

# TESTING INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 20, December, 2008 Editor: Jan Bogg



## **PRESIDENT**

Prof. M. Born  
Erasmus University Rotterdam  
Institute of Psychology  
Woudestein, T13-15  
P.O. Box 1738  
3000 DR Rotterdam

## **PRESIDENT-ELECT**

Prof J.Hattie  
University of Auckland  
New Zealand

## **SECRETARY**

Prof. R.K. Hambleton  
University of Massachusetts U.S.A

## **TREASURER**

Prof. Em. Barbara M. Byrne  
School of Psychology  
University of Ottawa  
145 Jean-Jacques Lussier  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1N 6N5

## **PAST-PRESIDENT**

Prof. Jaques Gregoire  
Belgium

## **COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Elected Members  
Prof. Fanny Cheung  
Chinese University of Hong Kong,  
Hong Kong  
Prof. Cheryl Foxcroft  
University of Port Elizabeth, S.A  
Dr Dragos Iliescu  
National School for Political and Ad-  
ministrative Studies/D&D Testcentral  
Rumania  
Prof. Frederick Leong  
Michigan State University, USA  
Co-Opted Members  
Dr David Foster  
Kryterion, USA  
Prof. Tom Oakland  
University of Florida, USA

## **REPRESENTATIVES**

Dr. M. Bullock, IUPsyS  
American Psychological  
Association, U.S.A.  
Prof. D. Bartram, IAAP  
SHL Group plc  
U.K

## **EDITORS**

**International Journal of Testing**  
Prof. John Hattie  
University of Auckland  
School of Education  
Fisher Building  
18 Waterloo Quadrant  
Private Bag 92019  
Auckland  
New Zealand

## **Testing International**

Dr. Jan Bogg  
University of Liverpool  
Department Clinical Psychology  
The Whelan Building  
Liverpool L69 3GB  
UK

## **CONTENTS**

### **ITC COUNCIL NEWS**

**2**

### **ARTICLES**

**Ethical aspects of psychological testing in Romania, D. Iliescu**

**2**

**From test adaptation to development of indigenous measures, F. Cheung**

**6**

**Test Development and Use in Lithuania, G. Gintiliene & S Girdzijauskiene**

**7**

### **NEWS**

**8**

**Indonesian Psychological Association joins ITC**

**8**

**The Indonesian Psychological Association, U. Purwono**

**An ISO Standard for Assessment in Work and Organizational Settings,  
D. Bartram**

**9**

**Second European Survey on Test Attitudes of Psychologists  
to be carried out by EFPA., D. Bartram**

**10**

**ITC 2008 Liverpool Conference, A Personal Report,  
Testing and its stakeholders, N. Smid**

**11**

### **CONFERENCE WATCH**

**12**

**AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TEST COMMISSION**

## MEET THE ITC PRESIDENT Marise Ph. Born

Marise Ph. Born is a Professor in Industrial/ Organizational Psychology at the Department of Psychology of the Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Marise's research interests are in the areas of cross-cultural research, ethnicity and test development, personnel selection, job search and choice, personality and individual differences, entrepreneurship, and the method of meta-analysis. She has (co) authored more than 70 peer reviewed national and international articles and book chapters, among which articles in the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Personnel Psychology, Journal of Vocational Psychology, Journal of Applied Psychology and the International Journal of Selection and Assessment. She currently is member of the editorial boards of the International Journal of Selection and Assessment and Human Performance. Marise was visiting professor in 1997-1998 at the University of Houston, Texas, U.S.A., Department of Psychology and has extensive transcultural experience in several non-Western countries, especially Pakistan and China. She is council member of the International Test Commission and serves on the Test Commission of the Dutch Institute of Psychologists.



~~~

## ITC New Council Member from Romania



Dragos Iliescu holds a PhD in psychology (2003) from the Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania. He is the an associated professor with SNSPA (National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Department of Communication Sciences) in Bucharest, Romania and the managing partner of D&D/Testcentral, the Romanian test publisher. He is specialised in psychodiagnostics and I/O psychology. He has been a driving force in test adaptation in Romania since 2001. Dragos's research interests are in psychodiagnostics, ethics in testing and cross-cultural assessment.

