



The  
British  
Psychological  
Society



**British Psychological Society  
Psychological Testing Centre  
Test Reviews**

**Hogan's Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory**

Local test distributor / publisher: Psychological Consultancy Ltd

---

The British Psychological Society © 2007. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.

# Hogan's Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI)

**Reviewers:** R. Feltham  
& J. Loan-Clarke

**Consulting Editor:** I. Robertson

**Senior Editor:** P. A. Lindley

**Senior Update Editor:** P. A. Lindley

**Update Editor:** P. A. Lindley

## **GENERAL INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT**

**Test Name:** Hogan's Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory

**Authors of the original test:** Robert Hogan and Joyce Hogan

**Local test distributor / publisher:** Psychological Consultancy Ltd

**Publisher of the original version of the test:** Hogan Assessment Systems

**Date of Publication of Current Review/Edition:** 1997

**Date of Publication of the Original Test:** 1987

**Date of Current Review:** 2003

**ISBN:** 1854335510

**General Description of Test:** The MVPI is a self-report questionnaire that is occupationally oriented. It is a trait measure that is construct-based and has normative rating.

The MVPI is a normative measure of motivations and values, drawing heavily on existing theoretical constructs. The ten scales measured are:

Recognition – the desire to be known, recognised and visible  
Power – desire for challenge, competition, achievement  
Hedonism – orientation towards fun, pleasure and enjoyment  
Altruism – concern about the welfare of others  
Affiliation – desire for frequent social contact  
Tradition – morality and standards  
Security – order, predictability, safety  
Business – interest in making money, profits, business opportunities  
Culture – artistic interests  
Rationality – interest in new ideas and an analytical approach

Scales are assessed by a 200-item normative questionnaire, delivered either on paper or by computer. All scoring is by computer, no hand keys or scoring algorithms are available. Three computer-generated reports are offered at differing levels of detail.

The two stated purposes of the MVPI are firstly to evaluate the fit between the individual and organisational culture, and secondly to assess a person's motives 'directly'. The authors write: 'standard interest measures allow inference about a person's motives on the basis of ... expressed occupational choices. But from the MVPI, one can determine immediately the degree to which the person is motivated by security, money or fun. The only alternative to the MVPI for directly assessing a person's motives is to use a projective measure' (p. 11).

The MVPI appears orientated mainly to individual-level assessment.

## **Classification**

### **Content Domains:**

- Motivation
- Values
- Interests

### **Intended or main area(s) of Use:**

- Work and Occupational

### **Intended mode of use (conditions under which the instrument was standardised and validated):**

- Supervised and controlled administration. Test administration under the control of a qualified administrator or proctor

### **Description of the populations for which the test is intended:**

General working population.

### **Number of scales and brief description of the variable or variables measured by the test:**

10 scales. Rationally derived scale, mainly reflecting constructs drawn from existing theories of values/interest/ motivation and accumulated research into motivation over the last 80 years.

The MVPI is a normative measure of motivations and values, drawing heavily on existing theoretical constructs. The ten scales measured are:

Recognition: The desire to be known, recognised and visible.

Power: The Desire for challenge, competition, achievement.

Hedonism: Orientation towards fun, pleasure and enjoyment.

Altruism: Concern about the welfare of others.

Affiliation: Desire for frequent social contact.

Tradition: Morality and standards.

Security: Order, predictability, safety.

Business: Interest in making money, profits, business opportunities.

Culture: Artistic interests.

Rationality: Interest in new ideas and an analytical approach.

### **Items format:**

- Dichotomous (true/false)

### **Number of test items:**

200

### **Administration modes:**

- Interactive individual administration
- Supervised Group administration

**Response mode:**

- Paper and pencil
- On-line

Computer administration, scoring, analysis and interpretation. Scoring is only possible via computer. No hand-scoring keys available.

**Time:**

- Preparation: 5 minutes
- Administration: 30–35 minutes.
- Scoring: 0–5 minutes depending on method
- Analysis: A few minutes
- Feedback: 45–60 minutes

**Different forms of the test:**

There is no alternative form available.

## **Measurement and Scoring**

**Scoring procedure for the test:**

- Computer scoring with direct entry of responses by test taker
- Bureau-service – e.g. scoring by the company selling the test
- On-line scoring

The manual also suggests that the MPVI can be administered orally in order to meet the needs of disabled respondents.

**Score transformation for standard scores:**

- Normative. Non-normalised. The manual (p.90) seems to indicate that the norms provided as standard by the software do not assume a normal distribution of scores.

