

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Public Administration ETDs

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-11-1973

Police Promotion Proposal: Survey and Appraisal

Vincent C. Villanueva

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/padm_etds

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106

POLICY ON USE OF THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Unpublished theses and dissertations accepted for master's and doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of New Mexico Library are open to the public for inspection and reference work. *They are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors.* The work of other authors should always be given full credit. Avoid quoting in amounts, over and beyond scholarly needs, such as might impair or destroy the property rights and financial benefits of another author.

To afford reasonable safeguards to authors, and consistent with the above principles, anyone quoting from theses and dissertations must observe the following conditions:

1. Direct quotations during the first two years after completion may be made only with the written permission of the author.
2. After a lapse of two years, theses and dissertations may be quoted without specific prior permission in works of original scholarship provided appropriate credit is given in the case of each quotation.
3. Quotations that are complete units in themselves (e.g., complete chapters or sections) in whatever form they may be reproduced and quotations of whatever length presented as primary material for their own sake (as in anthologies or books of readings) ALWAYS require consent of the authors.
4. The quoting author is responsible for determining "fair use" of material he uses.

This thesis/dissertation by Vincent C. Villanueva has been used by the following persons whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above conditions. (A library which borrows this thesis/dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.)

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

G. P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, Ind. 12/3/73

This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Public Administration

POLICE PROMOTION PROPOSAL: SURVEY AND APPRAISAL

Title

Vincent C. Villanueva

Candidate

Public Administration

Department

John S. Zepper

Dean

May 11, 1973

Date

Committee

Edwin F. Connerley

Chairman

Donald W. Smith

Alfred W. Rasmussen

POLICE PROMOTION PROPOSAL: SURVEY AND APPRAISAL

BY
Vincent C. Villanueva

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Public Administration
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
May 1973

LD
3781
W563V712
CDP.2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my wife, Benita, I can only say that it would have been virtually impossible to complete this paper without her cooperation, patience, understanding, and assistance.

The assistance, guidance and inspiration afforded to me by Donald A. Byrd, Chief of Police, Albuquerque, New Mexico has been invaluable.

I would like to give special thanks to Professor Ed Connerley. His advice, encouragement and many hours of his own time contributed to the completion of this paper.

POLICE PROMOTION PROPOSAL: SURVEY AND APPRAISAL

BY
VINCENT C. VILLANUEVA
B.S.B.A., University of Albuquerque, 1972

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Public Administration
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
May 1973

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to analyze the promotional processes now in use in a comparative sample of police departments and to suggest measures which might be taken to improve promotional systems. The available literature on the subject is also reviewed.

The various factors commonly used in making judgments as to promotions are surveyed. Among these are written examinations, oral examinations, performance evaluations, seniority, and in-service education and training. The writer found little uniformity as between departments in the way in which the various factors were weighted.

An analysis of the literature revealed that written examinations were almost always used, but to be effective, care must be given to see that the examinations are properly constructed and should contain material pertinent to all phases of the policeman's job. Oral interviews can be very helpful in revealing the more subtle aspects of the supervisory position but care must be taken in the selection of the interviewers and in the selection of appropriate material to be covered.

Performance ratings can also be used but extreme care must be exercised to eliminate bias. Various techniques for accomplishing this are suggested.

Seniority as a criterion for promotion is analyzed and, except in cases of ties between individuals, is ruled out as a promotional technique. It is felt that seniority in itself

can be a hindrance rather than a help in allowing a department to promote those persons who are most aware of changing needs.

Finally, the problem of requiring formal education on an in-service basis as a condition for promotion is examined. It was found that, while, in the past, little attention was given to in-service education and training, more departments and almost all authorities are giving formal education increasing weight in promotions. The education incentive system used by police departments is examined and in particular that used in Albuquerque.

The study concludes that much more study and consideration be given to promotional processes if the ultimate aim of more professional law enforcement is to be attained.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Effective Leadership: The Need For..... | 1 |
| Professional Supervisor..... | 3 |
| Purpose..... | 6 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 7 |
| Methodology..... | 8 |
| CHAPTER II. THE WRITTEN AND ORAL EXAMINATIONS AS PART OF PROMOTIONS..... | 11 |
| Written Examination..... | 11 |
| Validity and Reliability..... | 12 |
| Contents..... | 13 |
| Weighted Scores..... | 16 |
| Oral Interview..... | 17 |
| The Interviewers..... | 19 |
| Content of the Interview..... | 21 |
| Weighted Scores..... | 21 |
| CHAPTER III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SENIORITY... | 26 |
| Performance Evaluation..... | 26 |
| The Rater..... | 28 |
| When Should an Evaluation be Given..... | 31 |
| Training of Supervisors in the Evaluation of Personnel..... | 33 |
| Employee Participation..... | 34 |
| Percentage Weights Towards Promotion..... | 36 |
| Other Usable Rating Forms..... | 39 |
| Seniority..... | 40 |
| When Should Seniority be Considered for Promotion | 41 |
| Weighted Percentage Scores..... | 43 |
| CHAPTER IV. EDUCATION AND TRAINING..... | 47 |
| Emphasis of Education on Promotions..... | 47 |
| Educational Requirements..... | 49 |
| Incentives..... | 52 |
| School Attendance During Duty Hours..... | 54 |
| Training..... | 54 |
| CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. | 58 |
| Conclusions..... | 60 |
| Recommendations..... | 63 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 69 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1 Comparison of Percentage Weights for the Written Examination..... | 17 |
| 2 Comparison of Percentage Weights for the Oral Interview..... | 23 |
| 3 Comparison of Percentage Weights for the Performance Evaluation..... | 38 |
| 4 Comparison of Percentage Weights for Seniority... | 45 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Effective Leadership: The Need For

In this fast-changing society, it is becoming more and more apparent that all institutions have to respond if they are to be effective.

Law enforcement is no exception. The role of the police officer must change to meet new needs. He must be trained and educated to deal with our social problems in a professional manner. In a word:

Law enforcement is especially difficult in a society such as ours that has so heterogeneous and mobile a population; that has so prosperous an economy; that has so high a degree of urbanization, with its accompanying congestion and anonymity; and that places so high a value on individual freedom upon equality under the law and upon local control over the police power.¹

Leadership in a police department is of the utmost importance, for it is the responsibility of the supervisor to not only educate and train his men in the area of law enforcement, but also to endeavor to secure high integrity among his subordinates. This should be coupled with an ongoing review of the dynamics taking place between these men and the society they work for and represent. The supervisor is the individual from whom these men will seek guidance in accomplishing their daily tasks. This is especially true of the first-line supervisor who has subordinates fresh out of the police academy. A new recruit just out of the academy is in need of guidance. It is a whole new ballgame

for him; he is taking his first steps into the real world not only as a police officer, but as a representative of a complex society that expects more of him today than ever before.

To secure able supervisors, a police department must have a modern promotion system. If the proper leader is selected, the police department can be assured that his subordinates will be trained and molded into good "cops". The rookie looks at and treats his first sergeant as the man with all the answers. If the sergeant is a professional, then his men will more than likely also act professionally.

However, it appears that many police departments are not selecting qualified leaders, but merely men who have either memorized testing material commonly used for promotion or have had some sort of political influence. In some cases, these men have turned out to be good leaders, but this is a small percentage. Promotional processes, in general, have not been geared toward selecting professional leaders; instead, they have selected only men who scored high on written and oral exams. Many times these men have no real leadership abilities, and this indeed should be a prerequisite. In other cases, the seniority criterion is relied on too heavily, and the only men that get promoted are those who have been in the department for a long period of time. This certainly is not fair and just for the young, qualified enthusiastic policeman who has ability and is seeking opportunities for advancement.

The performance evaluation phase of the promotional process has proved to be a very controversial one because there doesn't seem to be a suitable method of assuring that the evaluator will give a fair and just evaluation of each man. In some departments, performance evaluations have been given enough weight to make or break a potential supervisor. Experience has shown that many good leaders have not made high rank simply because their evaluator has disliked them and has allowed these prejudices to influence his final decision.

Professional Supervisor

The autocratic supervisor still exists in many police departments, but it appears that he is slowly fading out of the picture. This type of person exists merely because he dominates by way of power and rank. Police subordinates today no longer want this type of person; rather, they prefer a man who allows them to become involved in decision making. The autocratic leader finds himself faced with a group of men of low morale, numerous grievances, and a lack of cooperation. "Maintaining his position through his personal ability to represent and voice the wishes of his men, the effective officer seeks so to unify the conflicting interests of the group that there will result a higher goal to be attained."² A good leader must not only be aware of the values and shortcomings of his men, but must also be aware of his own. He must be fair with all of his men and make sure he does not treat them in a biased manner; he must be consistent in his decisions. The effective supervisor

must not only praise his men when praise is due, but reprimand them when such action is necessary. The effective leader must not only be loyal to his department and its policies, but he must also be loyal to his men.

The contemporary policemen want to be recognized as professionals. "They want to be professional, or 'white collar', for this they think is respectable and is synonymous with success."³ There are many standards cited by many experts as to what constitutes a professional. It is generally felt that the police officer of today is moving toward this goal--from the unprofessional to the professional--and he is demanding to be recognized as such. The contemporary police chief is stressing education and encouraging his subordinates to seek higher education. This seems to be a requirement for most professions. In keeping with this, the young policeman of today has a better educational background than his predecessors. Many police departments are requiring their men to acquire a certain amount of college education in order to be eligible for promotion. Some police departments are even requiring higher education for entrance into their department. We can well assume that in the future we will see a college education playing a big role in the law enforcement field. As the recruit becomes more and more educated, it will become incumbent upon his leaders to do the same. Society wants an educated man dealing with its problems, and the policeman must change to meet this demand. The value of education for older "veteran officers", seems to be ques-

tionable. However, most of the criticism of educational requirements comes from the veteran who has never been to college or has not attended college for any length of time.

