

Can Psychological Profiling Identify High Risk and Low Risk employees?

AIFP would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Mr John Van Groningen and Ms Karen Maynard of Correctional Services, Department of Justice, Victoria in the preparation of this report.

Overview

A psychological profiling system which claims better success rates for recruitment should have evidence of its ability to identify High Risk as well as Low Risk employees.

This research is based on AIFP test data from 19 serving Corrections Officers. These officers were selected by Correctional Services as representatives of clearly High Risk and clearly Low Risk employees. Each officer was paid overtime to participate in the study. Each completed our battery of psychological tests which were scored and analysed. Our challenge was to identify which category each officer belonged to. The cost of employing 'High Risk' employees was then calculated.

No interviews were conducted. AIFP was unaware of which category each subject belonged to. We correctly identified nine of ten officers regarded as 'High Risk' employees and eight out of nine who were regarded as 'Low Risk' employees. This 89% success rate is highly statistically significant.

Methodology

The officers selected were a mixture of 'High Risk' and 'Low Risk' employees. The characteristics of each group based on their performance are as follows:

1. High Risk Employees

The performance of individuals in this group is consistently poor. It is characterised by low productivity, poor morale and motivation, poor teamwork and disruptive behaviour.

2. Low Risk Employees

These staff display a consistently high level of productivity, motivation and morale, work well in teams and make a higher than average contribution to the Department.

It should be noted that the procedure for making a hiring recommendation using the AIFP Profiling System relies on the integrated data obtained from the psychological test battery and from the AIFP TRAIT© Interview System. Because these subjects were existing employees, only the test battery data could be used. It is therefore likely that the predictive potential of the system would be even better under normal conditions.

Study Results

Using results from the test data only, **9 out of 10** ‘High Risk’ employees and **8 out of 9** ‘Low Risk’ employees were correctly identified .

These results indicate an 89% success rate in our predictions. The likelihood of arriving at this number of correct predictions by chance alone is 2 in 10,000.

This outcome strongly suggests that the predictive accuracy is directly related to the test battery findings. The personality characteristics evaluated by the test battery data accurately distinguish ‘High Risk’ performers from ‘Low Risk’ Corrections Officers even without an interview.



The Cost of High Risk Performers

The Department supplied AIFP with the estimated employment costs for 9 of the 10 ‘High Risk’ employees for the total time employed (the data on one employee was unavailable).

This estimate included the following costs:

Salary Costs
Overtime
Allowances
Sick Leave Costs

Recruitment Costs
Training Costs
WorkCover Costs

The total cost of employment for this group from the time of appointment was calculated to be:
\$2,617,408

Implications of the Victorian Study

The study demonstrates that AIFP Profiling—even without an interview—can accurately discriminate between ‘High Risk’ and ‘Low Risk’ employees. As a result, clients can expect to save enormous amounts of money. These include:

Direct Savings — reduce the risk of potentially unlimited costs associated with multiple Worker’s Compensation claims, excessive sick leave etc.

Indirect Savings — reduce risks associated with disruptive behaviour, low productivity, poor morale and legal risk to the organisation.

There are also significant benefits for the individual. Appointing someone to a job for which they are psychologically ill-suited can cause significant stress, be a backwards step in their career and be detrimental to self-esteem and wellbeing.

Identifying the *most suitable* candidates for any job is best for employer and employee alike.

For more information on this or other studies, or to discuss how AIFP can help your organisation recruit the best possible candidates for your public safety positions, please contact us.

Australian Institute of Forensic Psychology

41 Queens Parade
Clifton Hill, VIC 3068
Australia

Phone: (03) 9482 2887
Fax: (03) 9481 3024
Email: selection@aiofp.com



Visit us at
www.aiofp.com.au

Better People Decisions for Public Safety