**Scales Used:****Percentile-based scores:**

- Centiles
- The narrative report generated by the software describes low scores in terms of percentiles below 35, and high scores in terms of percentiles about 65.

## **Computer-Generated Reports**

**Are computer generated reports available with the instrument?:**

- Yes

**Do distributors offer a service to correct and/or develop computer generated reports?:**

- Yes

<b>Brief description of Reports..</b>	
<b>Media:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated text and graphics</li> </ul>
<b>Complexity:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex</li> </ul>
<b>Report Structure:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale based</li> </ul>
<b>Sensitivity to context:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-defined context-related versions</li> </ul>
<b>Clinical-actuarial:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on empirical/actuarial relationships</li> <li>• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts</li> </ul>
<b>Modifiability:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlimited modification</li> </ul>
<b>Degree of 'finish':</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication quality</li> </ul>
<b>Transparency:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear linkage between constructs, scores and text</li> </ul>
<b>Style and tone:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance</li> </ul>
<b>Intended recipients:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualified test users</li> <li>• Test takers</li> <li>• Third parties</li> </ul>

**Professional qualifications required for use of the test:**

- None

**Evaluation of Test Materials**

**Key to symbols:**

★	Inadequate
★★	No longer used
★★★	Adequate/Reasonable
★★★★	Good
★★★★★	Excellent
[N.r.i.o.r]	(for updates only) Item was not rated in original review

**Quality of the explanation of the rationale, the presentation and the quality of information provided:**

★★★★

<b>Overall rating of the Quality of the explanation of the rationale:</b>	★★★★
i) Theoretical foundations of the constructs:	★★★★
ii) Test development procedure:	★
v) Summary of relevant research:	★★★★
<b>Adequacy of documentation available to the user (user and technical manuals, norm supplements etc):</b>	★★★★
i) Rationale:	★★★★
ii) Development:	★★★★
iii) Standardisation:	★★★
iv) Norms:	★★★★
v) Reliability:	★★★★
vi) Validity:	★★★
<b>Quality of the Procedural instructions provided for the user:</b>	★★★★
i) For test administration:	★★★★
ii) For test scoring, norming etc:	★★★★

iii) For interpretation and reporting:	★★★★★
iv) For providing feedback and debriefing test takers and others:	0 stars
v) For providing good practice issues on fairness and bias:	★★★★
vi) Restrictions on use:	0 stars
vii) References and supporting materials:	★★★★★
<b>Quality of the materials:</b>	★★★★★
i) General quality of test materials (test booklets, answer sheets, test objects, software, etc):	★★★★★
ii) Test quality of the local adaptation (if the test has been translated and adapted into the local language):	N/A
iii) Ease with which the test taker can understand the task:	★★★★★
iv) Ease with which responses or answers can be made by the test taker:	★★★★★

**Reviewer's comments on the documentation (comment on rationale, design, test development and acceptability):**

**Design:** The questionnaire booklet is organised in blocks of five questions, as is the answer sheet. However, the columns on the answer sheet do not correspond to the pages in the booklet. The manual suggests that a screening process occurred to avoid items that might seem offensive or invade privacy. It also states that as there are no correct or incorrect responses there is no need for validity or faking keys. The Flesch–Kincaid reading level analysis showed that the inventory is written at the 8– to 9–year–old level.

Overall, the quality of the manual is good; it is well written with extensive referencing to sources (though one reference is missing).

**Rationale:** The manual states that the MVPI was designed for two purposes: to permit an evaluation of the fit between an individual and the organisational culture (it suggests that culture is usually defined by the values of top management) and to allow assessment of a person's motives.

Each of the 10 scales (termed motives scales) comprises items reflecting five themes: lifestyles; beliefs; occupational preferences; aversions; preferred associates. The conceptual background for each of the scales is described in the manual. The MPVI appears to have good content validity for each of these themes. Although the manual stresses the organisational relevance of the instrument, not all the items/themes seem explicitly relevant to the organisational domain. For personal/career counselling use the instrument has good content validity.

**Test development:** No information is given about empirical testing of the instrument in its development.

**Acceptability:** Face validity for assessment of motives, values and preferences is good. The items look credible and are transparent. Questions in the questionnaire are relevant to the general population. They are not explicitly related to the organisational domain.