Being promoted to a higher position is a goal which most policemen wish to attain. However, "only about one out of every six or eight men can expect to rise in the service..."⁴ This figure reveals that the promotion exams are very competitive. Since this is true and only a few do get promoted, the police department must make sure that the few they promote will be highly qualified. Pfiffner and Presthus contend that "promotion by open competitive examination energizes an organization, helping it to combat the inertia and time-serving that too often characterize big institutions."⁵ Most police departments use several comprehensive steps to select their future leaders. "Selection of police supervisors cannot be based on a hit or miss method, nor can it be left to chance."⁶ The police department must develop training programs to assure itself of selecting a qualified person for a position of responsibility. "A strong merit system of promotion utilizing good tests as part of the basis for selection will tend to eliminate 'halo' factors. People who are competent rather than flashy will emerge from the crowd."⁷ Melnicoe and Mennig suggest that "some of the qualities needed to be a good supervisor are (1) the ability to handle men, (2) ability to plan, (3) ability to organize, and (4) technical knowledge."⁸

Another important factor would be that of human rela-

tions. A supervisor should be quite proficient in this area, since it is one factor which is central to police work. The police leader must set the example for his subordinates and see that people are treated as people and that justice is equal for all. His officers must also change their attitudes, especially if they are working in an area where the culture markedly differs from the one to which they have previously been exposed. According to research conducted by Robert L. Derbyshire in Los Angeles and cited by Coffey, Eldefonso, and Hartinger, the "most significant finding for the practicing policeman, however, is that with little effort, attitudes learned from one's culture and/or subculture can be changed."⁹ They go on to say:

Changes in attitudes are brought about in various ways. Some involve the change in an individual situation. An example of this is a young man's having a new attitude toward police upon his being sworn in as a policeman. Change in group membership, too, may cause a shift in attitude. An example of this is a youngster's ceasing to be a gang member and consequently his changing (for the better) his attitude toward police. Other changes in attitude are brought about through the impact of education. Broadly speaking, each policeman can do something about effecting attitude changes through this last means.¹⁰

If the leader is properly trained and educated and is made aware of the differing attitudes held in that community which he serves, then we can hopefully see a change come about not only in himself but also in his men.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to study and evaluate pro-

motion systems throughout the country and to ascertain whether or not promotion processes are similar. This study also attempts to evaluate the results of various promotion systems and to develop a method for a more effective system of promotions.

The emphasis here will be not only to reveal inconsistencies in existing promotional processes, but to acknowledge good aspects as well. By no means is this study trying to prove that there is one ultimate solution to the problem of promotions. Indeed, this study might show that universal guidelines cannot be used or applied in every situation but must be modified accordingly.

It will also be the purpose of this study to make recommendations in an effort to assist police departments in selecting qualified officers for supervisory positions. Hopefully, the study will contribute toward making the promotional process a more equal and just system for all men seeking to advance in the field of law enforcement.

Theoretical Framework

One of the main goals of any police department should be to have a promotional system which will enable it to select professional leaders. Experience has revealed that police departments have supervisors who only wear the symbol of responsibility and leadership but do not actually possess the qualities required as an inherent part of that symbol.

"In the original selection of a patrolman (assuming the

department adheres to the traditional rank structure and promotion pattern), qualities of leaders over and above those needed for the performance of the usual patrol tasks should be sought."¹¹

In their book Police Administration, O. W. Wilson and Ray Clinton McLaren state:

Selection for promotion presents greater difficulties than the selection of recruits. It is also more important. In spite of the firsthand knowledge that supervisors and command officers may have of the characteristics of promotional candidates, the present methods for detecting and accurately measuring the necessary qualities of leadership are seriously inadequate.¹²

"The use of competitive processes offers the most rational method of deciding who should be promoted. Care must be taken, however, to insure that the candidates compete upon relevant grounds."¹³ Promotions are as important as any other function within a police department and should be a goal of major priority in every law enforcement agency. A policeman moving from the rank of patrolman to sergeant should be properly trained and motivated so that he may be able to take on his new responsibility in a more mature and organized manner. This training procedure should in some measure be required of all men, especially those going beyond the rank of sergeant.

Methodology

After embarking on this study, the writer found that there is a paucity of information written on police promotions.

However, information was acquired from fourteen police

departments in an effort to examine the various methods used in selecting their supervisory personnel. The geographical area covered in the study was concentrated in the west and southwest portion of the country. The intent of this study was to assist police agencies in this country in their endeavor to select qualified leaders. Information was also acquired from the International Association of Chiefs of Police and California's Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training.

FOOTNOTES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 13.
2. Arthur R. Pell, Police Leadership, (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1967), p. 36.
3. Raymond E. Clift, A Guide to Modern Police Thinking, (Cincinnati: The W. H. Anderson Co., 1970), p. 352.
4. IBID., p. 50.
5. John M. Pfiffner and Robert Presthus, Public Administration, (5th ed.; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967), p. 294.
6. William B. Melnicoe and Jan Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 23.
7. IBID., p. 25.
8. IBID., p. 24.
9. Alan Coffey, Edward Eldefonso and Walter Hartinger, Human Relations: Law Enforcement in a Changing Community, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC., 1971), p. 166.
10. IBID., p. 167.
11. O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren, Police Administration, (3rd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 276.
12. IBID., p. 277.
13. Larry D. Soderquist, Upgrading the Service, ed. by Thomas F. Adams, Criminal Justice Readings, (Pacific Palisades: Goodyear Publishing Company, INC., 1972), p. 163.

CHAPTER II

THE WRITTEN AND ORAL EXAMINATIONS AS PART OF PROMOTIONS

Written Examination

In most police departments the written examination is usually the first step towards promotion, and it must be passed in order to continue on to the next phase of the promotional process. The written examination has always been given too much emphasis and still is in many police departments. If a policeman scores extremely high on the written exam, he can almost be assured of being promoted. As stated in the police task force report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement:

It is ... inappropriate to rely heavily upon high achievement in written examinations. The commission goes on to quote Bruce Smith, Police Systems in the United States: Written promotional examinations, ..., do not test those qualities of leadership or administrative capacity which are presumably a major consideration in promotion to higher ranks. Such qualities are, therefore, largely ignored before the more familiar techniques of personnel management which do not attempt any such evaluation of human personality.¹

The written exam in large police departments is necessary in order to eliminate some of the many officers going up for promotion. However, precautionary measures must be taken so as not to eliminate the potential leaders. If a man being considered for promotion can pass an examination merely by means of memorization, this in itself is not a valid basis for advancement. "The written examination should be so designed to identify supervisory and leadership

qualities and knowledge about supervision and management concepts."²

In selecting future leaders it must be remembered that written criteria are not to be solely relied on in seeking out the true supervisory qualities of an individual.³ This phase of the promotional process should be only one part of the entire process and not the ultimate selection factor.

Validity and Reliability

Tests should be validated within each department. A test is said to be valid when it actually measures the traits, aptitudes, or skills that it purports to measure. A test is said to be reliable if the same results are obtained in repeated administrations of the test to the same group of testees and if the same thing is measured when the test is given repeatedly to similar groups of testees.⁴

A test can be validated before it actually is used for promotional purposes. This is usually done through the "present employees" method of validation. "While there are other methods for determining the validity of a particular test or group of tests, a commonly used method is to try out the tests on present employees."⁵

These tests can be given with prior notification that its results will have no negative effect on the testee's job. Such a test would only be given to help develop a more valid test for future promotions. By testing existing supervisors, the results of the test should point out the strengths and weaknesses of said test. Once the results of the first test are evaluated, then another test can be drawn up and adminis-

tered so as to omit the existing weak points. Several tests can be given until satisfactory results are achieved for the individual department. This may take several months to complete, but the end result should prove to be of great value in selecting qualified leaders. "Validity is not a characteristic of a test in general but, rather, refers to its value in predicting success of persons in a specific situation."⁶

Once a test has been validated it should be reviewed, evaluated, and adjusted annually so as to make sure that parts of it do not become outdated or obsolete. The test should be examined after each group of promotional testees has been tested so as to check for any weaknesses or inconsistencies found in the test.

Contents

What should the contents of such a written exam be if it is to bring out valid information concerning the leadership qualities of the testee. The answer to this question can surely not be a universal one that fits each and every department. Some of the testing situations may be the same for most departments, but others will surely have to be modified or deleted.

Let us now look at some of those areas which should be considered in any written promotional exam.

Leadership ability would certainly be one of the main areas to be considered in selecting a supervisor, and some

of the questions on such a test should be related to this subject. "In the promotion to sergeant, supervisory content should be stressed in the written examination."⁷ Questions dealing with administrative and supervisory methods are two more areas which should take up a portion of the written examination. A potential supervisor must be familiar with police administration. He will eventually be dealing with higher administrations as he takes one step further up the ladder. When he becomes a leader, he will be asked questions by subordinates pertaining to the functions of the administration.