~~~

## ITC COUNCIL, Liverpool, UK, July 2008



## ARTICLES

### Ethical aspects of psychological testing in Romania

**Dragos Iliescu, PhD**  
**National School for Political and Administrative  
Studies / D&D Testcentral, Bucharest**  
**dragos.iliescu@ddresearch.ro**

#### Background

Romania is located in south-eastern Europe, sharing borders with Hungary, Serbia, Ukraine, Moldova, and Bulgaria. Romania developed a strong sense of identity as a Latin nation, but due to its geographical isolation from other Latin nations, represents today a fascinating blend of Eastern and Western traditions.

Psychology has a long history in Romania, with a promising start in the early 1900s, a communistic pruning in the 1980s and a recent blooming. Psychology was introduced in Romania early, three students of Wundt in Leipzig are considered as founders: in 1893 E. Gruber set up a psychological laboratory at the University of Iasi, in 1900, C. Radulescu-Motru started teaching psychology at the University of Bucharest, and in 1922, F. Stefanescu-Goanga organised the first Romanian Institute of Psychology at the University of Cluj (Iliescu, Ispas & Ilie, 2007). All these three centres blossomed rapidly, developing distinct research interests: Cluj specialised in experimental and developmental, Bucharest in theoretical, and Iasi in social psychology (Foreman, 1999, David, Moore & Domuta, 2002).

This promising start was cut short in the 1970s by the regime's decision to outlaw psychology as an independent academic discipline. The communist regime decided to forbid the teaching and practice of Psychology in Romania, some of the most prominent psychologists were sent to prison, others were forced to work in factories in unskilled jobs. Some others, again, were transferred to other academic departments, such as philosophy and educational sciences. It is in these departments that psychology survived (in a manner) during this period. As a result, many of today's mid-career psychologists hold philosophy rather than psychology degrees.

After fifteen years of underground existence, psychology was re-instituted as an academic discipline in 1990, shortly after the collapse of the Ceausescu regime.

The result of this history is that there has been no continuity in the development of psychology in Romania, and that the promising start has been cut short at a time when it had already begun to show competitive results. Nowadays the effects of this heritage are visible both externally and internally. Exter-

nally, Romanian psychology is marked by a strong backwater allure of the research interests, by the lack of visibility on the international scene, and the lack of high impact research. Internally, there is a high deficit of professionals, both in the areas of practicing and in the academic field. Also, internally, a strong attitudinal heritage is visible, marked by some regular practices that may generate seminal discussions with regard to the ethics of our profession.

Psychology as an academic program is present now in 11 universities in Romania. Four of them are considered to be major players. A number of 2-3000 students graduate each year, but only a fraction of them practice psychology after graduation. Until 2006, psychology was studied 8 semesters for undergraduate studies and 2 or 3 semesters for a master's programme. Since Romania's adherence to the Bologna regulations, undergraduates study 6 semesters, with a supplementary 4 semesters for a master's degree. Psychology as a profession is regulated by the Romanian Psychological Board ([www.copsi.ro](http://www.copsi.ro)), which is a normative and certifying body active since 2006. It has certified some 8000 psychologists, who serve now a population of 22 Million people.

Romania has a long history of testing. Prior to 1989, almost all of the renowned and established measures have been imported to Romania for research purposes (16PF, CPI, NEO PI-R, MBTI, Wechsler scales etc.), mostly through direct relationships with the authors, but never through direct contact with the publishers of these tests. These measures were absorbed into academic programs and were thus studied by students, which has a positive side: the measures are known, appreciated and used, and something like a testing culture is visible. The negative result of this makeshift situation is the spread of tests into large-scale illegal usage, an attitude favoring copyright infringement and, of course, the weak psychometric characteristics of the Romanian versions of these measures: usage of old versions, poorly adapted, small or skewed normative samples, low quality of testing materials, no technical manuals, no regular publishing, no training offered to users etc.

At the present time, Romania has three test publishers, one larger (~20 published measures) and two smaller (~3-4 published measures). These publishers are at the forefront of redressing the balance in the ethical adaptation, publishing and usage of psychological tests. They publish only the latest versions, produce good adaptations, usually together with the test authors, run and publish local validation studies, collect large scale and well controlled normative samples, have a high quality of testing materials, publish technical and interpreta-

tive manuals, offer training and workshops to their users.