Scale terms (e.g. 'Affiliation', 'Hedonism') have a rather academic feel, and some would need explaining (to line managers, for example) in terms of their business relevance. These are generally acceptable, but not

highly face valid.

## **Norms, Validity & Reliability**

Evaluation of **technical** information:

★★★★

**Norms or reference group information:**

<b>Overall adequacy:</b>	★★★★
i) Appropriateness for local use, whether local or international norms:	★★★★
ii) Appropriateness for intended applications:	★★★★
iii) Sample sizes:	★★★★★
iv) Procedures used in sample selection:	No information is supplied.
v) Quality of information provided about minority/protected group differences, effects of age, gender etc:	0 stars

### **Reviewers' comments about the norms:**

The overall UK norm group has had two recent updates (1998; 2003) The current overall UK norm group is drawn from a sample n= 2439. This is broken down into six subgroups: males only; females only; University students; working adults; telesales applicants and professional and managerial. The subgroup samples range from 261 (University students) to 2199 (working adults). For each group there is a break down on the basis of ethnicity.

In keeping with US policy, the US norms (n= 3015) are provided as combined males and females only. These norms collated in 1996 have not been updated.

Means and SDs for each scale are presented in each of the tables.

### **Validity:**

<b>Overall adequacy:</b>	★★★
<b>Construct Validity (overall adequacy):</b>	★★★★
i) Designs used:	No information is supplied.
ii) Sample sizes:	★★★★★
iii) Procedure of sample selection:	No information is supplied.
iv) Median and range of the correlations between the test and other similar tests:	★★★
v) Quality of instruments as criteria or markers:	N.r.i.o.r.



vi) Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses:	N.r.i.o.r.*
<b>Criterion-related validity: overall adequacy:</b>	★
i) Description of the criteria used and characteristics of the populations:	No information is supplied.
ii) Sample sizes:	★★★
iii) Procedure of Sample selection:	No information is supplied.
iv) Median and range of the correlations between the test and criteria:	0 stars

**Reviewers' comments about validity:**

**Content validity:** The conceptual base for development of the scales is described clearly in the manual. Item development was based on the content domain of the five themes for each scale. No empirical testing of items appears to have occurred. The item alteration process for the UK version is also described. Content validity for the five themes/10 scales seems good. Different item formats are used within each scale to measure the constructs concerned from different perspectives – e.g. for culture ‘I like to be around artists and writers’ and ‘A dedication to art is the highest calling in life’.

**Concurrent validity:** Two UK concurrent studies are described in the manual, both with very limited and inadequate description of the data and methodology.

**Study one.** This consists of telesales staff in an insurance company with no sample size given. Seven criteria (e.g. number of days sick, time spent on each call) were regressed onto the 10 MVPI scales. Results of regressions of the MPVI scales against the criteria are reported in narrative only. ‘Significant’ results show some intuitively logical relationships. Only one scale predicted more than 10% of the variance in the criteria. A ‘modification’ to the sample was then made and the scores of the most experienced and least experienced staff were compared. Subsequent regression equations appeared to explain greater percentages of variance. However, it is unclear to whom these results refer.

**Study two.** This compares MVPI profiles of 125 employees in different departments in a bank that had been part of a merger. However, only cross-sectional, rather than longitudinal, results are reported. These are in graphical form. The study indicates some cultural differences between the acquired organisation and the acquirer but is incomplete in data presented, as other merger activity had also occurred. This study also illustrates that top management differs in its cultural profile from other employees on two scales.

The studies reported need to be more detailed to allow proper inferences to be drawn.

**Predictive validity:** No information supplied.

**Construct validity:** Reasonable construct validity data are provided, against marker tests. Only one of the marker instruments – Self-Directed Search – is a values/interests measure. The others are mainstream personality measures and ability measures.

Eight construct validity studies with various psychometric instruments are reported. Although not stated explicitly these would appear to have been conducted with US samples (apart from one). The studies are with: Holland’s Self-Directed Search (SDS, n = 167); Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI, n = 46 graduate students); Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI, n = 2058 employed adults); Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI, n = 134 police officer job applicants); Hogan Development Survey (HDS, n = 140 sales and marketing employees); Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal (n = 117 railway applicants); Industrial Reading Test (n = 83 railway applicants); HPI with British sample (no sample information).