Another area to be considered would be that of managerial psychology and administrative behavior. A leader will surely become more proficient if he knows something about these areas. Since he will have all sorts of people working for him, he will surely have to use such knowledge in dealing with them. He will have to look at each person as an individual entity and deal with him as he develops problems. With a basic knowledge of managerial psychology and administrative behavior, the new leader should be able to do a good job in treating all his subordinates fairly and justly.

The content of the written test in examination for original appointment generally emphasizes aptitude. At the promotional level however, the examination should generally measure knowledge of work. It should be aimed primarily in the direction of knowledge required in the rank to which promotion is sought, rather than rank already held. When possible, the examination should also include "problem-solving" types of questions. Over-emphasis on short answer types of questions, such as multiple choice, true-false,

and fill-in places a premium on memorizing knowledge and subordinates the ability to apply that knowledge.⁸

Other areas that could be utilized in the contents of the written examination are departmental general orders, rules and regulations and also personnel regulations.⁹

The area of human relations should certainly not be forgotten. It was surprising to this writer to find that very little of the material covered for this paper mentioned anything about human relations. Human relations definitely play a big role in this day and age. An individual who does not have any knowledge of or ability to get along with other people should not be placed in a position of responsibility. If he is, he will only be leading his subordinates into following his old traditional, autocratic ways. The area of human relations is an essential one for the police officer; and if it is used properly, then his job will be made easier. Human relations, this writer feels, should be covered on the test and promotional candidates should be very knowledgeable in this field. A policeman must deal with people and their moods; and the more effective he is in relating to all people, the better off the entire society will be.

The Chief of Police and his staff should make the final decisions as to what will be the contents of the examination. Expert assistance should be sought. This guidance in most cases would come from local universities. "It is incumbent upon the departmental administration to participate with the central personnel agency in ... the make up of written examinations."¹⁰

Weighted Scores

Table 1 will reveal the weight given to a promotional written exam (expressed as a percent). This figure indicates the percentage value of the composite score.

TABLE 1*

| <u>Police Department</u> | <u>Written Test Percentage</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | 70% |
| Arizona-Department of Public Safety | 40% |
| Austin, Texas | 70% |
| Dallas, Texas | 50% |
| Denver, Colorado | 50% |
| Madison, Wisconsin | 30% |
| Phoenix, Arizona | 45% |
| Portland, Oregon | 50% |
| Sacramento, California | 60% |
| San Diego, California | 50% |
| San Jose, California | 60% |
| Seattle, Washington | 50% |
| Tucson, Arizona | 40% |
| Washington, D. C. | 50% |

*These figures were obtained from a study conducted for the Albuquerque Police Officers Association by this writer in 1971.

Although the figures for Table 1 are two years old, they nevertheless still point out the differences in percentage weight given by the above departments to the written exam. The lowest weight given was 30%, and the highest was 70%. The average percent given was approximately 51%

The Chief of Police and his administration should assign the weight to be given to written exams. In most departments surveyed the entire promotional process is set up on a 100%

scale, and each phase of the promotional process takes up a part of that scale. If the written exam is assigned a high percentage score, then the final composite score (i.e., all those scores used in the final percentage score) will of necessity be high. This means that a man who scores a 100% on the written exam is surely going to do quite well in the final outcome even if he only makes a mediocre score on the other phases of the promotional process. A suitable percentage weight for the written exam can only be found after thoroughly examining the entire promotional process and determining what weight should be assigned to each phase. However, the written exam should not be overly emphasized since it in itself does not give a true picture of other qualities being sought. The written exam could instead be used as part of a weeding-out process so as to eliminate candidates who do not possess the elementary skills necessary. If the written test is assigned an excessively high percentage weight, this might very well eliminate candidates who possess leadership abilities not measurable by such an instrument. Therefore, other phases of the process should be examined in an effort to produce a truer picture of a candidate's overall potential.¹¹

Oral Interview

The oral interview is another phase in the promotional process in selecting candidates who aspire to be promoted to a high rank. This study has revealed that most police depart-

ments use some form of an oral interview for selecting supervisory personnel.

The oral interview usually comes after the written examination, and certain qualities are looked for in a candidate. These qualities cannot be fully measured through a written examination. "It is felt that a board that is properly set up can size-up the individual candidate for possible promotion to supervisory positions."¹² Qualities such as appearance, alertness, judgment, conversational ability, are but a few of the many factors that an oral board can look for in a candidate.

This phase, as well as all other phases, of the promotional process must be carefully studied and applied to assure that all candidates will be treated equally and fairly. This phase of the process is very vulnerable to bias and subjectivity on the part of the board; and for this reason, the Chief of Police must select qualified interviewers.

The question as to who should be allowed to participate as an interviewee has always puzzled some departments. However, this study has discovered that only those who successfully pass the written examination will move on to the oral interview. In their book, Police Administration, O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren state that "only those candidates who pass the written examination should be given the oral interview."¹³

"The interview is a special type of face to face communication. It is characterized by a higher degree of per-

sonal interest and in the receiver when compared with other types of communication."¹⁴ Objectivity is always one of the golden rules that the interviewer should follow.

While the percentage weight assigned to the oral interview varies from department to department, it is entirely up to each department to determine what that weight should be. Some of the questions asked by an oral board should have some bearing on the geographic area to be served, specifically keeping in mind cultural differences.

The Interviewers

There appears to be two schools of thought as to who should preside on an oral board:

1. Ranking members from within the department.
2. Ranking members from outside police departments.

Members from both sides seem to have reasonable justification in deciding who shall preside on the oral board.

The departments using personnel from within the department feel that they know what their particular problems are and those facing the community they serve, and feel they are qualified to judge a man and his capabilities. "Police department participation in the interview phase is desirable, but many civil service agencies refuse offers of participation in the interest of greater objectivity."¹⁵

The reasoning behind the second thought is that by using qualified personnel from outside the department, the area of objectivity will be maximized. This will assure against

members of the board grading a candidate in terms of favoritism; instead of this, the interview will be focused on intellectual and personality traits.

While both arguments have merit, it would seem that an ideal oral board could consist of a combination of the two. This area will be discussed more carefully in the concluding chapter of this paper.

The oral interview should be used "to obtain further information concerning the applicants abilities, motivation and attitudes....and to observe the candidate as he answers questions."¹⁶ Whichever group of interviewers are selected, this main theme will surely enable them to select the proper promotion candidate. The members presiding on the oral interview board "should have a good deal of skill in interviewing so as to be able to expose relevant characteristics--good and bad--of each candidate."¹⁷

In their book Personnel Management, Chruden and Sherman cite Milton W. Mandell, The Selection Process as the source of their views on the several qualities that an interviewer should maintain.

The most fundamental quality should be humility because it motivates the interviewer to avoid hasty judgments, to improve his skill, to obtain the evaluations of others and to rely on other selection devices. Other specific qualities that are desirable for interviewers are: ability to think objectively, critically and systematically; experience in associating with people who have a variety of backgrounds; recent extensive experience with people similar in age and occupation to those being interviewed...; freedom from overtalkativeness, extreme opinions, and bias; maturity and poise.¹⁸

Content of the Interview

The question of what should be used as criteria by the board so as to best seek out the true qualities of an individual is something that all modern police departments are faced with. Although there are several different combinations that can be used in establishing an oral board, there is no universal combination that will fit every department because needs will vary. The size and location of a department might require adjustments.

In 1967, Colonel William L. Durrer, Chief of Police Fairfax County Police, Fairfax, Virginia developed a promotion system for his department. Concerning the oral board he states the following:

During the interview, the board asked specific questions designed to elicit each candidate's narrative response concerning his overall job knowledge, his knowledge of local government operations, his knowledge and philosophy relative to basic factors affecting human relations, and his ability to judge and decide any number of actual supervisory or personnel management problems.¹⁹

The content of the interview is what will eventually help select the qualified leader, and this is what every department seeks.²⁰ If the proper questions are asked and the proper answers are given by the candidate, the board will not have much of a problem in judging him and issuing the proper scores.

Weighted Scores

Of the fourteen police departments surveyed for this

study, only twelve of them used an oral interview for their promotional process. Table 2 reveals the percentage weight assigned by each of the fourteen departments to the oral interview.

TABLE 2

| <u>Police Department</u> | <u>Oral Interview Percentage</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | 10% |
| Arizona-Department of Public Safety | 60% |
| Austin, Texas | -- |
| Dallas, Texas | 40% |
| Denver, Colorado | 39% |
| Madison, Wisconsin | 10% |
| Phoenix, Arizona | 40% |
| Portland, Oregon | 30% |
| Sacramento, California | 40% |
| San Diego, California | 20% |
| San Jose, California | 40% |
| Seattle, Washington | 50% |
| Tucson, Arizona | 40% |
| Washington, D. C. | -- |

The table shows that the lowest percentage weight was 10%, and the highest was 60%. The average for the twelve departments was approximately 35%, while the average for the fourteen departments was approximately 30%.

As in the written examination, we can see that the percentage weight varies considerably from department to department. Perhaps a more intense study of each individual department would reveal inconsistencies within their promotional process. Again, it will be in the concluding chapter that this writer will attempt to generate a promotional

process system which will reflect what he feels to be the proper percentage scores for each phase.

