



Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

# Personality and Individual Differences

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/paid](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/paid)



## The values of work success

Adrian Furnham<sup>a,\*</sup>, Gillian Hyde<sup>b</sup>, Geoff Trickey<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Clinical, Educational, and Health Psychology, University College London, London WC1H 0AP, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup> PCL Tunbridge-Wells, Tunbridge-Wells TN4 8AS, United Kingdom

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 2 January 2013

Received in revised form 6 April 2013

Accepted 17 April 2013

Available online 7 June 2013

#### Keywords:

Values

Motives

Occupational preferences

### ABSTRACT

This study attempted to examine the work value correlates on various occupational scale dimensions like service, sales and management. In all 1458 people completed two validated questionnaires: one measuring six occupational scales (HPI: Hogan Personality Inventory) and the other measuring the values and preferences that indicate the type of work that an individual would like to do, and is best suited for (MVPI: Motives and Values Preferences Inventory). There were many sex differences on the values measured. Hierarchical regressions showed some values (Affiliation, Power, Recognition) related to many of the occupational scales but often in the opposite direction. Factor analysis suggested three overall value/vocation factors (Enterprising, Traditional and Social). Implications for vocational guidance and limitations of the study are considered.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the relationship between six work criteria-focused occupational personality scales and a test of work values and preferences which is concerned with work motivation. There are various taxonomies of value systems in the area of personality and vocational psychology which are used to help make decisions on vocational choice and change. The one theory of vocational preferences that has attracted most attention is Holland's Theory of Vocational Choice (Holland, 1966, 1973, 1985). It has also served to inspire other instruments such as the one used in this study. Inevitably there have been various attempts to examine the relationship between personality measures and values, mainly using the Holland measure (De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1997; Furnham, 1994, 2001; Goh & Leong, 1993; Schinka, Dye, & Curtiss, 1997; Tokar & Swanson, 1995).

This study will use the Hogan and Hogan (1999) Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI) which is a modern, psychometrically valid measure which has been validated in over 100 organisations with working adults and completed by 200,000 people in the last 10 years (Hogan, Hogan, & Warrenfeltz, 2007). It measures 10 values set out in Table 1. It is based on Holland's work and ideas (Hogan & Blake, 1999). It has been used in a number of studies on leadership efficacy and fit (Furnham, Hyde & Trickey, 2013; Giberson, Resick, & Dickson, 2005; Thomas, Dickson, & Bliese, 2001).

The 10 dimensions of MVPI were arrived at by a content analysis of the literature including the taxonomies of five authors work-

ing in the area (Hogan & Hogan, 1999, p. 11). A principal component analysis yielded four factors relating to Holland's Enterprising, Social, Conventional and Investigative types. Correlations with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) showed the Affiliation scale to be a good marker (i.e. consistent high correlate) for Extraversion-Introversion, Aesthetics and Security for Sensing-Intuition; Altruism for Thinking-Feeling and Security and Tradition for Judging-Perceiving. They also reported correlations with the seven factor Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). Many correlations were significant ( $N = 2692$ ), and nine were  $r > .30$ . They showed Adjustment (Neuroticism) negatively related to Hedonism; Ambition positively correlated with Affiliation; Sociability with both Affiliation and Recognition; Likeability (Interpersonal Sensitivity, Agreeableness) with Affiliation; Prudence positively with Security and Tradition but negatively with Hedonism; and Intellect (Inquisitive; Openness) positively with Aesthetic and School Success ( $r > .20$ ).

This study looks at occupational scale correlates of these values. In this sense the study is partly a validation on the MVPI. Hogan and Hogan (1999) developed six criterion-established scales that are proxy measures of success in various types of occupations such as the service industry and sales. They should be interpreted as reflecting potential for success in different occupations. They have been used in various studies (Muchinsky, 1993). This study will use that measure. These subscales were developed over a number of years by correlating HPI facet scores (HICs) with observer and behavioral criteria in various organisations. The idea of devising criterion-focused occupational personality scales is well established (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001). Perhaps the two scales that have been most explored are Service Orientation (Muchinsky, 1993) and Reliability (Stone, Kisamore, & Jawahar, 2008).

