported by principals and teachers as superior. The younger children had IQs of 135 or above, and the older had IQs of 120 or above. One or two cases with lower IQs were studied, the lowest being 117. These children were given a great number of tests of all kinds, opposites, symbol-digit, directions, proverbs, and the like. The superior children excelled normal children on all these tests.

The sociological part of the study includes very elaborate case histories of each child. These are very interesting in as much as we

---

<sup>1</sup> Root, W. T.: *A Socio-Psychological Study of 53 Supernormal Children. Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 29, No. 4. Whole No. 133. Princeton, 1921.

have little of this sort of data as compared with the amount we possess for subnormals. In general the superior child is characterized as having a good home and superior parents. The author then attempts to explain his results and proceeds to a long discussion of the central common factor theory. According to our author the common factor could just as well be environmental as innate. "The common factor or factors may be a varying admixture of innate ability, formal training, incidental education and social conditions." Indeed, all through the thesis the author emphasises the importance of environmental factors much more than the average psychologist would, and one is inclined to question the soundness of some of his opinions in this respect. It is, however, well to have this side of the picture presented, even although we cannot agree. There seems, furthermore, a feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the author with the present intelligence tests or with tests in general. He feels that no tests measure the real basis of superior intelligence, for this real basis consists of ability to suspend judgment, freedom from suggestibility, critical attitude, etc. Again there is room for much argument over these phrases. The results presented in the monograph are important and interesting. The conclusions and the opinions of the author are open to much debate.

R. P.

---

3. *Group Intelligence Tests in England*.<sup>1</sup>—This book gives American psychologists the first account of group testing in England and we have in its author, Mr. Ballard, a most delightful cicerone for our tour, one who knows well how to mix humor with his learning. We must remember, however, that he is not acting as guide to Americans, but is explaining the field to English teachers. So much the more interesting, therefore, is it to the American psychologist to hear the explanation of our own group tests. Here is their origin. "Individual testing was born in France; group testing was born in America. And its mother was necessity—the stern necessity of war." And so he tells of the testing in the army. "The whole undertaking was a colossal business; and the official report which has recently been issued is correspondingly colossal. It weighs about four pounds." Mr.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ballard, P. B.: *Group Tests of Intelligence*. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1922, pp. X, 252.