FOOTNOTES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 142.
2. John P. Kenney, Police Administration, (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1972), p. 100.
3. Other areas to be covered will be the oral interview, performance evaluation, seniority, education and training.
4. William B. Melnicoe and Jan Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 26.
5. Herbert J. Chruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr., Personnel Management, (3rd ed.; Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1969), p. 185.
6. IBID., p. 185.
7. O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren, Police Administration, (3rd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 277.
8. Municipal Police Administration, ed. by George G. Eastman and Esther M. Eastman, (Washington, D. C., International City Management Association, 1971), pp. 188-189.
9. These would be the regulations from the central personnel agency whether it be city, county or state. Rules that would govern all employees including police personnel.
10. Kenney, Police Administration, p. 100.
11. For example, the oral interview, which will be discussed next, can bring out qualities such as attitudes that the written exam cannot reveal.
12. William B. Melnicoe and Jan Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 27.
13. O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren, Police Administration, (3rd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 278.

14. Herbert J. Chruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr., Personnel Management, (3rd ed.; Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1968), p. 338.
15. Municipal Police Administration, ed. by George G. Eastman and Esther M. Eastman, (Washington, D. C., International City Management Association, 1971), pp. 188-189.
16. Chruden and Sherman, Personnel Management, p. 143.
17. Melnicoe and Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, p. 27.
18. Chruden and Sherman, Personnel Management, p. 150.
19. William L. Durrer, "Who is Promotable?" Police Chief, (June 1970), pp. 30-36.
20. This is not to say that this is the only criteria that will help to select the qualified leader. This along with every other phase of the promotion process will enable a department to select the proper personnel.

CHAPTER III

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SENIORITY

Performance Evaluation

The police supervisor, . . . , would have to judge his patrolmen on the basis of their ability to keep the peace on their beat; and this, like the judgment the patrolman must make about the citizen, is necessarily subjective and dependent on close observation and personal familiarity. Those departments that evaluate officers by "objective" measures (arrests and traffic tickets) work against this ideal; so also do promotional requirements and civil service examinations that reward the officer best able to memorize the penal code or the departmental rule book.¹

The area of performance evaluation seems to be an area of much controversy and confusion at the present time in personnel management. Many experts in the field have tried for many years to come up with an adequate system for evaluating the work performance of an individual. It is generally felt that an ideal evaluation system could help improve areas that deal with promotions, salary increases, disciplinary action, etc. However, such a system can only be attained through objectivity on the part of the evaluator and his thorough knowledge of the evaluation technique being used.

What is a performance evaluation? The simplest and most exact definition seems to be that a performance evaluation is "a judgment about another person."² Although there are many definitions, it was felt that in essence the above definition fits them all.

"The efficiency report of an officer is part of his personnel file. Thus, ready reference to individual progress

can be made. Training should be made available to correct any failings revealed by the report."³ The task of evaluating subordinates is certainly one of the most difficult jobs any supervisor must deal with. "Although the evaluation process is difficult, a department should endeavor to develop a comprehensive, just and fair system."⁴ In rating his subordinates, the supervisor must make not only quality decisions but decisions that take into consideration values and morals. If he is going to evaluate an individual for the purposes of a pay increase, the rater will always think about the subordinate's family and how his decision will affect them. If he declines or deprives the subordinate of the raise, then surely this affects the subordinate's family life. Although it should be the responsibility of the subordinate to make sure he does what is expected of him on the job (so he may be assured of a salary increase), the supervisor has a tendency to think about it as depriving a man of a higher salary. This is also true of evaluations dealing with promotions. "Evaluation," Preiss and Ehrlich seem to feel, is largely a product of agreement among raters by impressionistic methods rather than any measurement of performance by established standards."⁵

Quite frequently, in promotion evaluations, a supervisor will tend to rate his men higher because he feels it makes him look good in the eyes of his superiors.⁶ Some supervisors will rate high in an effort to keep subordinates at a level with the subordinates of a supervisor in another

unit or shift. "Such ratings,..., have proved to be universally unsatisfactory, and their results have been a flat rating everyone as superior."⁷ Now, we look at one of the few supervisors who tries to do an honest and fair evaluation of his men. He soon will find out that he is not really helping his men but hurting them because they will be evaluated much lower than their peers even though their evaluations were true and just. It will not take long for this supervisor to see his mistake and as a result turn to those methods of evaluating used by his counterparts.

The Rater

Experience has proved that a subordinate will also get hurt when he transfers under a different supervisor or when a new supervisor is assigned to him. An individual gets to know a supervisor's likes and dislikes, and as a rule does his job not necessarily by the rules of the department, but by the rules of his immediate supervisor in an effort to please him. Suddenly the individual changes supervisors and finds out that the rules he has been following are violations according to his new supervisor and finds himself in a predicament. So in order for him to receive a good evaluation, he must change to meet the needs of his new supervisor or find himself falling behind if he doesn't. As a result, we have a confused subordinate who has learned that to be a first-line supervisor you must run things the way you see fit and not necessarily in conformity with what is written out

for him by the department. This is not to say that in order to be a "top notch" supervisor you must follow rules to the letter, because experience has revealed that rules must be bent and should be flexible, especially in the field of law enforcement. However, at the same time, especially in law enforcement, you must not have too many nonconforming units working in the field but rather units which mesh and function in a coordinated way.

Supervisors evaluating subordinates must take into account the type of person he has just relieved. He must also confer with ex-supervisors of the unit when evaluating his new subordinates especially if he has not been with them for any great length of time. This will allow him to evaluate them more accurately. "The accuracy of any given rating depends upon many things including the skills, character, and immediate disposition of the rater, his range of contact with the individual rated, and the tangibility of the traits under consideration."⁸

The new supervisor must advise his subordinates exactly as to what he expects of them before he can evaluate them. If a subordinate is in a state of "limbo" because he doesn't know how to react to his new supervisor's form of supervision, he surely cannot be held accountable for violations that have never been explained to him. One case in point was when a beat officer was eating breakfast regularly at a coffee shop two blocks outside of his district. Supervisor A (his previous supervisor) never mentioned to him that it was against

the shift commander's orders to eat outside the district he was patrolling. Supervisor A was extremely pleased with this officer's work, so he felt he would allow him to go two blocks outside of his district in appreciation for his caliber of work. Supervisor B takes over as the supervisor for this individual and almost immediately advises the officer that he is in direct violation of the station commander's orders by eating outside of his district. The police officer advised Supervisor B that he was never informed of the order, and that he was allowed to eat outside of his district by Supervisor A. When performance evaluation time came around, Supervisor B advised the officer he rated him low in one area of the evaluation because he was caught disobeying a direct order of the station commander and cited the incident of leaving his district to have breakfast. The officer filed a grievance with the station commander, and as a result was given a higher grade on his evaluation. The officer proved that the order was never given to him, and he was never advised of it by Supervisor A. If Supervisor B would have investigated the incident thoroughly, his preliminary action could have been eliminated. However, this writer has witnessed many similar incidents and has seen where it has actually kept an individual from being promoted. "No individual deserves special favor any more than he deserves unfair condemnation."⁹ Many officers have refused to file grievances because of the simple fact that they have to work close with their new supervisor or this supervisor's peers and do not

wish to get on the wrong side of him for fear of being downgraded on future evaluations.¹⁰ "Only those with adequate knowledge of the employee's performance should be expected to rate. This is a problem if supervision changes, or if men are reassigned. Review of ratings by the command staff is desirable to control differences in standards among raters."¹¹

Another point that deserves mentioning is stated by Costello and Zalkind in their book Psychology in Administration: "In the rating situation, a supervisor may single out one trait--either good or bad--and use this as the basis for his judgment of all other traits, for example, an excellent attendance record causes judgments of highest productivity, quality of work and so on."¹²

When Should an Evaluation be Given

Although the time period varies from department to department, it appears that the most evaluations take place twice a year. This study has also revealed that the prior two performance evaluations be combined and averaged so as to obtain a more reliable score.¹³

The evaluations should be held at least every six months; or whenever feasible should be used on a more frequent basis so as to assure a fair and equal evaluation for all subordinates. It should also be mandatory for each supervisor to keep a personnel notebook and record all violations or outstanding performances of the men working under him. Documenting workers performances will surely enable a

supervisor to justify the decisions he makes in evaluating each and every man working under him. There have been cases where a supervisor has rated a man low, and had just cause for it, but for lack of documentation was unable to prove it at a later date. The supervisor should be required to keep the day, time and place of the infraction or commendation and a summary of the incident. This should only be done so as to rate a man for the previous six months rating period and not for time previous to this. Many supervisors will tend to remember infractions that occurred just prior to the previous rating and hold that incident against an officer in the current evaluation period.

Note taking will also assist mid-management and upper management personnel in making their final decisions on a grievance hearing. Many times a rater tends to remember the most recent infractions of the man he is rating and has a tendency to forget the good traits he has exhibited in the first three or four months of the evaluation period especially if the infraction is of a serious nature. A grievance committee can usually recognize this error by examining the supervisor's notebook for the current evaluation period and can thusly assist the committee in making its final decision.

Since objectivity appears to be the most important aspect in a performance evaluation, the use of a personnel notebook would surely assist a supervisor in his task of evaluating his men equally and fair. If the personnel notebook is properly kept and is current, the supervisor will be

able to explain to his subordinates the exact reason for his final evaluation when they meet to confer on the results.

