

Paired Comparisons

Partisans of this method assert that it is much easier to judge which of two officers is better than to rank employees. In paired comparisons, the evaluator will compare each man on his squad with every other man, with the final ranking determined by the number of times an officer was judged to be better than the others. The results of a ten-man patrol squad ranked by paired comparisons follow:

Officer Francis Dufey	9
Officer Judy Willner	8
Officer Willie Washington	7
Officer Victor Kroner	6
Officer Thomas Schultz	5
Officer Mary Salerno	4
Officer Nicholas Linder	3
Officer Stephen Rupnow	2
Officer Kendall Byron	1
Officer Wilmont Gray	0

The ranking indicates that Officer Dufey is the best officer, while Officer Gray is the worst. The number to the right of each officer's name represents the result of a person-to-person comparison in which one point was awarded to the better of two, with none going to the loser. Dufey, in a head-to-head rating battle with the other nine officers, won over each officer; Willner won 8 of 9, Washington won 7 of 9, and so on down to Gray, who was unable to better any officer on the shift. A typical paired comparison rating form would look like the one shown in Exhibit 6.3.

A major criticism of this method is that a very promising young rookie patrol officer may be constantly thrust to the bottom of the rating schedule when compared to seasoned veterans, with the result that a fledgling career may well be crushed before it has been allowed to develop.

Forced Distributions

The forced distribution rating offers an alternative to the preceding two methods, which do not lend themselves readily to the evaluation of large numbers of people. In this method, raters place their subordinates in categories according to predetermined proportions. In effect, the men to be evaluated will be graded on a curve that has been drawn prior to a rating period. A common distribution is:

Low	Middle Low	Middle	Middle High	High
10%	20%	40%	20%	10%

Exhibit 6.3 Factor: Quality of work (Mark "1" if the individual is better)

	Kroner	Dufey	Linder	Rupnow	Schultz	Willner	Gray	Byron	Washington	Salerno	TOTAL
Kroner	X	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
Dufey		X	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Linder			X	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Rupnow				X	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Schultz					X	0	1	1	0	1	5
Willner						X	1	1	1	1	8
Gray							X	0	0	0	0
Byron								X	0	0	1
Washington									X	1	7
Salerno										X	4

This standard distribution presupposes that both inferior and superior personnel will be in the minority, while adequate workers will cluster toward the middle. So, if a patrol division commander was asked to evaluate 50 officers according to a contrived distribution, like the one above, his ranking scale would, of necessity, reflect the following proportions:

Low	Middle Low	Middle	Middle High	High
5	10	20	10	5

Combined Employee Comparison

The aforementioned instruments are useful in ranking employees within a specified group, but they are not particularly valuable in determining intergroup status. In the combined employee comparison system the distribution obtained from ranking or pairing will be transmitted into scores by using conversion tables, which, when tabulated, can be combined into a single list.

Checklists

A checklist is a report form which lists specific job behavior factors, rather than the abstract traits that are found on rating scales. In this