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [ucjtsaf@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ucjtsaf@ucl.ac.uk) (A. Furnham).



work materials; (d) Aversions, which reflect attitudes and behaviours that are either disliked or distressing; and (e) Preferred Associates, which include the kind of persons desired as co-workers and friends. The initial norms for the inventory were based on the responses of 10,000 employed adults from a variety of industries including healthcare, banking and finance, food service, construction and transportation. More than 200,000 people have completed the MVPI over the past 10 years and it continues to be used as the primary tool for assessing values in hundreds of organisations throughout the world. MVPI scores are quite stable over time, with test–retest reliabilities ranging between .64 and .88 (mean = .79). More than 100 validation studies have been conducted on the MVPI with results indicating that the inventory is effective in predicting job performance and outcome variables such as turnover (Hogan Assessment Systems; Tulsa, USA; Thomas et al., 2001).

### 2.3. Procedure

Participants were tested by a British based psychological consultancy over a 10-year period. They were tested as part of an assessment centre commissioned by their employer. Attendance was mandatory. Inevitably this could have affected their results because of issues such as impression management and general dissimulation. Most of the participants were given personal feedback on their scores. They were nearly all employed as middle to senior managers in British companies.

### 3. Results

Table 1 shows both sex differences in the rated values, and also a Varimax rotated factor analysis of the ten scales which was done so that results could be compared with other studies that examined the “higher order” structure of the MVPI (Furnham, Hyde, & Trickey, 2013). Seven of the 10 values showed significant sex differences: males scored higher than females on Power, Commerce and Science, while females scored higher than males on Hedonistic, Altruistic, Affiliation and Aesthetics. The orthogonally rotated factor analytic results showed three factors: the first was described as *Enterprising*, the second *Social* and the third *Tradition*. Other studies that have factor analysed the MVPI show similar results (Furnham et al., 2013), though the manual suggested a slightly different four factor solution.

Table 2 shows the results of the hierarchical regressions with the six occupational scales as the criterion variables and sex, age,

social desirability and the 10 values as predictor variables. Sex, age and social desirability were entered first, then the 10 variables. The table shows the total variance accounted for in the final step. It is a matter of debate as to whether social desirability is measuring a style variable (impression management) or is, in and of itself, a substantial trait (Furnham, 1986). Thus it was placed in the first block in the regressions, and treated as a possible measure of dissimulation.

All the regressions were significant: sex, age and social desirability accounted for relatively little of the variance (six with equal or less than 5%). In three of the regressions the total variance accounted for was over 25%.

Six values were associated with *Service Orientation*. Those scoring high on Altruism, Affiliation and Commerce, but low on Recognition, Power and Hedonism seemed best suited to *Service Orientation* jobs. That is, three values show positive and three negative residual relations with this scale score.

Four values were strongly predictive of *Stress Tolerance* at work: Those who scored low on Recognition and Hedonism, but high on Affiliation and Power. There were two values that were positively associated with *Reliability* (Affiliation and Security) and four negatively associated with *Reliability* (Recognition, Power, Hedonism and Aesthetics). Three of the values were relatively strongly associated with *Clerical Potential*: High on Power and Affiliation but low on Hedonism.

The regression with *Sales Potential* as the criterion showed that over half of the variance was accounted for. Those who have the potential to be good sales people were very high on Affiliation and low on Security, and also high on Recognition and Altruism. The final regression with *Managerial Potential* as the criterion variable showed five of the values strongly related to it. Those with Management Potential, assessed by this scale, were high on Power and Affiliation but low on Recognition, Hedonism and Aesthetics. Thus two values were positively and three negatively related to this scale score.

It is likely that the occupational scores are themselves correlated and that the above analysis may increase Type 1 errors. Thus the six occupational factors were treated to a Varimax rotated factor analysis. Table 3 shows two factors: the first had all scales loading highly except Sales Potential while the second had Sales Potential loading significantly positively and Reliability negatively.

Two further hierarchical regressions were run. The criteria were the two above factors derived from the occupational scales; the predictor variables, first gender, age and social desirability and then the three factors derived from the factor analysis of the value scales as shown in Table 1. The first hierarchical regression was

**Table 2**  
Results of regressions for six occupational scales. Number in bold signify the most significant, high loading values.