Training of Supervisors in the Evaluation of Personnel

"Although the ideal rating system has not yet been devised, the rating system in use can be made more effective by training the officers in their use, and most important, by reducing the human error."¹⁴ There are several forms being used for evaluating subordinates; most of them are adequate to serve the purpose. It is felt by this writer that it is not the form which is unjust but the person filling out the form. The form is merely a piece of paper with words written on it; it is the man that interprets these words who must be held responsible for its interpretation. This is not to say that the performance evaluation forms are perfect, but if the rater is properly trained in the method of translating the form his result will be more meaningful. "A competent rater is one who has had a thorough training in the use of the rating device, and who has a conscientious attitude."¹⁵

This study has not found that any training programs for the proper use of an evaluation form are presently being offered by police departments. Training of how to evaluate personnel should be mandatory for all new supervisory personnel and of all supervisors being promoted to a higher rank. This training should also be used for a supervisor who seems to have forgotten the proper methods used for evaluation and

could be recommended by a supervisor's superior. The training along with a personnel notebook would undoubtedly increase the quality of an evaluation. It should also be incumbent upon the Chief of Police to take the proper action when a supervisor is consistently misusing the evaluation form for purposes of revenge or for assuring that his favorites are receiving the higher scores.

It doesn't make any difference what type of form is to be used (or is being used), for as long as a human being is making the judgment there is always room for biases to enter. It is the human being that must be policed more so than the form being used. Making sure that the supervisor does his job as an evaluator, will help select better supervisors when promotion time rolls along. Although there are evaluation forms which have proved to be better than others, it should be up to each department to select the form which it feels will serve the purpose. However, a department should solicit experts in the field of personnel management to make the final form selection. "A well-designed service-rating system forces the supervisor to consider just why he believes a particular employee to be particularly good or bad."¹⁶

Employee Participation

The idea of an employee participating in his evaluation seems to be what progressive thinking is encouraging. The employee should participate in his evaluation from start to finish being advised immediately of the supervisor's action

on any phase of the evaluation. The employee should be allowed input into the evaluation and also be allowed to openly discuss any part of the evaluation. By keeping a proper personnel notebook, the supervisor will immediately be able to justify his evaluation results to the employee.

The wise supervisor begins his appraisal, not merely ends it, by consultation with the person being evaluated. It should be understood, of course, that the participative process is most successful when it is used at a point of need that is obvious to both supervisor and employee alike, not merely to meet some thoughtless requirement for annual review that, in some cases at least, may mean plowing old ground over and over again.¹⁷

The purpose of the interview should be to encourage improvement on the part of the employee. The supervisor should not hesitate to point out the bad as well as the good characteristics of the subordinate being interviewed. The interview, if applied properly, could also serve as a learning situation for the supervisor in that he can improve his technique by soliciting input from his subordinates regarding his supervision. He may learn that he has been practicing bad supervisory techniques and correct them before they become a hazard in his future tasks as a supervisor. By soliciting comments from his men, the supervisor will also gain the confidence and respect of his men as far as his decisions are concerned. His subordinates will understand that not only is he trying to improve them but also trying to improve himself at the same time.

It does not take much of a supervisor to tell all of his men they are doing a good or excellent job. A true supervisor

will not only commend his men but also reprimand them if necessary. Disciplinary action is helpful in stimulating a man to improve himself. It also serves to show that such a recourse, if necessary, can be taken. Employees will observe that Joe Blow is not getting away with serious infractions, and that they can expect similar actions when they violate the rules of the game.

Percentage Weight Towards Promotion

Of the fourteen police departments surveyed, only six of them used some form of performance evaluation for promotional advancements. While others used different types of ratings towards promotions, it was only these six that actually used a performance evaluation for the purpose of promotions.

Table 3 reveals the percentage score used by the six departments mentioned above along with the other eight departments contacted.

TABLE 3

| Police Department | Performance Evaluation Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | 10% |
| Arizona-Department of Public Safety | 0 |
| Austin, Texas | 30% |
| Dallas, Texas | 0 |
| Denver, Colorado | 1% |
| Madison, Wisconsin | 30% |
| Phoenix, Arizona | 5% |
| Portland, Oregon | -- |
| Sacramento, California | -- |
| San Diego, California | 0 |
| San Jose, California | 0 |
| Seattle, Washington | 0 |
| Tucson, Arizona | 10% |
| Washington, D. C. | 0 |

The average weight of the six departments using the performance evaluation was approximately 14% with the lowest being 1% and the highest 30%. The average weight, using all 14 departments surveyed, had an approximate average of 6%.

With eight departments not using a performance evaluation for promotional purposes, and with six averaging about 14%, one can only draw the conclusion that not much emphasis is being placed on the performance evaluation for promotional purposes. Although there are arguments for and against using a performance evaluation for promotion purposes, every department should attempt to use such a method if at all possible. Melnicoe and Mennig state: "If supervisors approach the rating program objectively, using a painstaking, clinical approach, allowing adequate time for it, and incorporating it into their training programs, then it should be a part of the promotional process."¹⁸ If police agencies would take

heed to these guidelines and see that they are followed, the performance evaluation could be an essential tool in selecting their future leaders.

This conclusion could have both good and bad views. First of all, it is not fair for all subordinates not to have their performance evaluated for promotional purposes. The writer states this because he feels that men who have worked hard to become good, dedicated professional officers are not, in such cases, being rewarded for their efforts. Instead, they are being robbed of the opportunities for advancement. This would have an adverse effect on such officers, since they would feel it was not doing them any good to show a greater amount of initiative on the job. This is especially true if the man that is getting promoted is an individual who has performed below average in his work, but yet, still gets promoted. The professional officer may then revert to his counterparts' tactics because he feels it is not worthwhile to do his job in a professional way.

One good reason for not having a performance evaluation as part of the promotional process is that it is very difficult to eliminate prejudices, biases and other negative effects which lead to a bad evaluation. Here again a good man can get hurt, and at the same time an unqualified officer can be promoted. If a supervisor, for example, dislikes officer A for personal reasons and officer A is a highly qualified policeman, his evaluation would more than likely reveal the hidden dislikes. This could very seriously

hamper the said officer's career, especially if a department relies quite heavily on the performance evaluation phase. On the other hand, officer B, a poorly qualified officer without any leadership abilities, may be a "beer drinking buddy" of his immediate supervisor and as a result gets promoted because he scores high on his performance evaluation. "If the rating system is one that is a popularity contest, the ratings should not be used for selecting supervisors."¹⁹

Although there are good and bad reasons for using or not using the performance evaluation for promotional purposes, each department should strive to establish a system that is adequate and fair for all men.

This writer feels that an adequate training program for all supervisors dealing with performance evaluations is a worthwhile one. However, the training program must be carefully monitored by experts in the area of personnel matters so as to assure that the goals of the program are carried out.

Other Usable Rating Forms

A police department could consider the possibility of initiating other types of rating procedures to support the performance evaluation. One type would be the "peer rating". This would be a rating in which the gradees own peers would evaluate his work performance. A comparison of the results of the peer rating and the supervisor's rating could be made to check for consistency or inconsistencies.

Another form being used by some departments is the "promotional potential rating. This procedure rates a man according to what his supervisor feels his promotion potential is. Some departments use this rating as part of the promotional process, assigning a percentage weight towards the composite score for promotion".²⁰ Again, as in the performance evaluation, caution must be taken to eliminate biases and measures must be taken to create objectivity on the part of the grader.

Seniority

According to Webster, "seniority" is a privileged status attained by length of continuous service.

In past years, seniority has played a big role in the promotion of policemen to supervisory ranks. Police officers have been promoted on the basis of seniority and by how well they have gotten along with their superiors. A man could be assured of a promotion if he had some seniority and was a favorite of the superiors doing the promoting. As a result, the men being selected were not qualified supervisors and were never trained in supervisory techniques needed by supervisors. This is not to say that every single one of them was a poor supervisor, but the chances of selecting a qualified man by this method were very slim. As a result of this, many of these men went on to become higher ranking personnel involved in decision and policy making functions of their respective police agencies. Some of them went as far as

becoming Chiefs of Police. It is not the intention of this writer to condemn all these men because some of them have gone on to become very proficient. However, we should not overlook the "bad apples" that were created by the system of our predecessors. Many of these men are still around and some of them will be around for a few more years. Yet it is disheartening to see these types of men in higher positions, especially since many of them are the old traditional type who are against contemporary methods of administration. One usually finds these men unwilling to change. These types of men are holding back progress and in some cases progress will be delayed until this type of person leaves his position and makes room for a professional leader.

When Should Seniority be Considered in Promotions?

The mere factor of seniority should not be used for promotions. A man can be a policeman for twenty years, but this does not mean he has twenty years of experience. He could very well have obtained his experience in the first few years on the force and thereafter coasted along doing only enough to get by.

There are men who definitely have improved themselves from year to year and have, during that same time, actually gained knowledge that is not only valuable to themselves but valuable to the department. The question then arises: who, and by what method, will decide what a man has achieved from year to year. We spoke previously of performance evaluations

and the problems facing that phase of promotions. An ideal performance evaluation should give one a good indication of the quality of an individual and how he has improved himself. This type of performance evaluation could then give some credit or discredit to seniority. As will be seen later, some departments allow a certain number or percentage points to be accumulated until the maximum is reached. However, this method still tends to discriminate against the men with fewer years on the force. A younger, more qualified officer could be eliminated by this method, and an older, unqualified person promoted. This should not be taken to mean that only the younger officers are qualified leaders, but merely point out that the seniority method can hamper the younger officer.

In their book, Elements of Police Supervision, Melnicoe and Mennig state:

Seniority is utilized by some agencies as one of the criteria for promotion. The main argument in favor of this practice is that the older men are entitled to some consideration because of their years of service to the department. This argument becomes invalid when one accepts the premise that the best available man should be selected to fill any given position. Length of service beyond the minimum necessary to learn the appropriate job skills has never been shown to be a valid criterion of supervisory ability. The seniority system has the further disadvantage of destroying the incentive of the younger personnel in the department. No matter how competent the man might be, he must wait for promotion until all of the department's "graybeards" have been promoted. This system usually results in unrest, low morale, and high turnover rates among the younger men in the agency. Seniority, therefore, should not be considered in the selection process.²¹

Seniority "is sound if the credit is sufficiently small that it merely breaks ties in favor of the senior employee.

