

Validity Study

Using MMPI Special Scale Configurations to Predict Field Training Officer Ratings of Probationary Police Officer Performance

Jay C. Thomas
Pacific University

Brad Kauder
Private Practice
Ashland, Oregon

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 ratings of the performance of 30 probationary police officers in small northwestern police departments. Given the small sample size, the results indicated that scores on the Good Cop/Bad Cop, Husemann Index, Aamodt Index, Goldberg Index, Gonder Index, and Factors I through IV were not significantly related to field training office ratings of driving, relationship, or global performance. Scores on Factor V, however, were significantly related to FTO ratings of driving skill.

Participant Characteristics

N	30 probationary officers
Dept	Small to medium sized suburban and rural departments
Gender	93% were men
Race	100% were white
Age	$M = 29.4$ ($SD = 3.89$)

Use of the MMPI

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

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in this study was field training officer ratings of probationary officer performance. The ratings were made on a seven-point scale (1=low, 7=high). Ratings were combined into, Driving Skill, Relationship, and a Global composites.

The mean rating of Driving Skill was 4.3 ($sd = .69$), the mean for Relationship was 4.8 ($sd = .82$) and the mean for Global was 4.4 ($sd = .72$).

Results

As shown in Table 1, Factor V was significantly related to the Driving Composite. Several other validity correlations were of a magnitude to be potentially useful, but the sample size was too small to obtain a significant effect. Table 2 provides the intercorrelations between the special scales. Since some scales were calculated using some common variables, the correlations are often high (e.g., the Goldberg and Gonder indices, Factors IV and V). Out of 30 subjects, 25 scored in the “Good cop” range and only five scored in the borderline range. None scored as “Bad cop”.

Table 1
Correlations with field training officer ratings

Scale Configuration	Mean	SD	Training Supervisor Ratings		
			Driving	Relationship	Global
Good Cop/Bad Cop (scored 0 = “bad cop”, 1= “Borderline”, 2 = “Good cop”)	1.83	.38	-.04	.11	.07
Husemann Index (F + Pd + Ma)	140.87	9.46	.06	-.02	.03
Aamodt Index (F + Ma)	88.33	7.30	-.06	-.03	-.04
Goldberg Index (L+Pa+Sc-Hy-Pt)	255.57	22.08	.19	.06	.11
Gonder Index (Pd+Pt+Mf+Ma+Hs+Hy)	288.10	20.18	.33	.25	.30
Five-Factor Model					
Factor I (Hs + Pd + Pa + Pt + Sc + Ma)	294.97	22.85	.26	.13	.20
Factor II (Hy + Hs + K – Ma)	116.70	17.22	.27	.19	.23
Factor III (Si)	39.17	6.05	.25	.30	.26
Factor IV (Pa + MF – L – K)	-29.10	14.39	-.05	.04	.00
Factor V (F-K)	-22.00	7.93	-.39*	-.28	-.35

Table 2
Correlations among scale configurations

Scale Configuration	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Good Cop/Bad Cop	-.30	-.12	-.42*	-.31	-.45*	-.15	-.29	-.03	-.07
2. Husemann Index		.83**	.26	.55**	.67**	-.18	.01	.27	.18
3. Aamodt Index			.06	.33	.35	-.50	.18	.25	.49**
4. Goldberg Index				.73**	.82**	.65**	-.03	-.45*	-.50**
5. Gonder Index					.84**	.51**	.05	.14	-.35
6. Factor I						.50**	-.05	-.07	-.36
7. Factor II							-.26	-.33	-.79**
8. Factor III								.29	.48**
9. Factor IV									.55**
10. Factor V									

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

GCBC Category	Frequency
Failed	0
Borderline	5
Passed	25