For each study a clear rationale for expected relationships is presented. These generally, but not always, work as predicted. Of the previous research which informed the development of the MVPI, only the SDS is included in these construct validity tests. It would, therefore, be expected that the strongest convergent validity would be between the MPVI and parts of the SDS. The strongest relationship is between Culture (MVPI) and Artistic (SDS), at 0.66. The range of other statistically significant relationships is 0.15 to 0.51. While many of the 70 possible correlations between MVPI and HPI are statistically significant they are small, with only 12 achieving 0.3 or greater. The pattern of correlations probably reflects the large sample size and the breadth of the Big Five personality factors covered by the HPI.

As expected, there were no substantial links between the MPVI and cognitive ability tests. The Culture scale did correlate with both cognitive measures, at 0.18.

In addition to comparisons with other psychometric instruments, the authors consider observers' ratings to be probably more important validity information. Three sets of ratings data are presented: from subordinates (n = 500), peers (n = 200) and bosses (n = 35). No reliability data regarding the observers' ratings are presented.

Although the ratings from subordinates and peers were taken in the same organisation, it is not clear whether subordinates and peers used the same or different descriptors for rating bosses. Only correlations for different descriptors are reported for each of the three later groups. Overall, correlations are quite low, ranging from 0.14 to 0.37. Patterns of correlations across the three rater groups vary in their consistency on different scales of the MPVI. The ratings tend to say more about the rater groups and their role expectations /perspectives within the organisational hierarchy than about the construct validity of the MVPI. Further studies to demonstrate the convergent, rather than discriminant, validity of the MVPI would be helpful.

**Reliability:**

<b>Overall adequacy:</b>	★★★
i) Data provided about reliability:	No information is supplied.
<b>Internal consistency:</b>	
i) Sample size:	★★★★★
ii) Median of coefficients:	★★★
<b>Test retest stability:</b>	
i) Sample size:	0 stars
ii) Median of coefficients:	0 stars
<b>Equivalence reliability:</b>	
i) Sample size:	N/A
ii) Median of coefficients:	N/A

**Reviewers' comments on Reliability (comment on confidence intervals for reliability coefficients and provide Spearman Brown equivalents for a 30–item scale):**

Reliability is established satisfactorily through large sample internal consistency data (thousands of subjects) in the UK and US. UK results are based on a sample of 1200 adults (for means/SDs) and 2051

(for reliability).

## **Quality of Computer–Generated Reports**

<b>Overall adequacy of computer–generated reports:</b>	★★★★★
i) Scope or coverage:	★★★★★
ii) Reliability:	★★★★★
iii) Relevance or Validity:	★★★★★
iv) Fairness, or freedom from systematic bias:	★★★★★
v) Acceptability:	★★★★★
vi) Practicality:	★★★★★
vii) Length–number of printed pages:	Interpretive (9)– Index 9 Feedback Summary (3) – Index 3 Data Report (1) – Index 1 Team Builder Report (3) – Index 3 Consultants Brief (3) – Index 3

### **Reviewers' comments on the quality of computer generated reports:**

Five reports were submitted: the Data Report, the Feedback Summary Report, the Team Builder Report, the Consultant’s Brief and the Interpretative Report.

The Feedback Summary Report, the Team Builder Report are both based on the same interpretation of the scales. The introductions to the reports set the context differently that is, in the Feedback report , it is the context of the person’s life and career, in the Team Builder report the context is broader and also includes interaction within a team. These are both written to for the test taker and use the second person throughout.

The Data Report contains the scores in a tabular format and are intended for the skilled and knowledgeable user. The Consultant’s Brief combines the Data report and the Feedback Summary report.

The Interpretative Report is written in the third person. It contains the information about the scales, a graph showing the position of the test taker on those scales and an interpretation of the test taker’s score on each scale.

All the reports are clearly structured and relevant for their purpose which is developmental. The language is clear and where the information is interpreted, the interpretation is clear and relevant.

Overall, these are excellent reports that fulfil their intended purpose in a very clear and simple way.

# **FINAL EVALUATION**

## **Evaluative report of the test:**

The domain of personal values, needs and motivations is approached in a systematic and generally occupationally relevant way. Not all the scales are immediately face valid in a business context, but are open to explanation and relating to business criteria.

Although norms are available for males and females it would have been helpful to have more information about issues related to bias and adverse impact. The manual does present raw score means/SDs for various groups, such as whites (n = 868) and non-whites (n = 126) and under-40s and over (n = 153). However, it is not clear what the composition of the norm tables is. Similarly, guidance regarding possible restrictions on use would be helpful.

