

Validity Study

Relationship between MMPI-2 Scores and Police Misconduct in Australia

Stuart Macintyre & Carol Ronken
Office of Gambling Regulation, Australia

Tim Prenzler
Griffith University

We investigated the relationship between scores on the MMPI-2 and police misconduct for 301 police officers in Australia. The results indicated that although the correlations were low, scores on the Hs scale ($r = -.14$), Ma scale ($r = .17$), Husemann Index ($r = .14$), and Aamodt Index ($r = .14$) were significantly related to receiving an unacceptable number of complaints.

Sample

The sample consisted of 301 police officers in Australia. Of the 301, 150 were considered “undesirables” as they each had an unacceptable number of complaints and 151 were considered “desirables” as they had no complaints. The 151 desirable officers were selected to match the 150 undesirable officers in age, sex, tenure, and duties. All of the officers were men.

Predictor Information

Personality was measured using the MMPI-2. Scores were obtained from four standard validity scales (L, F, K, F-K), 10 clinical scales, and the special combinations of scales discussed by Aamodt (2004) including the Goldberg, Husemann, Good Cop/Bad Cop, Gonder, Aamodt, and Five Factor model. An additional combination was included in which the control scale (Cn) was added to the Husemann Index.

Criterion Information

The criterion for the study was whether the officer was classified as being “undesirable” or “desirable” on the basis of complaints. The undesirable officers had an unacceptable number of complaints ($M = 6.8$) whereas none of the desirable officers had any complaints.

Findings

As shown in Table 1, although the correlations were low, scores on the Hs scale ($r = -.14$), Ma scale ($r = .17$), Husemann Index ($r = .14$), and Aamodt Index ($r = .14$) were significantly related to receiving an unacceptable number of complaints.

Table 1
Correlations with complaint status (0=No complaints; 1 = many complaints)

Scale Configuration	Mean T	SD	Correlation with Complaint Status
Good Cop/Bad Cop			
Blau <i>et. al.</i> Method	.16	.37	.05
Brewster & Stoloff Method	.19	.46	.02
Husemann Index (F + Pd + Ma)	143.30	14.26	.14*
Husemann, Lefkowitz, & Eron Index (F+Pd+Ma+Cn)	177.44	16.66	.14*
Aamodt Index (F + Ma)	96.37	11.67	.14*
Goldberg Index (L+Pa+Sc-Hy-Pt)	55.26	14.69	.06
Gonder Index (Pd + Pt + Mf + Ma + Hs + Hy)	276.89	25.07	.01
Five-Factor Model			
Factor I (Hs + Pd + Pa + Pt + Sc + Ma)	275.11	28.45	.03
Factor II (Hy + Hs + K – Ma)	93.47	23.71	-.14*
Factor III (Si)	41.15	6.42	-.09
Factor IV (Pa + MF – L – K)	-19.99	23.15	.06
Factor V (F-K)			.05
MMPI-2 Scales			
Validity			
L	56.07	11.04	-.03
F	46.28	7.45	.03
K	53.73	9.60	-.07
F-K	-13.74	5.54	.05
Clinical			
Hs	44.62	6.88	-.14*
D	50.22	7.00	-.09
Hy	45.20	7.06	-.03
Pd	46.93	6.86	.04
Mf	45.51	8.20	-.02
Pa	44.31	7.99	.07
Pt	44.54	7.15	-.06
Sc	44.62	6.84	.00
Ma	50.09	8.55	.17*
Si	41.15	6.42	-.09
Subscales			
Control (Cn)	34.14	6.05	.08
Anxiety (A)			.04
Repression (R)			-.06
Ego strength (Es)			.04
MacAndrew alcoholism (MacR)			.08

* $p < .05$.

Notes: All of these mean scores represent MMPI T-scores with the exception of the Good Cop/Bad Cop analysis. For the Good Cop/Bad Cop analysis, Blau *et. al.* Method, 0 = Good Cop, 1 = Bad Cop. For the Good Cop/Bad Cop analysis, Brewster & Stoloff Method, 0 = Good Cop, 1 = Borderline, 2 = Bad Cop.

Table 2
Outcome frequencies for the Good Cop/Bad Cop method

GCBC Category	Frequency (Percent)	Percent “Undesirable”
Blau et al Method		
Bad Cop (1+ problem scales)	27 (16%)	18.5%
Good Cop (no problem scales)	143 (84%)	9.8%
Brewster & Stoloff Method		
Bad Cop (2+ problem scales)	5 (3%)	0%
Borderline (1 problem scale)	22 (13%)	22.7%
Good Cop (no problem scales)	143 (84%)	9.8%

Table 3
Correlations among scale configurations

Scale Configuration	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
Good Cop/Bad Cop										
1. Blau et al. method	.95	.55	.49	-.04	.44	.48	-.08	-.11	.11	.04
2. Brewster & Stoloff		.54	.46	-.07	.49	.50	-.01	-.09	.11	.04
3. Husemann Index			.88	.00	.63	.68	-.16	-.07	.27	.28
4. Aamodt Index				-.03	.38	.42	-.44	-.01	.40	.52
5. Goldberg Index					-.11	.12	.08	-.06	.17	-.15
6. Gonder Index						.90	.43	-.14	.17	-.23
7. Factor I							.35	-.15	.13	-.23
8. Factor II								-.15	-.50	-.70
9. Factor III									.19	.44
10. Factor IV										.64
11. Factor V										

References

- Aamodt, M. G. (2004). Special issue on using MPI-2 scale configurations in law enforcement selection: Introduction and meta-analysis. *Applied H.R.M. Research, 9*(2), 41-52.
- Macintyre, S., Ronken, C., & Prenzler, T. (2002). The MMPI-2 as a tool for preventing misconduct: A Victoria (Australia) police study. *International Journal of Police Science and Management, 4*(3), 213-232.

Editor Note

An earlier version of this study was published in the *International Journal of Police Science & Management* (Macintyre, Ronken, & Prenzler, 2002). Because the original publication did not contain the correlation coefficients for each of the scales, the authors were invited by the Editor to submit their findings as a Validity Study so that all correlations in the study would be available for future meta-analyses.

Author Note

Questions about this study should be directed to:

Dr. Tim Prenzler
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Griffith University
Brisbane, Queensland, 4111, Australia
(011-61) (0)7 3735 5613
t.prenzler@griffith.edu.au