Extensive credit, however, is to be avoided if possible; long service as a patrolman is no indicator of supervisory potential."²²

Other sources have also stated that too much emphasis on seniority will not produce qualified leaders but rather eliminate qualified individuals.

Since seniority is no sign of supervisory ability, the seniority factor should only be used to break a tie of two promotional candidates who have identical scores at the end of the promotion process.

Weighted Percentage Scores

Although the opinion of this writer is not to involve seniority in the promotion process, Table 4 illustrates the departments that were surveyed that do use seniority. The table indicates the percentage scores used for promotion by these departments.

With the exception of San Jose, California, the other departments averaged a weighted score of approximately 5½%. Of the departments using seniority in the promotional process, the average was approximately 10½%.

TABLE 4

| <u>Police Department</u> | <u>Seniority Percentage</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | 0 |
| Arizona-Department of Public Safety | 0 |
| Austin, Texas | 10% |
| Dallas, Texas | 0 |
| Denver, Colorado | 10% |
| Madison, Wisconsin | 10% |
| Phoenix, Arizona | 10% |
| Portland, Oregon | 20% |
| Sacramento, California | 5% |
| San Diego, California | 0 |
| *San Jose, California | $\frac{1}{2}$ point per year |
| Seattle, Washington | 0 |
| Tucson, Arizona | 10% |
| Washington, D. C. | 0 |

*San Jose adds $\frac{1}{2}$ point per year of service after the written and oral exams have been past successfully.

Six of the departments did not use seniority as a basic process in their promotional process. This may indicate that the trend could possibly be changing toward the non-use of seniority as part of the process. The Albuquerque Police Department was using seniority up until a few years ago and has since been eliminated.²³

If seniority is going to be used, it should be based on the man's actual experience, improvements and so on. It should not be based primarily on the length of service he has in the department.

FOOTNOTES

1. James Q. Wilson, Varieties of Police Behavior, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 291.
2. Sherwood, Frank P. and Best, Wallace H., Supervisory Methods in Municipal Administration, (Chicago: The International City Managers' Association, 1958), p. 199.
3. John L. Sullivan, Introduction to Police Science, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 190-91.
4. John P. Kenney, Police Administration, (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1972), p. 100.
5. Jack Preiss and Howard J. Ehrlich, An Examination of Role Theory, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), p. 30.
6. Some supervisors feel that they will get praise from their superiors if all of their men are excellent performers. As a result, they rate their men higher than what they should.
7. John M. Pfiffner and Robert Presthus, Public Administration, (5th ed.; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967), p. 207.
8. Sherwood, Frank P. and Best, Wallace H., Supervisory Methods in Municipal Administration, p. 199.
9. IBID., p. 201.
10. This is especially true in departments that rely heavily on performance evaluations for consideration of promotion. When relied on heavily, the evaluation can make or break a candidate going up for promotion.
11. Municipal Police Administration, ed. by George G. Eastman and Esther M. Eastman, (Washington, D. C., International City Managers' Association, 1971), p. 187.
12. Timothy W. Costello and Sheldon S. Zalkind, Psychology in Administration, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, INC., 1963), p. 35.
13. At promotion time the two scores should be combined and averaged to determine a suitable grade for the past twelve months. This would also help, if a man has had two different supervisors in the past twelve months, to check if his performance is consistent with each supervisor.

14. Arthur R. Pell, Police Leadership, (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1967), p. 62.
15. IBID., p. 28.
16. Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson, Public Administration, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), p. 365.
17. O. Glenn Stahl, Public Personnel Administration, (6th ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1971), pp. 192-93.
18. William B. Melnicoe and Jan Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 28.
19. IBID., p. 28.
20. The survey revealed that the following police departments use some type of promotional potential rating. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Madison, Wisconsin, Dallas, Texas, San Diego, California and Washington, D. C.
21. William B. Melnicoe and Jan Mennig, Elements of Police Supervision, (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 28-29.
22. Municipal Police Administration, ed. by George G. Eastman and Esther M. Eastman, (Washington, D. C., International City Management Association, 1971), p. 188.
23. The seniority factor was eliminated in 1971 by Chief Donald A. Byrd. After being appointed Chief in 1971, this was one of his actions as a progressive move toward professionalizing the Albuquerque Police Department.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Emphasis of Education on Promotions

The trend in contemporary, professional police departments seems to be that of moving in the direction of higher education not only for management personnel but for all men entering the law enforcement field. Practically all material studied for this paper emphasized the importance of higher education for the modern police officer for one reason or another. "The most compelling arguments for higher educational standards for police is the steadily rising educational level of the general population."¹ In their book, Human Relations, Coffey, Eldefonso, and Hartinger state:

There are many sources of community tension, but none are so great as the social changes that increase the disparity of opportunity to control one's destiny. Education is increasingly the prime ingredient in the potential of ultimate control.²

Increased education will enable a police department to progress at a much faster pace, but today's leaders must not waste time in implementing educational requirements. "The quality of police service will not significantly improve until higher educational requirements are established for its personnel."³

The police administrators must take the initiative to lead the way for higher educational standards. The Chief of Police and his staff must attain a higher level of education in order for their subordinates to follow in the same manner.

Newly assigned police chiefs should not have anything less than a Bachelor's Degree, and they should see to it that their immediate staff accomplishes the same within a given time. Sullivan, in his Introduction to Police Science, states:

More and more departments require 30 units of college work. Others request two years of college leading to an associate in arts degree. Still others have already stipulated that all applicants must have a four-year college degree. The trend is toward requiring an increase in college education as an entrance qualification.⁴

It should be pointed out that the departments requiring a college education as a prerequisite are in a minority today. However, these departments will progress at a much faster pace when those departments not requiring a college education finally make their move.

One may quickly observe that the general public has a higher degree of education than it ever has had in the past. With the situation being as it is, law enforcement agencies must follow the same trend. George E. Berkley, in The Democratic Policeman, brings out the fact that:

We should center our efforts in the field of education. This should be done with urgency since it has been estimated that in a few years the American job market will require seven out of ten workers to have at least two years of college. A. F. Brandstatter, who heads Michigan State's School of Police Administration, points out that, if such an estimate is accurate, "it means that all police departments still recruiting from high school graduates will be obtaining the most marginal people coming out of high school, the lower 30 percent...."⁵

Law enforcement agencies must not settle for marginal people but must make every effort to recruit a better caliber of individual.

Educational Requirements

A police department should begin to establish some definite policy which would increase the educational requirements for promotions. A minimal number of college credits should be initially required before a man can apply for a promotion examination. Police Chief Donald A. Byrd of the Albuquerque Police Department issued General Order 71-23 on December 17, 1971. This order deals with police promotional examinations. Section VII paragraph A states:

...all officers to be promoted to sergeant, lieutenant, or captain after January 1, 1973, must have successfully completed six semester hours of college-accredited study in police-related courses or degree programs, and must have successfully completed at least six semester hours of such study during each succeeding calendar year, until the attainment of a Bachelor's Degree.⁶

This general order allows those officers who haven't been to school in many years to keep up with the younger ones. However, although the order is an excellent one, it makes for a process which is much too slow. Following this course it can take a man as much as twenty years to receive his Bachelor's Degree. Guidelines should be established so as to aid the veteran officer and at the same time require more of the younger officer who will become a future leader. By establishing these guidelines, an officer with fewer years experience would be expected to acquire more college work

than one who has been in the department for a greater length of time. An example of this would be the following: An officer beginning his career in January of 1973 would be required to have a Bachelor's Degree in seven years.⁷ If at the end of seven years he has not received his degree, he would not be eligible for promotions. An officer who has been on the department ten years as of January 1973 would have seven years to complete eighty-four college credits towards his Bachelor's Degree, and an additional three years to receive his degree. An officer who has been with the department fifteen years or longer as of January 1973 would have seven years to receive an associate degree or sixty-three college credits. This man could then be given five additional years to complete his course work for his Bachelor's Degree.

During the seven years an officer falling in one of the brackets would have to acquire a given number of credits - each year - to be eligible for the next higher rank. This would assure the administration that the men eligible for promotion are indeed attending college. The example cited above should be used for a man being promoted to sergeant. The educational requirement for ranks above sergeant should be adjusted to increase the educational requirements at a much faster pace. An example of this would be that any man who wishes to be promoted to the rank of captain must have a Bachelor's Degree to be eligible. This requirement should be put into effect immediately. As stated earlier, it should

be mandatory for the Chief of Police and each member of his immediate staff to hold a Bachelor's Degree, and this should also be put into effect immediately. An example of what has been discussed can be charted as follows:

SERGEANT

Date Initiated:
January, 1973

Date of Accomplishment:
January, 1980

| <u>Seniority</u> | <u>Hours Required to Complete Annually</u> | <u>Seven Year End Result</u> |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 - 5 years | 18 | 126 (Bachelor's Degree) |
| 5 - 10 " | 15 | 105 Credits |
| 10 - 15 " | 12 | 84 Credits |
| 15 - over | 9 | 63 Credits (Associate Degree) |

Adjustments must be made at the end of seven years to assure that all personnel will have a Bachelor's Degree at the earliest possible date. This pertains to all personnel seeking advancement.