### **Method**

The research focused on assessing in what way Romanian psychologists gave adopted the new system of test publishing and usage, and in what way and to what degree the old system and the unethical attitudes encouraged by it have marked current test usage in Romania. After all, all of the measures that circulated illegally for so much time may now be used legally by Romanian psychologists. Research design was focused on a descriptive frame and was developed as a questionnaire-based survey, deployed by email to the participants. The domains covered by the investigation are: Copyright infringement (legal vs. illegal), Test materials (quality and coverage), Psychometric characteristics (reliability, validity, norms), Testing procedure (informed consent, divulging test data), Qualification and Training in testing and Test security.

### **Participants**

The intended sample was of 1200 participants. The data was collected in the time-span between 14 April and 10 July 2008 (11 weeks). The return ratio was quite high: 471 out of 1200 participants (39.25%) returned their completed forms. The sample is uncontrolled and is from certain points of view a skewed sample; a major bias is represented by the fact that those who returned the questionnaires are more prone to be (at least in part) into legal usage. Thus, as bleak as the conclusions presented in the next part may seem, we should bear in mind that the reality is even bleaker. Also, in order to ensure participation and accuracy of reactions, even though the questionnaires were distributed through email to the participants (and thus were targeted by name), the completed forms were anonymously uploaded to the project website. This of course brings to the forefront the fact that there is no way of ensuring who has actually offered to responses to the questionnaire.

From the 471 participants, 108 are males and 363 females, which is a distribution loosely mirroring the gender split of the psychological profession in Romania. Participants are aged 21 to 52 years ( $m=29.43$ ,  $SD=6.33$ ). Work experience ranges from less than a year (3.40%), to 1-3 years (21.87%), 4-6 years (21.02%), 7-10 years (21.23%), 10-20 years (25.27%) and finally more than 20 years (7.22%);  $m=8.43$ ,  $SD=6.33$ . The participants are specialized in I/O psychology (98 participants, 20.81%), clinical psychology (202 participants, 42.89%) and educational psychology (171 participants, 36.31%).

## Results

### *Copyright infringement*

When asked if they use legal copies and test materials, 3.82% of the participants stated that they use exclusively licensed materials, 15.07% stated that they have mixed, but mainly licensed usage, 30.57% stated that they use mixed, but mainly non-licensed, 46.28% acknowledge rather non-licensed usage (4.25% non-answers).

Even though both copyright infringement manifests itself both in research and in commercial usage, it is more visible in the area of commercial usage: 33 participants tend to pay the publisher for commercial purposes, opposed to only 4 for research purposes; 6 try to contact the author in order to get free usage of the test for commercial purposes and 78 do this for research purposes. Opposed to these acceptable practices, 336 of the participants "just use the test" in commercial and 308 "just use the test" in research settings.

When asked about the source of illegal copies, 40.18 % of the participants acknowledge that they have them since university, 7.85% have gathered them in time (and still do), and 38.80% search or ask for them, as the need arises (13.16% DK/NA). When looking for an illegal copy, 35.80% would address an University setting, 8.31% would turn to friends, 18.71% to colleagues, 9.47% are given these copies by their employer and 6.47% would search on the internet (21.25% DK/NA).

### *Test materials*

From the total of illegal possessions of testing materials, it seems that 26.27% refer to the questionnaire, 12.60% refer to the answer sheets, 6.43% refer to the scoring form, 31.90% refer to the software, and 22.79% refer to the manual.

The ownership of a copy of the test manual is important, as it discusses directly the matter of competent usage of the test. From all participants, 4.46% state that they own a legal copy of the test manual for all the tests they use, 14.65% have the manual only for some of the tests they use, 9.34% own a legal copy of the manual only for their main measure(s), 62.85% acknowledge that they do not own a legal copy of the test manual for of them (8.70% DK/NA).

Illegal usage of tests is in some areas that profound that some Romanian psychologists have actually never even seen a legal copy of the test materials they use. When asked to think about the test they use most often and to remember if ever having seen the original test materials, 60.30% state that they have at least seen them (if they do not own them), and 22.29% state that they did never even seen the original test materials (17.41% DK/NA).

