

others in the group were compared with these selected individuals and rated according to the value assigned the man they most resembled. A variation of this method was used in some O.C.S. training in World War II. Every man rated every other man in his class on selected traits, lining them up from poorest to best in a straight array.

The most popular method in use today is the graphic rating scale. It consists of a list of traits or activities to be evaluated, followed by a line along which the rater marks. He is guided by descriptions along this line ranging from low to the highest degree of that trait. The different types of graphic scales are numerous, but most often there is a continuum of equally divided units along the line of qualities and the evaluation for that factor is interpreted numerically.

Another process makes use of a check list; and has reached its greatest refinement in the "Probst System" developed by J. B. Probst formerly of the St. Paul Civil Service Commission. This rating consists of one hundred items designating modes of behavior or characteristics, for example: "Indifferent," "too much self importance," "always uses good judgment," "cranky disposition," "work always up to date," etc. The rater checks only those of the hundred items which he believes apply. Each factor is assigned a relative value, and the final scoring is most often done by the central agency.

The California State Personnel Board rating carries the Probst System one step further. A variety of mixed items is also used, but each item is qualified by checking "always," "nearly always," "generally," "seldom," and "never." Also California has over twenty-five different forms designed for various types of occupations. All ratings are machine scored by the personnel board.

Some Problems of Development

Classification has to do with *what* an employee does; service rating, with *how well* he does it. Evaluation of *what* an employee does lends itself easily to

determination by disinterested, outside personnel men not connected with the department; but *how well* he does it can most often be determined only by his immediate supervisors. There is agreement on the truth of this conclusion; but as to the best method to follow in getting the supervisors' rating, there is great disagreement. One school of thought believes that the supervisor, who is closest to the employee's work, should do the actual rating. The opposing belief is that the supervisor should be limited to merely reporting the observable significant traits of the employee with the central personnel agency doing the actual scoring either manually or by machine.

Neither path is a smooth one; both are filled with problems and difficulties. Service rating procedures have not yet reached the super highway status. It is a matter of deciding which of two rough roads leading to the same destination is easiest.

The choice of the proper system comes down to two factors—each in conflict with the other. On one hand, the system must be simple, flexible, and economical; on the other hand it should be as reliable and valid as possible. A certain amount of one factor has to be sacrificed in order to attain the other.

The 'classical' personnel people—considered a strange and terrible breed in some quarters—insist that it is impossible to make a valid rating of the man as a whole, and that specific traits or items of behavior must be evaluated separately. The *renegade* personnel group—also a strange people—maintain that regardless of how much rigmarole and red tape is gone through, it always comes back to an overall rating of the man anyway, that it is a matter of judgment, that all such evaluations are subjective; and most of all that the system must be simple enough to work. These people believe that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts; and, moreover, that the overall personality and character of the man appear in his

(Continued on page 18)