

## Validity Study

### Using MMPI Special Scale Configurations to Predict Police Officer Performance in New Jersey

George S. Matyas  
GM Associates

*As part of a special issue of Applied H.R.M. Research on using special scale configurations of the MMPI and MMPI-2 in selecting law enforcement personnel, I investigated the ability of these scale configurations to predict supervisor ratings of the performance of 115 police officers in New Jersey. The results indicated that none of the special scale configurations were significantly related to the supervisor ratings of performance. However scores on the Good Cop/Bad Cop and Gonder Index were negatively related to commendations and scores on Factor II and Factor III were related to the number of suspensions received.*

---

#### Participant Characteristics

N	115 officers with at least one year on the job
Dept	A medium-size police department in New Jersey
Gender	100% were men
Race	90% were white
Tenure	$M = 59.46$ months, $SD = 30.92$
Age	$M = 23.83$ (at time of hire)

#### Use of the MMPI

Officers in this study had been screened prior to hire by the department using an oral board interview, civil service exam, background investigation, and physical examination and by a clinical psychologist using the MMPI (data were collected from 1969-1978), a clinical interview, and a background questionnaire.

#### Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this study were collected during a 12-month period and included commendations, suspensions, accidents, sick leave, and supervisor ratings of officer performance. The performance ratings were made on a five-point scale (1=low, 5=high) by two supervisors. The mean overall performance rating for the officers was 2.97 with a standard deviation of 1.03. The interrater reliability of the performance ratings was .85.

## Results

As shown in Table 2, none of the special scale configurations were significantly related to the supervisor ratings of performance. However scores on the Good Cop/Bad Cop and Gonder Index were negatively related to commendations and scores on Factor II and Factor III were related to the number of suspensions received.

**Table 1**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

Scale Configuration	Mean	SD	Low	High
Good Cop/Bad Cop				
Two categories (good cop, bad cop)	0.35	0.48	0	1
Three categories (good, borderline, bad)	0.98	0.83	0	2
Husemann Index (F + Pd + Ma)	162.49	11.32	137	186
Aamodt Index (F + Ma)	104.98	7.92	87	126
Goldberg Index (L+Pa+Sc-Hy-Pt)	50.45	10.79	21	75
Gonder Index (Pd + Pt + Mf + Ma + Hs + Hy)	321.43	20.66	273	364
Five-Factor Model				
Factor I (Hs + Pd + Pa + Pt + Sc + Ma)	313.94	23.23	259	353
Factor II (Hy + Hs + K - Ma)	111.08	16.82	45	148
Factor III (Si)	43.98	5.64	32	67
Factor IV (Pa + MF - L - K)	-13.12	15.68	-49	34
Factor V (F-K)				

**Table 2**  
**Correlations with Criterion Measures**

Scale Configuration	Supervisor Ratings	Commendations	Suspensions	Complaints	Sick Days	Auto Accidents
Good Cop/Bad Cop						
Two categories	-.09	-.25*	.08	-.07	-.01	-.15
Three categories	-.02	-.19*	.10	-.05	.08	-.12
Husemann Index	.07	-.12	.12	-.02	.10	-.03
Aamodt Index	.04	-.02	.15	.01	.16	.13
Goldberg Index	.11	.02	.01	.09	-.04	-.03
Gonder Index	-.01	-.27*	-.12	-.14	-.07	-.16
Five-Factor Model						
Factor I	.01	-.26*	-.11	-.14	-.09	-.15
Factor II	-.06	-.15	-.19*	-.10	-.15	-.15
Factor III	.09	.04	.25*	.10	-.02	-.03
Factor IV	-.01	-.09	.01	.12	.04	-.04
Factor V	.02	.04	.17	-.02	.16	.14

**Table 3**  
**Correlations among scale configurations**

Scale Configuration	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Good Cop/Bad Cop		.68*	.40*	.18	.69*	.66*	.06	-.23*	.10	-.21*
2. Husemann Index			.80*	.28*	.64*	.64*	-.26*	-.19*	.22*	.14
3. Aamodt Index				.26*	.35*	.31*	-.59*	-.16	.36*	.42*
4. Goldberg Index					.27*	.43*	-.05	-.08	-.02	-.14
5. Gonder Index						.89*	.30*	-.24*	.18	-.35*
6. Factor I							.37*	-.26*	.03	-.41*
7. Factor II								-.08	-.50*	-.65*
8. Factor III									.11	.35*
9. Factor IV										.53*
10. Factor V										

**Table 4**  
**Outcome frequencies for the Good Cop/Bad Cop method**

GCBC Category	Frequency
Failed	38
Borderline	37
Passed	40

**Appendix**  
**Correlations between individual MMPI-2 scales and criteria**

MMPI Scale	Supervisor Ratings	Commendations	Suspensions	Complaints	Sick Days	Auto Accidents
L	.06	.03	-.03	.09	-.06	.00
F	.02	.01	.14	.07	.13	.11
K	-.01	-.05	-.14	-.05	-.13	-.11
Hs	-.13	-.29*	-.19*	-.13	-.15	-.12
D	-.05	-.04	-.16	-.20*	-.09	-.14
Hy	-.02	-.18	-.15	-.20*	-.04	-.12
Pd	.06	-.18	.02	-.05	-.02	-.20*
Mf	-.02	-.11	-.07	.01	-.02	-.10
Pa	.07	-.12	-.07	-.01	-.08	-.09
Pt	.02	-.15	-.17	-.16	-.16	-.12
Sc	-.07	-.25*	-.16	-.20*	-.09	-.14
Ma	.04	-.03	.09	-.03	.10	-.08
Si	.09	.04	.25*	.12	-.02	-.03

## Author Notes

1. The data for this article were initially collected for the following doctoral dissertation:  
Matyas, G. S. (1980). *The relationship of MMPI and biographical data to police selection and police performance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.
2. Questions regarding this article should be sent to:  
Dr. George Matyas  
GM Associates  
Box 384 Riverwood Avenue  
Bedminster, NJ 07921  
(908) 234-9423  
[Georgematyas@earthlink.net](mailto:Georgematyas@earthlink.net)