LIEUTENANT

All candidates for the rank lieutenant should be required to pursue the work for a Bachelor's Degree at a much quicker pace than those being promoted to sergeant. Three to four years should be a sufficient amount of time to acquire the degree. At the end of this time, all sergeants wishing to be promoted to lieutenant would have to hold a Bachelor's

Degree. This writer realizes that this will be an inconvenience for a sergeant who has no college credits whatsoever. However, the line must be drawn somewhere; and the sooner we establish a higher caliber of personnel, the better off the police agency as a whole will be.

CAPTAIN AND ABOVE

Any rank of captain and above should require a Bachelor's Degree immediately. These individuals are considered to be mid-management and upper-management personnel and should have the educational background to go along with their experience.

O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren, in Police Administration, point out that:

,.....a minimum educational requirement of two years of college is now feasible - or soon will be - in many areas in the United States. A four-year degree in police administration or law enforcement should be listed or desirable in any promotional examination, and within a few years the baccalaureate degree should be required for promotion.⁸

Education, one readily sees, should be stressed in all law enforcement agencies. They should immediately establish policy to bring this about.

Incentives

Each and every agency should begin offering incentives to policemen for attending colleges or universities to improve themselves.

There is not any better incentive than that of higher pay. Some police departments are using this type of incentive, and it appears to be working quite well. An example is the Albuquerque Police Department, Albuquerque, New Mexico. They received a federal grant in 1971 to assist the city of Albuquerque in establishing an educational incentive pay plan. Prior to the incentive plan there was less than 10% of the sworn personnel attending institutions of higher education. They have realized an increase of enrollment and attendance of about 45% to 50% in the past two years. They now have approximately 55% to 60% of their personnel attending local universities.

The educational incentive pay plan works in the following manner. After receiving 15 credit hours, a man is eligible to receive \$1.00 for every college hour per month or \$15 extra a month. An individual can accumulate 80 hours and receive \$80 over and above his basic pay per month. After the 80 credit hours, the individual will not receive an increase until he receives a Bachelor's Degree. Upon receiving his Bachelor's Degree, his pay will then be increased by \$100. An individual receiving a Master's Degree will receive an additional \$25 per month or a total of \$125 over and above his base pay.

An educational incentive pay plan should certainly encourage men to attend college. Each and every law enforcement agency should attempt to persuade their local governments to endorse such a plan.

With policemen educating themselves, they can look forward to receiving better pay. Since most policemen are underpaid, this would be one way of overcoming the dilemma.⁹ By professionalizing himself through higher education, a policeman will have more than a just argument when negotiating for a higher salary.

School Attendance During Duty Hours

Although in the majority of the cases attending school during duty hours may not be feasible, every effort should be made to assist an officer who encounters class scheduling problems. When an officer is nearing the completion of his Bachelor's Degree program, he should be allowed to attend classes during his duty hours especially if they are required courses and are not offered at any other time. This could be a privilege for a man who has performed well and is striving to improve himself.

Studies should be conducted by agencies to attempt to work out a plan to allow their men to take some courses during duty hours. Perhaps by cooperating with local colleges or universities, some feasible plan can be initiated.

Training

Training of promotional candidates and of newly appointed supervisors should be required in every department.

Formal promotional training is less generally available. Only 21 percent of 276 agencies surveyed in 1968 conducted mandatory training

for all officers being promoted to higher responsibilities, as recommended by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement.¹⁰

Candidates for promotion should be required to attend an in-service training program to familiarize them with the knowledge and skills expected of them as supervisors. Training men after promotion will certainly aid them in keeping with new supervisory techniques. This training should continually be carried on so as to expose these men to any changes in administrative policy, supervisory techniques, etc. It should be mandatory for "...all present supervisors, middle managers and administrators... be exposed to advance training in supervisory and management principles."¹¹

As mentioned in a previous chapter, the newly appointed supervisors can be trained and educated in their responsibilities as evaluators of employee performance. A continuous in-service training program for all levels of supervisors is essential and should be implemented as soon as possible.

In his book Police Administration, John P. Kenney stresses the training of middle management and executive leadership. He says:

Middle management and executive leadership training for the police has only recently become a reality. It has long been evident, however, that one of the weakest links in the operation of a police department is its management and leadership capabilities. If police departments are going to effectively cope with the rapidly changing problems and issues with which they are confronted, a greater emphasis on middle management and leadership training is necessary.

In the final analysis training is an effort to induce change, and those involved in the process may be described as change agents.¹²

As police officers, we must progress and keep ourselves informed of the problems we face. We must be aware of changes and assure that our subordinates are also aware of them. By keeping our leaders well trained and educated, we can expect to see their subordinates follow in a similar manner.

FOOTNOTES (Education and Training)

1. Charles B. Saunders, Jr., Upgrading the American Police, (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970), p. 88.
2. Alan Coffey, Edward Eldefonso, and Walter Hartinger, Human Relations, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 149.
3. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and The Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 3.
4. John L. Sullivan, Introduction to Police Science (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 38.
5. George E. Berkley, The Democratic Policeman, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 199.
6. Albuquerque Police Department General Order 71-23.
7. Although this is an arbitrary figure, seven years should be a sufficient amount of time to complete the requirements for a Bachelor's Degree.
8. O. W. Wilson and Roy Clinton McLaren, Police Administration, (3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 310.
9. This is not only incentive pay, but a much better over-all salary.
10. Alan Coffey, Edward Eldefonso, and Walter Hartinger, Human Relations, p. 137.
11. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement, The Police, p. 27.
12. John P. Kenney, Police Administration, (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1972), p. 102.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident that the promotion of policemen is a problem faced by each and every police agency. The intricacies and ramifications involved are not easy to cope with. Selecting the proper man for advancement when only limited resources exist is not a simple task. However, it is a task that we must deal with in attempting to advance an individual who is capable of assuming the role of supervisor.

The upgrading of police supervisors and administrators is recognized as a necessity by all of the literature covered in this study. Some agencies rely too heavily on a written examination while others do not. Passing a written exam does not produce a quality leader. It was also found that the oral interview board was made up of either outside police officials or superiors from within the agency. While neither may be the best, it should be incumbent upon the Chief of Police or his designated representative to select professional personnel to conduct the interviews. This would surely help to create a fair and unbiased board.

The performance evaluation is one of the most criticized phases of the promotional process. The questionable items in this phase are that of fairness and objectivity by the grader. While there will always be complaints about the results of an evaluation, the complaints can be greatly reduced through proper training. Evaluating subordinates is

one of the most difficult responsibilities of a supervisor. However, a supervisor must keep in mind the fact that he will only be hurting all of his subordinates by over grading the few favorites. Immediate steps must be taken to assure fairness in evaluations because personal observation is the primary method that can be used to recognize the abilities of any subordinate.

Seniority has been proven to be of no significant value for promoting an individual. This study has revealed that the use of seniority is declining more and more as a criterion for promotions. If an officer has shown signs of marked improvement in his every day performance throughout his years of service, then this should be indicated on his evaluation form or by some other means. Although there may be a few individuals who have gained valuable leadership abilities through their many years of service, the chances of selecting them are slim without a good evaluation method to rely on. To give all men credit or percentage points simply because of seniority towards their promotional composite scores could be a hindrance to other officers who otherwise are qualified.

More and more education is entering the picture, not only in the area of promotions, but also in recruitment. There are but a few police agencies using college education as a requirement to be eligible for promotions. However, it appears that it is being valued more and it will only be a short time before it begins playing a vital role in all

contemporary law enforcement agencies. Every law enforcement agency in the country must face up to the fact that higher education is indeed an essential requirement for combating not only crime but all social problems. The sooner this is realized the sooner every department is going to progress. The review of the literature indicated that any department that has not taken measures to implement college educational requirements should do so immediately. The study also brought out the fact that time is of the essence and college education requirements should be instituted as soon as possible.

Supervisory training is not being conducted regularly by most departments. A supervisor must be aided in his responsibilities by all available information and knowledge. This can only be gotten through a sound training program administered on a regular basis. Any changes of supervisory techniques should be supplied to supervisors by means of an in-service training program. If a supervisor is constantly being trained, then there can be no excuse for consistent violations of his responsibilities. By not having any or very little training there will always be a legitimized excuse for not knowing. It was brought out by the literature covered that there was a general need for the training of supervisors from the lowest rank to the highest.

Conclusions

Using up to date promotional techniques will aid every

administration in selecting the proper supervisors. It is apparent that of those departments surveyed and the literature covered for this study that progress is being made in the promotional process. However, progress in most cases appears to be quite slow. A concerted effort must be made in this area so that we may reach our goal at a much faster pace. A law enforcement agency must keep up with the changes that are constantly taking place. We must not allow ourselves to become antiquated in our methods of leadership.

The purpose of this study was to survey and compare promotional systems of various law enforcement agencies. Along with this, documented information was reviewed on police promotions. Also, the purpose here was to compare the results and attempt to develop a sound system for selecting an individual for advancement into a supervisory position. As previously mentioned, this is surely not going to be a panacea of the problem, but hopefully will be a starting point.

Twenty law enforcement agencies were contacted and information on police promotions was solicited of them. Of the fourteen responding it was interesting to see the **dis-similarities** in the percentage weight assigned to each given phase of the process. The criteria used in the process were basically the same: written examination, oral interview, performance evaluation and seniority. It appeared that most departments were interested in these areas and were attempting to overcome the promotional problems. Most of

the departments requested a copy of the study. They felt it might assist them in their efforts to improve the matter of police promotions.