### *Psychometric characteristics*

The decision to use one test or another, in a specific setting, should strongly take into account the psychometric characteristics of that specific test.

A good knowledge of the specific psychometric characteristics of a measure is presumed to be a prerequisite for the ethical usage of that measure. When asked to think about the test they use most often, and to consider if they have seen empirical evidence of its validity (research or published papers), 4.46% of the participants stated that they had seen extensive evidence of validity, 18.26% said they'd seen some evidence and know there is more they did not see, 17.83% stated that they had seen but scarce evidence. On the bleakly funny part, 25.90% of the participants acknowledged that they had never seen evidence of validity, but they are sure the test is good and that evidence exists, and 22.29% of participants stated that they'd never seen empirical evidence to support the validity claims of that measure, and that they don't know if it actually exists (11.25% DK/NA).

Local research is also important. Local validity studies take into consideration local cultural specificities and prove that the test performs well cross-culturally. When asked about the published research they had seen, about studies run in Romania with the measure they use most often, 0.85% of the participants stated that they had seen more than 10 published papers, 5.94% of the participants had seen up to 10 published papers, 22.93% of the participants had seen only 2 or 3 papers, 12.95% of the participants had never seen one piece of local research (but somehow know that these pieces of research exist) and 52.65% of the participants had never ever seen local research, do not know and do not care if it exists (4.67% DK/NA).

Another question addressed the minimum requirements for validity: what specifically should a test have, before anything else, in order to be considered valid for a specific usage. When asked this question, 44.16% of the participants stated that a test is considered valid by them if it has been approved by the Psychological Commission, 26.75% of the participants stated that it should have a research bibliography of more than 100 published papers worldwide, 2.97% of the participants said that it needed to have been researched worldwide, on the same population as its intended usage and 5.52% of the participants said that it should be researched in Romania, on the same population as its intended usage (9.13% DK/NA).

The problem of norming is chronic in Romania. All of the older versions of tests circulate without indigenous norms, with very old and outdated norms or with norms that do not provide information about the volume and structure of the normative sample. When asked if they use local or international norms, 30.79% of the participants stated that they use international norms and 42.68% of the participants stated that they adhere to local norms (26.54% DK/NA). When asked when the norms had been collected 10.83% of the participants stated

that they use new norms, collected earlier than 5 years (and we may assume that these participants are into legal usage, as no norms have been collected illegally during the past 5 years). A percentage of 6.16% of the participants use norms collected in the last 5-10 years, 30.36% of the participants adhere to older norms (10-20 years), 16.35% of the participants have in usage norms collected more than 20 years ago, and, sadly, 27.39% of the participants don't have a clue when their norms have been collected (8.92% DK/NA). Some of the norms used give information about both the volume and the structure of the normative sample (10.19%). But 44.37% only give information about the volume, while 30.36% give no information whatsoever about volume or structure of the normative sample (15.07% DK/NA).

#### *Testing procedure*

The collection of informed consent from the testees is a point well captured in most of the ethical codes addressing tests and testing. When asked about how (and if) they collect informed consent, only 0.85% of the participants stated that they collect informed consent regularly, in writing, from their testees; 12.95% of the participants collect informed consent verbally, 52.02% of the participants do not collect informed consent (34.18% DK/NA).

The versatility with which the psychologist chooses a specific measure for a specific task is an important part of his/her status as a professional and plays again an important part in the ethical usage of tests. When asked if they prefer to use only one single test for all their needs or to change the test according to the specific needs, 12.95% of the participants stated that they use only one test, 68.79% of the participants use two or three tests, and rotate them according to their specific needs, and 4.46% use 5-10 tests, employed as needed (13.80% DK/NA).

#### *Qualification & training*

Qualifications of users is a touchy subject whenever test are in discussion. As all participants in the present research have been psychologists, issues pertaining of qualification have been investigated through declarative measures. When asked if they consider themselves qualified to use the tests they are using, 46.50% of the participants stated that they consider they are completely qualified, 47.77% consider they are "mainly qualified", and 1.27% consider they are not really qualified, but have no other option (4.46% DK/NA). When asked how many hours of formal training (not experience) they have had for the test they use most, a huge percentage, 77.71% of the participants stated that they had received less than 5 hours of formal training; 4.25% of the participants had received 5-10 hours, 7.43% 10-20 hours, 0.85% 20-50 hours, and only 0.42% of the participants had received more than 50 hours (9.34% DK/NA). A volume of 85.99%

of the participants got their training during the university; 10.83% received training from the test publisher; 2.34% of the participants received training from another provider of training (0.85% DK/NA).