Various facets of the MVPI make it an attractive instrument for use with individuals in the assessment of motives, values and preferences. It has good face validity with transparent items that are easy to understand. Content validity appears good in respect of the five themes each scale comprises as well as the 10 scales themselves. The MVPI is easy to administer and interpret with relatively user-friendly software. Overall, the instrument has good internal consistency reliability.

The MVPI is relatively quick and practical to administer using the software. However, scoring is completely locked into software. Psychologists approaching this tool with a view to conducting detailed research at the item level should be aware that no hand-scoring mechanisms are available – so there is no obvious way of identifying items with scales. However, PCL in the UK and Hogan Assessment Systems in the US both give priority to ongoing research with the MVPI and will assist researchers with any analysis at the item level.

The MVPI's authors identify two ways in which the motivational information produced by the MVPI can be useful. Firstly, it can be used to evaluate the fit between a person's interests and the psychological requirements of jobs; thus, the MVPI can be used to help people choose occupations or careers. Secondly, the inventory can be used to evaluate the fit between a person's values and the climate of a particular organisation; thus the MVPI can be used to help people to think strategically about their current careers.

Those looking for tools with which to assess needs and motivational style of employees or 'motivational fit' between candidates or employees and an organisation could consider using the MVPI. It should be borne in mind, however, that the MVPI is more of a 'psychological' tool than some others – attempting to map out key domains of human motivation (e.g. 'Affiliation') rather than addressing business issues like customer service orientation directly.

Although several comments are made about the use of MVPI to assess organisational culture, the manual seems to use the term 'climate' interchangeably with 'culture'. A section of the manual entitled 'Organisational Climate' does not define climate but argues (citing Schneider, 1987), 'The climate of an organisation is a function of the kind of people it retains'. There has been some debate in the literature regarding the similarity of the culture and climate concepts (e.g. Denison, 1996). However, a common view is that climate reflects employees' perceptions of organisational practices (e.g. James & Jones, 1974) and culture is a reflection of employee values and assumptions (e.g. Schein, 1985).

The MVPI does not ask questions about organisational practices.

Adequate information is provided on sex and ethnic comparisons, and disability issues are flagged. There do not appear to be any obvious limitations to use on these grounds.

## **Conclusions:**

Overall, the MVPI is a soundly based assessment tool that will appeal to those seeking to assess employee motivation in a fairly in-depth way. However, it may lack immediate face validity, and links to specific business outcomes are likely to be indirect rather than immediately obvious.

The MVPI has been developed from a broad conceptual base. This breadth would be very useful to individuals in understanding their motives, values and preferences. Therefore, it would be appropriate for use in personal counselling and career counselling/choice contexts. Although there is potential for use as an organisationally focused tool, the data reported in the manual are not wholly convincing in this respect. Because of its broad nature the MVPI may lack face validity for candidates in a job selection context.

**Recommendations:**

- Suitable for use in the area(s) of application defined by the distributor, by test users who meet the distributor's specific qualifications requirements

**Notes, references and bibliography:**

The MVPI has been reviewed by the Buros Institute of Mental Measurement in the US and this review is available on-line at the Buros website [www.unl.edu/buros](http://www.unl.edu/buros).

Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619–654.

James, L. & Jones, A. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 18, 1096–1112.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.

**SUMMARY EVALUATION OF THE TEST**

**Content Domains:**

- Motivation
- Values
- Interests

**Intended or main area(s) of Use:**

- Work and Occupational

**Intended mode of use (conditions under which the instrument was standardised and validated):**

- Supervised and controlled administration. Test administration under the control of a qualified administrator or proctor

**Test Description:**

<b>Test Name:</b>	Hogan's Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory
<b>Local test distributor / publisher:</b>	Psychological Consultancy Ltd
<b>Date of Current Review:</b>	2003
<b>Date of Publication of Current Review/Edition:</b>	1997
<b>Constructs Measured:</b>	Recognition; Power; Hedonism; Altruism; Affiliation; Tradition; Security; Business; Culture; Rationality.
<b>Administration Mode:</b>	Interactive individual administration Supervised Group administration
<b>Response Mode:</b>	Paper and pencil On-line Computer administration, scoring, analysis and interpretation. Scoring is only possible via computer.

No hand-scoring keys available.

**Instrument Evaluation:**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Quality of Documentation	★★★★
Quality of Materials	★★★★
Norms and reference groups	★★★★
Construct validity	★★★★
Criterion-related validity	★
Reliability-overall	★★★★
Number of Computer-Generated Reports	Not recorded

The British Psychological Society © 2007. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.