AI Hasn't Broken Personality Assessments.
Here's What the Research Says.

Over the past year, one message has been everywhere in our industry: AI is changing how we assess people, and traditional assessments are on their way out. I've always believed personality assessments would hold their ground, but belief isn't evidence. Recently, I read a research paper by Alan Redman (2026), *Has AI broken traditional assessments?*, which looks at whether AI makes it easier to cheat on assessments. I read it closely, along with related research, looking for what supports my view and what challenges it.

What AI can and can't do

People have always tried to cheat on tests, either by finding the answers in advance or by getting someone else to take the test for them. Redman shows that AI hasn't created a new way to cheat. It has made the second route easier, but mainly on tests with clear right answers, such as verbal reasoning. Even there, time limits and AI's tendency to give confident wrong answers get in the way.

The research is also still thin. A 2025 review found only seven proper studies on AI cheating in workplace assessments. Much of the current fear is running ahead of the facts.

Why personality assessments are different

A personality assessment has no right answers. It assesses who you are: the core you. As Redman puts it, it is hard to see how AI could provide "the correct answers."

The picture isn't one-sided. Phillips and Robie (2024) found that AI can distort personality responses, but its ability to do so was inconsistent and depended heavily on how the test was designed. A larger 2025 study by Robie and colleagues found that ChatGPT did not consistently fake better than real people. The risk is real but manageable, and well-designed personality assessments hold up.

The "modern" alternatives aren't safer

Redman notes that CVs were easy to fake long before AI. Even game-based assessments, often sold as the future, can be beaten with online guides, bots or repeated practice.

How we've approached it

At 27 Echo, we built protection into the design of the assessment itself. An impression management scale flags when someone is trying to present an overly polished picture of themselves. A response consistency scale picks up answers that don't hang together, which is often a sign of guessing or outside help. Our questions are also designed so that a candidate may believe an item is measuring one quality when it is actually measuring another. That makes it very hard, for a person or an AI, to work out the "ideal" answer. Proctoring adds a further layer, in line with the countermeasures Redman highlights.

My view

The assessment industry is changing, and it should. But the fundamentals still hold. Tests with right-or-wrong answers can be looked up, and answers can be generated. The core you can't. That is why well-designed personality assessments are here to stay.

Contributor: Dr. Tanvi Chaturvedi, CEO

References

Phillips, J., & Robie, C. (2024). Can a computer outfake a human? Personality and Individual Differences, 217, Article 112434.

Redman, A. (2026). Has AI broken traditional assessments? Assessment & Development Matters, 18(1), 4–10.

Robie, C., Phillips, J., Bourdage, J. S., Christiansen, N. D., Dunlop, P. D., Risavy, S. D., & Speer, A. B. (2025). Can ChatGPT outperform humans in faking a personality assessment while avoiding detection? International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 33(3), Article e70015.