#### *Test security*

Test security is an important topic when discussing testing ethics, but in the present research only two issues have been investigated in this chapter: the release of test materials to non-qualified persons and the training in test-taking.

When asked to whom they release test materials (questionnaires, scoring grids, test manuals or others), 12.95% of the participants stated that they release these to their testees, after the testing procedure, by default, 42.68% of the participants stated that they release this kind of information to their testees, upon request, 27.18% of the participants said they would release these data to the person who had requested the testing (parent, teacher, supervisor or manager) but not to the testee, 99.36% of the participants would release these kind of data to legal institutions (court), upon request and 11.89% of the participants would not release this information to anybody.

When asked if they did ever happen to train a person (friend, family member, client) on the taking of a specific test, 12.31% of the participants acknowledged that they did, and 82.17% of the participants denied ever having done so (5.52% DK/NA).

### **Discussion and conclusions**

Some of the issues discussed show a lack of knowledge on the psychological profession regarding an ethical approach to psychological testing. Among those we may discuss the problems in the area of informed consent, release of test materials, test security, psychometric characteristics that prove validity etc. This is most probably the expression of the fact that among the academic programs that offer an education in psychology, in Romania, those who include ethics explicitly in a course or curricula are few and far between. But this is also the part which may be addressed most easily and where light could be shed in an expeditious manner.

However, other problems mentioned above are rather the expression of a deeply rooted attitude of test users in Romania, probably to be attributed to an emotional and empirical heritage due to the communist era and the difficult situation of psychology, which was outlawed at that time. Among these we may mention the general attitude towards copyright infringement, qualification and training of test users and test security. Unfortunately, these attitudes might be harder to reform and require more time to wear off.

The data presented above proves a state of fact characterized by an extremely poor following of ethical guidelines and standards by Romanian psychologists, with direct repercussions on all the

stakeholders involved in the testing process. Direct repercussions might be seen upon test takers, clients and the society in general, upon the quality of psychological services, upon test authors / publishers, and upon the (still very low) financial income of test authors and test publishers, as this state of affairs cuts directly into their income and their right to receive compensation for their important work. The entire system of test authors, test publisher and test users suffers on the long term, because lack of legal usage does not provide enough spread and in the end enough turnover in order to invest back in the system, in new developments, new norms, new tests. In the end, the psychologists themselves have to suffer, as a low standard of professional practice reflects on each and all.

There is as yet no clear sign that the national associations would assume leadership in fighting the current status. Though all the relevant professional associations in Romania have included testing ethics as an important part of their respective ethical codes, these have not been followed through by clear policies. The only timid actions so far have been on behalf of test publishers and test authors.

The data presented above makes a rather discouraging statement about the current state of ethical test usage in Romania. By no means is this to be understood as a fundamental critique of the state of Romanian psychology; there are more than enough countries in South-Eastern Europe and in other areas of the globe where similar or even worse situations are encountered. Also, by no means should this conclusions reflect upon all specialists practicing psychology in Romania, a great number of them are real and dedicated professionals, paying the utmost attention to the ethical challenges of this profession.

The reason for this research is to provide a thorough understanding of the state of affairs with regard to testing ethics, in Romania. Some of these results may be extrapolated on most of the former communist countries, some not. However, a correct understanding of the negative aspects is the first and mandatory step for future improvements.

