

Validity Study

Using MMPI Special Scale Configurations to Predict Supervisor Ratings of Police Officer Performance

Bobbie L. Raynes
New River Community College

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, we investigated the ability of these scale configurations to predict supervisor ratings of the performance of 26 police officers in a southern police department. Due in part to a small sample size, the results indicated that scores on the Good Cop/Bad Cop, Husemann Index, Aamodt Index, Goldberg Index, and Gonder Index were not significantly related to supervisor ratings of overall performance. Scores on the Husemann Index, Aamodt Index, and Factor I, however, were significantly related to supervisor ratings of discipline problems.

Participant Characteristics

N	32 officers (26 officers had performance ratings)
Dept	A medium-size police department in a southern city
Gender	87% were men
Race	96% were white
Age	$M = 26.04$

Use of the MMPI

Officers in this study had been screened prior to hire by a clinical psychologist using the MMPI-2, a clinical interview, and a background questionnaire.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in this study was supervisor ratings of officer performance. The ratings were made on a three-point scale (1=low, 3=high). The mean overall performance rating for the officers was 2.00 with a standard deviation of .75. Ratings of above average (3) were received by 7 officers, average (2) by 12 officers, and below average (1) by 7 officers.

The mean rating on discipline problems was 2.19 with a standard deviation of .63. Ratings of above average problems (3) were received by 8 officers, average (2) by 15 officers, and below average (1) by 3 officers. Ratings of discipline problems were negatively correlated with overall ratings of performance ($r = -.59, p < .001$)

Results

As shown in Table 1, none of the special scale configurations were significantly related to the supervisor ratings of overall performance. However scores on the Husemann Index ($r = .40$) and Factor I ($r = -.39$) were significantly related to ratings of discipline problems.

Table 1
Correlations with supervisor ratings

Scale Configuration	Mean	SD	Supervisor Ratings	
			Discipline Problems	Overall Performance
Good Cop/Bad Cop	0.16	0.37	.30	-.15
Husemann Index (F + Pd + Ma)	139.53	9.79	.40*	-.22
Aamodt Index (F + Ma)	90.25	7.56	.48*	-.28
Goldberg Index (L+Pa+Sc-Hy-Pt)	56.72	13.51	.18	-.19
Gonder Index (Pd + Pt + Mf + Ma + Hs + Hy)	274.91	21.73	.11	-.04
Five-Factor Model				
Factor I (Hs + Pd + Pa + Pt + Sc + Ma)	275.72	20.47	.18	-.26
Factor II (Hy + Hs + K – Ma)	99.63	18.33	-.39*	.20
Factor III (Si)	41.88	6.00	-.08	.13
Factor IV (Pa + MF – L – K)	-30.09	17.39	-.27	.05
Factor V (F-K)	-17.81	3.29	.16	.03

Table 2
Correlations among scale configurations

Scale Configuration	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Good Cop/Bad Cop		.47*	.46*	.37*	.33	.25	-.14	-.21	.11	.00
2. Husemann Index			.75*	.25	.70*	.70*	-.09	-.25	.12	-.11
3. Aamodt Index				.32	.30	.44*	-.49*	-.05	.11	.25
4. Goldberg Index					.14	.24	.06	.11	-.31	-.09
5. Gonder Index						.86*	.45*	-.43*	.15	-.60*
6. Factor I							.47*	-.45*	-.16	-.66*
7. Factor II								-.32	-.42*	-.82*
8. Factor III									-.02	.56*
9. Factor IV										.33
10. Factor V										

Table 3
Outcome frequencies for the Good Cop/Bad Cop method

GCBC Category	Frequency
Failed	0
Borderline	5
Passed	27

Appendix
Correlations between individual MMPI-2 scales and supervisor ratings

MMPI-2 Scale	Mean	SD	Supervisor Ratings	
			Discipline Problems	Overall Performance
L	57.44	10.60	.02	-.02
F	41.16	3.31	-.11	.30
K	59.09	6.70	-.17	.06
Hs	44.22	4.70	-.15	.01
D	42.44	4.41	-.13	-.04
Hy	45.41	5.39	-.16	-.06
Pd	49.28	6.53	.05	-.01
Mf	42.69	11.38	-.43*	.22
Pa	43.75	6.11	.09	-.26
Pt	42.22	5.99	-.07	-.01
Sc	45.16	4.21	.01	.16
Ma	49.09	7.25	.52*	-.42*
Si	41.88	6.00	-.08	.13