This study indicated that higher education is only beginning to enter the picture in the law enforcement field. Not many of the departments used higher education as a requirement for promotional eligibility. But the fact that some of the departments are using it is a sign that progress is taking place. Education should be stressed if we want to professionalize the law enforcer. In summing up, this writer has concluded that with respect to college education the following quotation by William J. O'Rourke, who favors a college education, best explains the necessity for it.

I base my opinion on the fact that in law enforcement the "product" we are dealing with is people; and just as the smart businessman insists that his employees know as much as possible about his product, it is good "business" for us to know all about our "product". In addition, our "product" is the most complex mechanism known to man; therefore, the learning process is longer and more difficult. Obviously, the social sciences and the behavioral sciences can be more easily learned in a formal college program than in the street, although I agree that both learning processes should be supplemented by in-service training programs in both sciences.¹

As law enforcement agencies increase in size, it will be necessary to promote more men into supervisory positions. If departments will begin to place more emphasis on promotions, we may rest assured that future administrators will indeed be qualified in leading and guiding police departments towards progressive goals.

Recommendations

By getting deeper into the subject of police promotions it became clear that there were many areas open for improvement. As it was earlier stated, the results of this study will certainly not supply the ultimate answer. Hopefully though, this study will make us more aware of the fact that law enforcement agencies urgently need better promotional systems. If any part of this study should prove to be useful to police agencies, then the main goal will have been reached and the work and effort put into it will have been worth while.

The following recommendations should give us a starting point from which to generate effective guidelines. They will hopefully help those people involved correct, or improve existing ones.

1. Written Examination - Immediate steps should be taken to validate a written promotional examination so that it may be relied upon. Caution must be taken to eliminate any culturally biased questions in such examinations. The names of several reference books of pertinent knowledge for supervisors should be supplied to all officers eligible for advancement.² The officers should be given this information with sufficient time and notice so they may have it read by the time of the examination, (preferably six months or longer). Too much emphasis on the written examination will not make a professional leader. Restrict the percentage

weight for the examination to 50% and below. One must keep in mind the other phases of the process.

2. Oral Interview - The oral interview should pick up what the written test cannot bring out. The interviewers should be comprised of professional men who are knowledgeable and experienced in interviewing. Whether an agency uses outside personnel or personnel from within the organization, the selection of these individuals should be carefully done. An oral board embodied with a combination of outside and inside professionals could very well be the ideal situation. Possibly, a good combination would be to have three outside members and one member from inside the department. The individual from within the department could be the Chief of Police himself or a staff representative who is familiar with the Chief's philosophies. He should also be aware of the community problems. The percentage weight assigned to the oral interview should not be any more than 25%.
3. Performance Evaluation - This critical area should be considered as the toughest of all phases. Each and every agency should attempt to correct the problems that this area produces. Experts should be consulted, and their assistance should be solicited in developing an evaluation form that is fair and just.³ Supervisors should be required to keep an official record of some sort on each subordinate. Reference to these records

should certainly assist a supervisor in evaluating his men. This will also be an aid to the administration in a grievance hearing. If the administration will take the "bull by the horns" on this subject, we can very definitely expect improvement. Any violations in evaluating personnel should be dealt with in the strictest sense. Percentage weight in this area should be cut and dry. First, if the evaluation system is only a game of "favoritism", then the evaluation should have no bearing on the promotional process. Since this area reveals the actual performance of a man, then every effort should be made to give it some weight. If an agency feels that its evaluating system is working, then no more than a score of 15% should be assigned to it. Peer ratings should be investigated and attempted on a trial basis. Comparisons could be made between the supervisor's rating and the peer rating and the results studied for inconsistencies and favoritism on the part of the supervisor.

4. Promotional Potential Rating - An attempt should be made to devise such a system. If an individual has supervisory abilities, then this type of rating should have some effect on whether he will be promoted or not. Caution must also be taken to eliminate the factor of favoritism. If this rating is used, it should not have a value of more than 10% of the total score.

5. Seniority - This phase of the promotional process should only be used as a tie breaker.
6. Education - Each department should strive to educate its personnel. Since this study has shown that there is a need for educating policemen at a higher level, each agency should immediately take steps to move in the proper direction. Educational incentive pay plans should be sought in an effort to assist the officers with the educational cost and to increase their rate of pay. The administration should be in a position to help, if possible, any man that is trying to improve himself through higher education. Law enforcement agencies must begin to set up educational requirements for an officer to be eligible for promotion. They should keep in mind that some men will not make their initial move unless they are forced to do so. Hopefully the requirements will motivate them to enroll in a local college or university. An individual who does not wish to improve himself will most likely not make a suitable supervisor. The only method to progress professionally is through higher education and the sooner this is realized the quicker we will progress.
7. Training - In-service training of supervisors should be a requirement for all newly appointed supervisors. All supervisors should be kept up to date on any changes in supervisory techniques and methods. This can be accomplished through a sound training program

administered on a regular basis. As a man advances up the organizational structure he must be made aware of and trained in his new responsibilities. Training sections should begin to set up proper training programs for supervisory and management personnel. Local experts should be utilized so as to establish first rate programs. Expert help should be solicited from local universities, private and public organizations.

8. The promotional process scale can then be set up in the following manner. This scale will be based on 100% scale.

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Written Examination | 50% |
| Oral Interview | 25% |
| Performance Evaluation | 15% |
| Promotional Potential Rating | 10% |

Adjustments can be made according to how well each phase is functioning or not functioning. However, every effort should be made to give some credit to each of the phases mentioned. This will not be an easy task, but if the proper time and effort is allotted to the promotional process the department will be the one that benefits in the end.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Albuquerque Police Department supplied the name of five books one year in advance of the examination. The officers were advised that a portion of the examination questions would come out of the assigned books. With one year's notice there was not any excuse for not reading the material. The department went as far as ordering these books through local universities for any officer who wished to purchase them. The ranks of sergeant, lieutenant, and captain were given the names of five books which were suitable for their respective rank.
2. William J. O'Rourke, "Should All Policeman Be College Trained?", Police Chief, (December 1971), pp. 36-37.
3. Any developments of a working method should be exchanged between agencies. This could be accomplished through national law enforcement magazines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Thomas F., ed. Criminal Justice Readings. Pacific Palisades: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
2. Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. 3rd ed. London: The Macmillan Company, 1968.
3. Argyris, Chris. Integrating The Individual And The Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
4. Becker, Harold K. Issues in Police Administration. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970.
5. Bell, Gerald D., ed. Organizations and Human Behavior. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
6. Berkley, George E. The Democratic Policeman. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
7. Chruden, Herbert J. and Sherman, Arthur W., Jr. Personnel Management. 3rd ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1968.
8. Clift, Raymond E. A Guide to Modern Police Thinking. 3rd ed. Cincinnati: The W. H. Anderson Company, 1970.
9. Coffey, Alan; Eldefonso, Edward; and Hartinger, Walter. Human Relations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
10. Costello, Timothy W. and Zalkind, Sheldon S. Psychology in Administration. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
11. Durrer, William L. "Who is Promotable?." The Police Chief, June, 1970, pp. 30-6.
12. Eastman, George D. and Eastman, Esther M., ed. Municipal Police Administration. 7th ed. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1971.
13. Golembiewski, Robert., ed. Perspectives on Public Management. Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1968.
14. Gorham, William A., ed. "Research Roundup." Personnel Administration, November-December, 1969, pp. 37-43.

15. Hahn, Harlan, ed. Police in Urban Society. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971.
16. Kenney, John P. Police Administration. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.
17. Kent, Deborah Ann and Eisenberg, Terry. "The Selection and Promotion of Police Officers." The Police Chief, February, 1972, pp. 20-9.
18. Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
19. Leonard, V.A. Police Personnel Administration. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1970.
20. Melnicoe, William B. and Mennig, Jan. Elements of Police Supervision. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.
21. "Mexican Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest," United States Commission on Civil Rights. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.
22. Mouzelis, Nicos P. Organization and Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1968.
23. Nunnally, Jum C. Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
24. O'Rourke, William J. "Should all Policemen be College Trained?." The Police Chief, December, 1971, pp. 36-37.
25. Pell, Arthur R. Police Leadership. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
26. Pfiffner, John M. and Presthus, Robert. Public Administration. 5th ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967.
27. Preiss, Jack J. and Ehrlich, Howard J. An Examination of Role Theory. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.
28. Reiss, Albert J., Jr. The Police and the Public. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
29. Richardson, James F. The New York Police. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
30. Saunders, Charles B., Jr. Upgrading the American Police. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

31. Sherwood, Frank P. and Best, Wallace H. Supervisory Methods in Municipal Administration. Chicago: The International City Managers' Association, 1958.
32. Simon, Herbert A.; Smithburg, Donald W., and Thompson, Victor A. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1950.
33. Stahl, O. Glenn. Public Personnel Administration. 6th ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
34. Sullivan, John L. Introduction to Police Science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
35. "Syllabus for Police Supervisory Training." Law Enforcement Institute of Governmental Affairs, Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1967.
36. "The Police", Task Force Report. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.
37. Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
38. Wiener, Solomon. "Examining Examiners for Promotion to the Supervisory Level." Public Personnel Review, April, 1971, pp. 96-100.
39. Wilson, James Q. Varieties of Police Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
40. Wilson, O.W. and McLaren, Roy Clinton. Police Administration. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.