## References

- AERA, APA, NCME (1999). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Foreman, N. (1996). Psychology in Romania: Ilona Gorog. *The Psychologist*, 9(3), 125-126.
- Iliescu, D., Ispas, A., & Ilie, A. (2007). Psychology in Romania. *The Psychologist*, 20(1), 34-35.
- Landy, F. J. (1986). Psychology in Romania. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 24, 21-25.
- Moore, D.M., & Domuta, A. (2002). Roma-

nian Psychology on the International Psychological Scene: A Preliminary Critical and Empirical Appraisal. *European Psychologist*, 7(2), 153-160.

~~~

## From test adaptation to development of indigenous measures

**Fanny M. Cheung**  
**ITC Council Member**  
**Department of Psychology**  
**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**

Many people thought that I translated the MMPI just because I studied at the University of Minnesota. In fact, when I headed home after graduating from Minnesota in 1975, I thought I would not be using the MMPI again, because it is a long test with 566 English items. The local Chinese clients would not be able to read these English items, many of which consist of unfamiliar contents. However, when I got home, I was amazed to find that the local clinical psychologists were administering the MMPI to their patients, and translating the items on the spot. So you can imagine how many different "versions" of the MMPI there were, and how equivalent they might be to the original test. I decided that if we were going to use the MMPI in Hong Kong, we may as well have a proper Chinese version. At least, I was familiar with the background and research on the MMPI, so I started to translate, adapt, and standardize the Chinese version. By the time Mainland China resumed psychology in the late 1970s, psychologists from the Institute of Psychology at the Chinese Academy of Science decided to adopt objective psychological tests that were evidence-based. They were delighted to find that we already had a Chinese version of the MMPI in Hong Kong. We started to collaborate on a common Chinese version for the MMPI and later the MMPI-2 and MMPI-A. We collected large representative samples for the norms and conducted validation studies. Now the Chinese version of the MMPI-2 is published by the Chinese University Press, and I am associated with the MMPI forever.

Translating and adapting the MMPI and the MMPI-2 into Chinese gave me a lot of insights into the issues of cross-cultural personality assessment. Using valid imported measures provides us access to their large empirical database and research literature that support their utility. However, we have to consider issues of cross-cultural equivalence of the test items, the constructs, the scales, the test structure, and the norms. We need to build up a research program to demonstrate the validity and utility of the measure. These are issues that are now fundamental to cross-cultural assessment. Even when we have addressed these issues, I still found a gap in

imported Western measures. There are indigenous personality dimensions that are important to the Chinese culture that are not being covered by the imported universal measures.

So together with my collaborators at the Institute of Psychology in Beijing, we decided to develop a comprehensive personality measure that could include both universal as well as culturally relevant personality dimensions. We took a bottom-up approach to identify indigenous personality constructs from folk concepts, classical literature, everyday-life person descriptions, surveys and previous psychological research. We conducted large-scale empirical studies to select items and scales that conformed to high psychometric standards. The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI) was developed in the early 1990s and has been revised and re-standardized in 2001, using large representative samples in China and Hong Kong to establish the adult norms. The CPAI-2 consists of 3 validity scales, 28 normal personality scales and 12 clinical scales. Four normal personality factors and two clinical factors were extracted from the two sets of scales. In joint factor analyses with scales from the Five Factor Model, we found that one of the CPAI-2 factors, Interpersonal Relatedness (IR), did not load on any of the Big Five factors and may be considered to be indigenous to the Chinese culture. This IR factor consists of scales that reflect normative interpersonal orientations emphasized in the Chinese culture, such as harmony and reciprocity in relationship.

Later, when we conducted cross-cultural research on the CPAI-2 with American and Asian samples using other language versions, we found that the CPAI-2 factor structure could still be retrieved in these other cultural contexts, which led us to rename the test as Cross-cultural (Chinese) Personality Assessment Inventory. We have been conducting an active program of research to establish the validity and utility of the CPAI. We have also developed an adolescent version and have collected norms in Hong Kong and China. Although we started with the intention of providing a culturally relevant psychological measure for use with the Chinese people, our research on the CPAI has led us down a theoretical path that informs us about cross-cultural personality theories and assessment.

We are pleased to note that South African colleagues are adopting a similar approach to that of the CPAI in developing their indigenous South African Personality Inventory. Psychologists are now more aware of issues in cross-cultural assessment, though still a lot more needs to be done. ITC provides useful guidelines for test adaptation and test use:

<http://www.intestcom.org/guidelines/index.php>.

For more information on CPAI and publications:

<http://www.psy.cuhk.edu.hk/~cpaiweb/publicdocument/PublicFiles.htm>.

## **Test Development and Use in Lithuania** **Grazina Gintiliene and Sigita Girdzijauskiene** **Vilnius University** **Lithuania**

Lithuania, one of three Baltic countries, has a population of 3.3 million. Its capital is Vilnius and its primary language is Lithuanian. Among persons ages 7 to 24, 82% are engaged in education or other forms of training, with 33% of ages 19-24 in higher education institutions. Five of 17 universities in Lithuania offer psychology bachelors and masters degree programs. Each year approximately 260 students graduate with a master's degree in psychology.

The year 1927 generally is considered to mark the origin of test development and use in Lithuania when Prof. Vabalas-Gudaitis translated the Binet-Simon test of intelligence into Lithuanian. In 1931 he developed nonverbal tests designed and used to evaluate working efficiency or working capacity of school children. Later, in 1940, Prof. Liugminas authored the first locally developed test of intelligence.

The Soviet occupation of Lithuania following World War II lead to a 50-year hiatus in test development and use. Immediately after the restoration of Lithuania's independence in 1990, the country lacked policies addressing the use of psychological assessment in clinical and educational settings. Additionally, reliable and valid psychological instruments were not available. Some tests, typically imported without the permission of their authors and publishers, merely were translated into Lithuanian and used clinically, often by psychologists with little to no training in test use. Neither governments nor professional associations instituted policies that effectively addressed these issues. Thus, having to grapple with a range of challenges, psychologists began to address system weaknesses, in part, through the efforts of the Lithuanian Psychological Association.

The Lithuanian Psychological Association became a member of the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations in 1997, the International Union of Psychology Science in 2000, and the International Test Commission (ITC) in 2002. The Association assumed leadership for test development and use, in part, by adopting its own national regulation for the use of standardized psychological assessment instruments in 1997 and translating the ITC's International Guidelines on Test Use in 2002, establishing the Committee on Psychological Testing and Assessment to promote good testing practices in 2007, and drafting a law governing psychological practice in 2008. This law, if implemented, would require the establishment of a test registration system designed to distinguish well-developed psychometric instruments that meet acceptable standards from others that are less rigorous and do not meet these standards.

The test adaptation work by teachers and students at university departments of psychology also has been instrumental in helping to establish a testing infrastructure in Lithuania. For example, between 1997 and 2008, different project groups at Vilnius University assumed responsibility for standardizing the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–III, Raven Colored Progressive Matrices, Intelligence–Structure–Test 2000R, Wilde Intelligence Test, Practical Technical Comprehension Test, and the Intelligence Test for Visually Impaired Children. Current efforts focus on adapting the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–III, the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence, and the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test–II. Psychologists and psychiatrists collaborated in standardizing The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaires and Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment. The Achenbach was standardized under the leadership of researchers from the Mykolas Romeris and Klaipeda universities. Many psychologists from clinical and educational settings in Lithuania assisted in the data collection of these instruments.

During the last decade, those engaged in test development encountered various and often chronic methodological, technical, and legal challenges. These challenges lead to the development of psychology programs that focus on test construction, test adaptation, and validation. The availability of adapted tests was important in that their use increased interest in test use within the governmental organizations responsible for the provision of the psychological services.

The Lithuanian market is small, test development and adaptation are expensive, government assistance is minimal, and attitudes toward test use and thus test development vary among government agencies. Nevertheless, our experiences demonstrate that an infrastructure needed to develop and use tests in a socially responsible fashion is being developed in Lithuania. Psychologists directing this work have a vision and plan for the future and are expected to display the persistence needed to achieve their goals.

