



## Hogan Assessments Validity FAQs

### FOUNDATION

---

**Q: What is the theoretical basis for the Hogan tools?**

**A:** The Hogan tools are based on Socioanalytic theory, a view of personality that combines Evolutionary theory, Sociology, and classic Psychoanalysis. Socioanalytic theory suggests that humans are social creatures by nature, and driven by needs to: (a) gain acceptance from others, (b) achieve status and power, and (c) make sense out of the environment. As people interact, they create *reputations* for themselves. Their reputations describe the way they generally interact with others at work and in private. The Hogan tools predict reputation, which reflects the stable patterns of behavior individuals demonstrate while attempting to get along, get ahead, and establish order and predictability in their own environment.

For more information, please read the [“Personality Theory and Job Performance”](#) whitepaper.

**Q: Why are the Hogan assessments not considered “self report” measures?**

**A:** Our answer to this question differs from all other test providers in three ways. First, when people respond to questions on our assessments, we do not believe they are reporting on their behavior, but rather telling us how to think about them and how they want to be regarded—exactly as they would do in any conversation. Second, we don’t care how people respond to items; we only care about what their responses predict. Consider the item, “I take a different way home from work every night.” People who answer “True” tend to be creative and adventurous, and that is the important point. We don’t care whether they really take a different way home from work each night; we care about what it means to say that they do. Third, we are not trying to *measure* anything; we are trying to *predict* performance at work.

**Q: How do the Hogan assessments mitigate “faking good” strategies?**

**A:** The topic of “faking” is important for those psychologists and business people who argue that personality can’t predict occupational performance. They base their conclusions on shoddy research (e.g., small student samples instead of large samples of real job applicants), inconsistent definitions (e.g., “faking” as socially desirable responding, inflation of scores, responding to match a desired profile), and dubious assumptions (e.g., people *intentionally* and *effectively* fake response patterns). Nevertheless, to deal with these critics, Hogan consultants monitor the response patterns of individuals on several subscales of the Hogan Personality Inventory to ensure that they do not match a “faking good” strategy. For more information regarding this topic, please visit Dr. Robert Hogan’s [blog post](#).

**Q: How much credibility do the Hogan tests have?**

**A:** The Hogan results have tremendous credibility, which is confirmed by the numerous validation studies, some of which are published. Hogan is known for predicting performance at work, even over long periods of time. This can help to predict success at work, in sales, in management and in occupational safety, and also to predict many criteria that companies can define themselves.



## NORMS

---

### **Q: What are the normative group sizes for each of the inventories?**

**A:** Unlike other assessments that are normed on samples of a few hundred cases, Hogan collects comprehensive normative data to ensure that our assessments accurately represent intended populations. However, for summary purposes, the normative group sizes for each of the Hogan assessments are as follows:

- Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI):  $N = 156,641$
- Hogan Development Survey (HDS):  $N = 109,103$
- Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI):  $N = 68,565$

### **Q: What is the composition/size/basis of the norm groups?**

**A:** For all assessments, Hogan conducts stratified random sampling to ensure that assessment norms represent intended populations. To create accurate norms, Hogan obtains workforce estimates from relevant sources (e.g., Department of Labor, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission), and samples normative data to match these estimates. In this way, Hogan ensures the norms apply across occupational (e.g., job families, industry sectors), demographic (e.g., age, gender, and ethnic groups), and other (e.g., selection vs. development application) groups.

## RELIABILITY

---

### **Q: Do scale scores change over time? If so, which ones? How often should one re-take inventories to capture “current functioning?”**

**A:** On an individual level, research shows that personality is stable. Although an individual's scores may fluctuate slightly over time, significant shifts in Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) and Hogan Development Survey (HDS) scores are rare and usually the result of careless responding. However, on an aggregate level, the “average” levels of HPI and HDS scale scores may change over time. For example, the average level of the HPI Sociability scale may be higher now than 20 years ago, indicating that, on average, people are more social now than then. To account for these changes, Hogan consistently monitors and maintains assessment norms to ensure that they reflect “current functioning” in intended populations. Because personality is stable, and because Hogan maintains norms to reflect “current functioning,” client respondents need not re-take inventories.

### **Q: Are there age-related or generational changes in scale scores?**

**A:** Collaborative research between Hogan Assessment Systems and Peter Berry Consultancy examined differences in scale scores between different countries, as well as between different generations. The “Research on Australia's Workforce DNA” white paper details the results of this research. However, to briefly summarize, researchers examined scale score differences between Baby Boomers (born 1946 – 1964), Generation X (born 1965 – 1977), and Generation Y (born 1978 – 1994). Although research revealed small generational differences in scale scores, these differences are not significant in practice. At an individual level, these results indicate that one cannot assume anything about a person's personality or value set simply by knowing when they were born.

### **Q: Can you provide any specific reliability figures?**

**A:** The HPI internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) is between .57 and .83 per scale. Test-retest (TR) reliability with two to three weeks between tests is between .69 and .87 per scale. If there are eight years between the two measuring periods, then the TR reliability moves between .30 and .73 per scale.



The HDS internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) is between .43 and .68 per scale. With three months between Test-retest, reliability is between .64 and .75 per scale. If the period is nine to twelve months, TR reliability is .52 to .75 per scale.

The MPVI internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) is between .70 and .84 per scale. The TR reliability over a three-month test period is between .71 and .85 per scale, and with nine to twelve months between tests it is .70 to .83 per scale.

## INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

---

**Q: What are (if any) the cultural differences in scale scores? What variables are associated with what cultural environments?**

**A:** With the ever-increasing globalization of business, questions regarding cross-cultural similarities and differences are becoming more frequent. We find some small differences across languages. Scores from multiple translations of a personality assessment can differ for reasons other than cultural sources (see Meyer & Foster, 2008 for a review). Consequently, Hogan avoids making strong assertions about cultural differences when comparing results across multiple translations of the assessments. Some recent research studying differences (“Research on Australia’s Workforce DNA” white paper) between Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and the United Kingdom shows that minor differences exist on certain personality and value scales. However, these differences are small in magnitude. This research concludes that the effects of culture on personality and culture are hard to define – we are more alike than we are different.

**Q: How can Hogan ensure that scores mean the same thing across cultures?**

**A:** “Equivalence” refers to the comparability of measures used across different cultural groups. However, methods for establishing equivalence vary widely, and no universally accepted standards for establishing equivalence exist. Although no one method can account for all potential sources of error, and achieving complete measurement equivalence is akin to catching the Tooth Fairy, Hogan uses two sets of analyses to determine functional equivalence of translated assessments using the U.S. English forms as benchmarks. Using Classical Test Theory (CTT), we examine functioning at both the item- and scale-level to identify content that may need further review. We also use Procrustes analyses to determine factor equivalence between the translated and English forms.

**Q: How reliable/valid are the Hogan assessments internationally?**

**A:** Hogan works diligently with our global network of distributors and clients to gather local data in international contexts supporting both the reliability and validity of Hogan assessments in predicting important work-related outcomes. For reliability, we provide evidence for the internal consistency of our assessments, as well as consistency of measurement over time, as sufficient data are available. To obtain local validation evidence for our assessments, we work with distributors and clients engaged in specific research initiatives to gather matched assessment and job performance data. These data allow Hogan to demonstrate the predictive validity of our assessments in local international contexts.