

Independent and Peer-Reviewed Research

The Hogan [archive](#) contains over 1,000 validation studies demonstrating the validity and impact of our tools. However, we are often asked about Hogan's research presence in peer-reviewed outlets. To address these questions, we maintain a [bibliography](#) of hundreds of academic studies, peer-reviewed publications, white papers, and conference sessions.

What is the difference between independent reviews and peer-reviewed research?

Independent reviews come from objective third-party sources, like the [Buros Center for Testing](#) or the [British Psychological Society](#) (BPS), who evaluate and appraise assessments based on standard criteria (e.g., reliability, validity). For peer-reviewed publications, journal editors ask other experts to review submissions and determine if the research provides useful information based on a journal's goals and target audience. While independent reviews provide objective evaluations of our tools across settings for different uses, peer-reviewed research focuses more on individual research studies.

Does the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) hold up under independent scrutiny?

Buros's [Thirteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook](#) (Axford, 1998; Lobello, 1998) and the British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre [Test Reviews](#) (Creed & Shackleton, 2007; Marshall & Lindley, 2009) provide favorable reviews of the HPI.

- Buros describes the HPI as “a theoretically sound, carefully conceptualized, and well-validated instrument offering practical utility for organizations” (p. 5).
- BPS states that the HPI “should appeal particularly to business professionals such as managers or those involved in personnel selection, organizational research, career counseling and training” (p.12).
- Between 1997 and 2014, the [Oregon Research Institute](#) compiled longitudinal data on the HPI and other major personality assessments using a sample in the Eugene and Springfield, Oregon communities. These data provide a comprehensive and objective source of validity evidence for the HPI and show convergent and discriminant validity with other FFM measures ([Goldberg, 2016](#)).

Can you provide peer-reviewed articles supporting the use of the HPI?

More than 150 empirical articles and dissertations exist using the HPI across laboratory and real-world settings. The Hogan [bibliography](#) provides citations for these publications. For example:

- [Hurtz and Donovan](#) (2000) used the HPI, among other assessments, in their meta-analyses of personality dimensions in predicting job and contextual performance.
- [Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, and Goldberg's](#) (2005) comparison of seven major personality assessments demonstrates that the HPI remains a marker instrument for the Five Factor Model in academic research.
- [Salgado, Moscoso, and Alonso \(2013\)](#) explored the subscale structure of the HPI, discussed its development, and concluded the HPI is a universal tool applicable across the world.

How do independent critics view the Hogan Development Survey (HDS)?

Buros' [Nineteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook](#) (Axford & Hayes, 2014) and the British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre [Test Reviews](#) (Hodgkinson & Robertson, 2007) provide favorable reviews of the HDS.

- Buros says the HDS is “alone in its test space and it has been developed with exceptional psychological and psychometric care” (p. 16).
- BPS states that the HDS is “useful primarily in occupational counseling as well as in personal and career development situations” (p.14).
- Between 1997 and 2014, the [Oregon Research Institute](#) compiled longitudinal data on the HDS and other assessments using a sample in the Eugene and Springfield, Oregon communities. Results demonstrate convergent and discriminant validity of the HDS with other personality measures ([R. Hogan & J. Hogan](#), 2009).

Can you provide peer-reviewed articles supporting the use of the HDS?

More than 100 empirical articles and dissertations exist using the HDS in laboratory and real-world settings. The Hogan [bibliography](#) provides citations for these publications. For example:

- [Gaddis and Foster](#) (2013) outline significant relationships between HDS scales and critical performance competencies for global leaders around the world.
- [Leary et al.](#) (2013) show how dysfunctional leaders (as measured by the HDS) impact employee burnout, engagement, and job satisfaction.
- [Spain, Harms, and Lebreton](#) (2013) discuss the history of dark-side personality characteristics and where the HDS fits in with other derailment models.

Are HDS items clinical in nature?

The HDS is neither intended nor appropriate for diagnosing mental illness. Instead, the HDS measures normal personality characteristics that can hinder an individual's ability to build relationships and accomplish goals in organizational contexts. Because of this, a primary consideration shaping the development of the HDS concerned the content of the items. Item content reflects work-related themes and how one relates to supervisors, co-workers, and other work associates ([R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009](#)). Here are some reviews that highlight these characteristics:

- The 2007 BPS review states “a key strength of the HDS is that, unlike other instruments designed to assess dysfunctional behaviors, the items have been specifically written in such a way as to specifically avoid tapping clinical themes, sexual preferences, and religious preferences” (p. 13).
- The 2014 Buros review says “users are cautioned to heed the authors’ cautionary statements regarding avoiding diagnostic or clinical application of the HDS” (p. 3).
- The HDS technical manual highlights that “...self-defeating behavior comes and goes depending on the context; personality disorders are enduring and pervasive...” (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 686).

What do independent critics say about the Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory?

Buros’ [Fourteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook](#) (Roberts & Zedeck, 2001) and the British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre’s [Test Reviews](#) (Feltham & Loan-Clarke, 2007) provide favorable reviews of the Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI).

- Buros notes that the MVPI “fills a void in the range of personality assessment tools”, “is based on a rich understanding of the motives and values domain”, and “the scales demonstrate relatively strong evidence of reliability and validity” (p.5).
- The BPS review concludes that “[the MVPI] is a soundly based assessment tool that will appeal to those seeking to assess employee motivation in a fairly in-depth way” (p.12).
- The [Oregon Research Institute](#) included the MVPI in its 2007 data collection involving their sample from the Eugene and Springfield, Oregon communities, again demonstrating convergent and discriminant validity with other self-report assessments.

Can you provide peer-reviewed articles supporting the use of the MVPI?

More than 25 empirical articles and dissertations exist using the MVPI across laboratory and real-world settings. The Hogan [bibliography](#) provides citations for these publications. For example:

- [Chamorro-Premuzic, Rinaldi, Akhtara, & Ahmetoglu](#) (2014) investigated the psychological attributes of female entrepreneurship, focusing on motivational factors as assessed by the MVPI.
- [Giberson, Resick, & Dickson](#) (2005) used the MVPI as a marker instrument to develop their own values assessment.
- [Ng, Woo, Tay, & Foster](#) (2016) conducted cross-cultural research using the MVPI to determine the impact culture plays in creating values.

Selected References

- Axford, S. N. (1998). [Review of the Hogan Personality Inventory (Revised)]. In J. C. Impara & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The thirteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Axford, S. N., & Hayes, T. L. (2014). [Review of the Hogan Development Survey (Revised)]. In J. F. Carlson, K. F. Geisinger, & J. L. Jonson (Eds.), *The nineteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Creed, P., & Shackleton, V. (2007). Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI). In P. A. Lindley (Ed.), *British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre test reviews*. London, England: British Psychological Society.
- Feltham, R., & Loan-Clarke, J. (2007). Hogan's Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI). In P. A. Lindley (Ed.), *British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre test reviews*. London, England: British Psychological Society.
- Hodgkinson, G., & Robertson, S. (2007). Hogan Development Survey (UK Edition) (HDS). In P. A. Lindley (Ed.), *British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre test reviews*. London, England: British Psychological Society.
- Lobello, S. G. (1998). [Review of the Hogan Personality Inventory (Revised)]. In J. C. Impara & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The thirteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Marshall, L. A., & Lindley, P. (Eds.) (2009). Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI). *British Psychological Society Psychological Testing Centre test reviews*. London, England: British Psychological Society.
- Roberts, B., & Zedeck, S. (2001). [Review of the Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory]. In B. S. Plake & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.