~~~

**Get the Guidelines on  
Internet and CBT Testing  
[www.intestcom.org/](http://www.intestcom.org/)**

### **Indonesian Psychological Association joins ITC**

In 2008, the Indonesian Psychological Association joined the ITC. Urip Purwono of the IPA has provided a brief resume on development of psychology in Indonesia and the goals of the IPA.

**The Indonesian Psychological Association  
Urip Purwono  
Head of Laboratory of Psychometrics and IS  
Faculty of Psychology  
Universitas Padjadjaran  
Bandung, Indonesia  
[urip.purwono@gmail.com](mailto:urip.purwono@gmail.com)**

Psychology education in Indonesia was not started until the late 50's. The emerging field in the country was initiated by the establishment of three undergraduate program in psychology at Indonesia University in Jakarta, Universitas Padjadjaran in Bandung, West Java, and Gajah Mada University in Yogyakarta, Central Java. Since then, the field has grown and gains more popularity attracting an increasing number of high school graduate. At the moment, 11 public/state universities and 72 private higher education institutions in Indonesia offer 62 undergraduate programs in psychology. The three frontiers universities, along with few other private and public/state universities have also been enjoying a significant development, now offering masters' degree and doctoral programs in psychology. With this ever growing popularity of psychology in Indonesia and the increasing number of psychology graduates, the need for a national association of psychology in the country become apparent.

