

Assessment Comparison

Hogan vs. The Enneagram Institute®

<p>Hogan Assessment Systems leads the world in personality assessment and leadership development. Hogan is grounded in more than 4 decades of validated research and was the first to scientifically measure personality for business. Hogan was founded in 1987 by Drs Robert and Joyce Hogan. Hogan has local distributors in more than 30 countries and has provided assessment services to more than 1500 companies worldwide.</p>	<p>About The Company</p>	<p>The Enneagram Institute® is the main proponent of Oscar Ichazo’s Enneagram Personality Types theory. Founded in 1997 by Don Richard Riso, M.A. and Ross Hudson, the institute’s aim is to further the research and development of this theory and promote it as a tool for understanding “our path to self-knowledge.” The applications of this model are highly flexible, and the institute has independent affiliates both internationally and domestically.</p>
<p>Hogan Assessments feature three core tests that measure different aspects of personality: normal personality characteristics, career derailment risks, and core value drivers. These three assessments can be taken separately, but are most powerful when used together.</p>	<p>About the Assessments</p>	<p>The Enneagram Institute has two core tests, the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI® v2.5) and the Instinctual Variant Questionnaire (IVQ v2.0). Both of these tests are based on Ichazo’s Enneagram of Personality Types theory. Ichazo cited the ancient Enneagram symbol, mystical Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Taoism, and Greek philosophy as inspiration.</p>
<p>The Hogan Assessment suite features three tests that each take 15-20 minutes to complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) has 206 items that comprise 7 primary scales and 6 occupational scales • The Hogan Development Survey has 168 items that comprise 11 primary scales • The Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI) has 200 items that comprise 10 primary scales 	<p>Assessment Options</p>	<p>The Enneagram Institute® offers two tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI® v2.5) has 144 items across 9 personality types and takes 40 minutes to complete • The Instinctual Variant Questionnaire (IVQ v2.0) is a forced choice test that has 37 items across 3 basic instinctual intelligences and takes 15 minutes to complete
<p>Hogan offers over 25 report options that target a wide variety of specific business needs.</p>	<p>Report Options</p>	<p>The Enneagram Institute® offers a report for both of their tests</p>
<p>Hogan Assessments can be used for recruitment, selection, development, performance management, succession planning and team building.</p>	<p>Business Applications</p>	<p>The Enneagram Institute® recommends using their tests in corporate, educational, medical, and personal settings for executive leadership, consulting/HR, healthcare, and religious/spiritual organizations. However, limited evidence is available about the legal defensibility of their tests, so users should proceed with caution before applying these assessments in professional settings.</p> <p>Not appropriate for selection</p>



<p>Hogan Assessments are based on Socio-Analytic Theory that posits that humans have evolved to accomplish three main goals in life: get along, get ahead and find meaning. The three core assessments conform to prominent personality theories such as the Five-Factor Model.</p>	<p>Theoretical Background</p>	<p>The Enneagram of Personality Types was developed without scientific, empirical evidence and is based on personality typing. The RHETI® v 2.5 categorizes people into nine personality types, such as the Romantic, the Performer, and the Mediator; meanwhile, the IVQ v 2.0 measures three underlying basic instinctual intelligences: Self-preservation, Social, and Sexual (Attraction).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal consistency averages are .76 for the HPI, .71 for the HDS, and .76 for the MVPI; The average test-retest reliability is .81 for HPI, .70 for the HDS, and .79 for the MVPI • Predictive validity of the combined assessments is .54 for predicting job performance across job families 	<p>Reliability and Validity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enneagram philosophies are widely regarded as pseudoscience, open to wide interpretation, and difficult to scientifically test or validate • There is some guarded support for the RHETI® v 2.5’s reliability and validity, but at present minimal scientific research has been conducted
<p>Assessments are available in nearly 50 languages; Reports are available in over 30 languages.</p>	<p>Languages</p>	<p>Publisher does not provide information on test translations</p>
<p>In addition to global norms, local norms for the HPI, HDS, and MVPI are available in over 30 languages based on data from over 2 million, 1 million, and 68,000 working adults respectively across countries, industries, organizations, and jobs.</p>	<p>Norms</p>	<p>Publisher does not provide information on global and/or local norms</p>

The most important question to ask when selecting an assessment tool is “does the tool assess what I want it to assess?” Hogan assessments are built to predict job performance. This means they can be used to evaluate employability and job fit, and provide a solid basis for development. Hogan assesses a candidate along 28 unique scales that measure normal personality characteristics, derailment risks, and core values that motivate us in the professional world. This allows for degree of precision that most assessments do not.

Although the tests provided by the Enneagram Institute® may provide positive feelings of well-being and an increased sense of self, there is still a lot of research to be done on whether these tests have predictive value for real world situations. Furthermore, the mystical orientation of the assessment, as well as its vague personality types, limits scientist’s ability to test the Institute’s claims. Because the Enneagram Personality Types Theory is fundamentally non-scientific, we do not find it appropriate for use as a professional, work-based assessment.