Variables	Service Orientation			Stress Tolerance			Reliability			Clerical Potential			Sales Potential			Managerial Potential		
	r	Beta	t	r	Beta	t	r	Beta	t	r	Beta	t	r	Beta	t	r	Beta	t
Age		-.01	-.48		.02	.70		.03	1.03		.05	1.99		-.09	-3.37		.00	.08
Sex		.05	1.87		-.19	-7.40		.01	.19		-.17	-6.41		-.17	-6.55		-.13	-4.98
Social desirability		-.01	-.44		-.19	-7.32		-.12	-4.60		-.09	-3.64		.06	2.28		-.06	-2.34
1. Recognition	-.18	-.19	-6.32	-.16	-.23	-7.64	-.26	-.13	-4.74	.01	-.11	-3.61	.35	.18	7.73	.20	-.12	-4.18
2. Power	-.14	-.14	-4.18	.08	.17	5.15	-.24	-.16	-4.95	.23	.29	8.93	.32	.09	3.46	.31	.38	11.93
3. Hedonistic	-.09	-.11	-3.94	-.14	-.18	-6.55	-.27	-.24	-9.12	-.09	-.20	-7.34	.22	-.03	-1.56	-.13	-.28	-10.57
4. Altruistic	.28	.29	9.86	.03	.05	1.56	.06	.03	.94	.11	.09	3.17	.20	.12	5.44	.05	.02	.65
5. Affiliation	.21	.26	9.41	.15	.21	7.58	.01	.21	8.05	.22	.21	7.63	.56	.39	18.1	.23	.27	10.05
6. Tradition	.03	-.10	-3.57	-.04	-.06	-2.09	.08	.02	.80	.05	.01	.16	-.02	-.04	-1.76	.06	.02	.84
7. Security	.04	.05	1.83	-.09	-.06	-2.32	.28	.28	11.27	-.12	-.08	-3.17	-.43	-.36	-17.79	-.04	-.00	-.07
8. Commerce	-.00	.12	4.02	.06	.06	1.92	-.03	.05	1.82	.10	.02	.61	.10	.04	1.90	.19	.06	2.10
9. Aesthetics	-.01	-.01	-.44	-.11	-.09	-3.26	-.20	-.13	-5.01	-.04	-.08	-3.16	.19	.04	2.16	-.11	-.13	-5.01
10. Science	.00	-.01	-.40	.01	.02	.57	-.06	-.03	-1.19	-.03	-.01	-.50	.07	.04	2.01	.05	-.01	-.37
F(14,1444) =		27.09			26.43			38.17			26.11			118.57			37.33	
AdjR <sup>2</sup>		.19			.19			.25			.18			.51			.25	

- Furnham, A., Hyde, G., & Trickey, G. (2013). The dark side of career preference: Dark side traits, motives and values. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, in press.
- Furnham, A., Trickey, G., & Hyde, G. (2012). Bright aspects to dark side traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 908–913.
- Giberson, T., Resick, C., & Dickson, M. (2005). Embedding leader characteristics: An examination of homogeneity of personality and values in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1002–1010.
- Goh, D., & Leong, F. (1993). The relationship between Holland's theory of vocational interest and Eysenck's model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15, 555–562.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan personality inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Blake, R. (1999). John Holland's vocational typology and personality theory. *Journal of Vocational Psychology*, 55, 41–56.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1999). *Motives, values, preferences inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Centre.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2007). *The Hogan guide: Interpretation and uses of Hogan inventories*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Holland, J. (1966). *A psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and environments*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.
- Holland, J. (1973). *Making vocational choices. A theory of career*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holland, J. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McClelland, D. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York: Free Press.
- Muchinsky, P. (1993). Validation of personality constructs for the selection of insurance industry employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 7, 475–482.
- Myers, I., & McCauley, M. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Ones, D., & Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity tests and other criterion-focused occupational scales (COPS) used in personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 31–39.
- Schinka, J., Dye, D., & Curtiss, G. (1997). Correspondence between five-factor and RIASEC models of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68, 355–368.
- Stone, T., Kisamore, J., & Jawahar, I. (2008). Predicting students' perceptions of academic misconduct on the Hogan personality inventory reliability scale. *Psychological Reports*, 102, 495–508.
- Thomas, J., Dickson, M., & Bliese, P. (2001). Values predicting leader performance in the US army reserve officer training corps assessment centre. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 181–196.
- Tokar, D., & Swanson, J. (1995). Evaluation of the correspondence between Holland's vocational personality typology and the five factor model of personality. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 46, 89–108.