Validity Study

Using MMPI Special Scale Configurations to Predict Performance Ratings of Police Officers in New Mexico

Michael A. Surrette
Springfield College

Michael G. Aamodt
Radford University

Gerald Serafino
Private Practice, Roswell NM

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 129 police officers in New Mexico. The results indicated that scores on the Good Cop/Bad Cop, Husemann Index, Goldberg Index, and Gonder Index were not significantly related to supervisor ratings.

Participant Characteristics

N	129 officers
Dept	A variety of law enforcement agencies in New Mexico
Gender	95% were men
Race	71% were white
Age	$M = 27.9$

Use of the MMPI

A clinical psychologist using the MMPI, the California Psychological Inventory, several measures of cognitive ability, a clinical interview, and a background questionnaire had screened officers in this study prior to hire. The data in this study were collected in the late 1980s.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in this study was supervisor ratings of officer performance made after the officer's first year on the job. The ratings were made on a five-point scale (1=low, 5=high) and the mean rating for the officers was 3.67 with a standard deviation of .88. Ratings of outstanding (5) were received by 21 officers, above average (4) by 59 officers, average (3) by 35 officers, needs improvement (2) by 11 officers, and unacceptable (1) by 3 officers.

Results

As shown in Table 1, none of the special scale configurations were significantly related to the supervisor ratings of performance. The only significant correlation found was between Factor IV, the Social Introversion scale of the MMPI, and the supervisor ratings.

Table 1
Correlations with supervisor ratings of overall performance

Scale Configuration	Mean	SD	Correlation
Good Cop/Bad Cop			
Good cop or bad cop	0.84	0.37	.00
Inclusion of borderline category	2.19	0.69	- .03
Husemann Index (F + Pd + Ma)			- .10
Aamodt Index (F + Ma)			- .08
Goldberg Index (L+Pa+Sc-Hy-Pt)			.04
Gonder Index (Pd + Pt + Mf + Ma + Hs + Hy)			.00
Five-Factor Model			
Factor I (Hs + Pd + Pa + Pt + Sc + Ma)			.01
Factor II (Hy + Hs + K – Ma)			.07
Factor III (Si)			.18*
Factor IV (Pa + MF – L – K)			.07
Factor V (F-K)			- .04

Table 2
Correlations among scale configurations

Scale Configuration	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Good Cop/Bad Cop		.61*	.46*	.33*	.52*	.50*	.05	-.04	.32*	.15
2. Husemann Index			.88*	.55*	.79*	.82*	-.03	-.02	.31*	.29*
3. Aamodt Index				.42*	.61*	.65*	-.26*	-.04	.31*	.41*
4. Goldberg Index					.79*	.82*	.53*	-.03	.14	-.13
5. Gonder Index						.93*	.37*	-.05	.41*	.03
6. Factor I							.25*	-.01	.37*	.08
7. Factor II								-.20*	-.25*	-.58*
8. Factor III									.25*	.41*
9. Factor IV										.60*
10. Factor V										

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

GCBC Category	Frequency
Failed	21
Borderline	62
Passed	46