Indonesian Psychological Association was established on July 11, 1959, under the official name of "the Association of Psychology Graduates of Indonesia" (ISPSI, Ikatan Sarjana Psikologi). In 1998 the association changed its name into the Indonesian Psychological Association (HIMPSI, Himunan Psikologi Indonesia). Based in Jakarta, the association is the only scientific and professional organization that represents psychology in Indonesia. Regular members of the association comprise of individuals holding an undergraduate, master, and doctoral degree in the field of psychology. Today, the association has 9100 members, 23 provincial branch offices, and 12 professional associations.

#### **Organization**

The mission of the Indonesian Psychological Association is to advance the science and profession of psychology in Indonesia. To carry this mission, the



association is equipped with two levels of legislative and executive bodies. At the national level, the central executive committee is headed by the president of the IPA. The president is elected to serve for three year terms by the congress, the highest legislative body of the organization made up of delegates from the provincial branches of the association.

Central executive committee consist of the President, Vice President for internal affairs, Secretary General, Vice Secretary General, Treasurer, Vice Treasurer, Public Relation officers, and five compartment heads. The five compartments are the by-law and ethics compartment, the compartment of branch and association relation, the psychology education compartment, the government relation compartment, and the compartment of psychological assessment and measurement, which is the newest compartment created to promote proper development and uses of psychological assessment and measurement, the tool uses by most practicing psychology in the country. As a manifestation to this commitment, starting this year the IPA has joined the International Test Commission as a full member.

~~~

## **An ISO Standard for Assessment in Work and Organizational Settings**

**Dave Bartram**  
**Chair of the BSI committee for**  
**Occupational Assessment services**  
**UK**

*This article is an update and an extended version of an article by Dan Palmer (Head of market development at BSI) that was published in Graduate Recruiter, October 2007, p24.*

As assessment becomes more widely used in recruitment and other work and organizational areas, a new standard is being developed by ISO (the International Organisation for Standardisation) to ensure that assessment procedures and methods are used properly and ethically.

Objective assessment in work and organizational settings, including structured interviewing, bio-data assessments, assessment centres and psychological testing and profiling, has been shown to be a valuable and effective tool for helping industry get the most from employees and for ensuring employees are in jobs that meet their needs and satisfy their wants. As well as providing recruiters and human resource managers with vital data on prospective employees and current staff, occupational assessment provides an opportunity for the individual to find out more about themselves: For example, how they interact with colleagues or how well they fit their current position or organization. This information will help them develop their job-related compe-

tencies and increase their job satisfaction and well-being at work.

But the very nature of occupational assessment methods, and their increasing use in the recruitment industry, brings with it a number of ethical considerations, such as how to protect people from improper or incompetent use of assessment procedures and instruments. The new international standard will address some of these issues.

### **Why do we need an international standard?**

Industry has highlighted the need for a standard to guide the entire process of assessment delivery: from planning, and implementation, through delivery to evaluation and follow-up. Assessment is often seen as either not justifiable in terms of work relevance or as having doubtful value. The standard will focus on the need for assessments to be work-relevant and evidence-based. While focused on the needs of all levels of industry and commerce, employers, employees and potential employees of multinational organisations are likely to benefit especially from the existence of a standard which can be followed internationally.

### **What will the standard include?**

The standard will contain requirements and recommendations for procedures and methods used to assess people in work and organisational settings. They refer to:

- the selection, integration, implementation and evaluation of assessment procedures
- the interpretation of the assessment results and subsequent judgment reports
- the requirements of the qualification of all individuals taking an active part in the assessment process
- fairness and ethical principles in the process
- personnel decisions to be made such as recruitment, selection, development, succession planning and reassignment

### **How is the standard being developed?**

The standard is being developed by an ISO project committee (PC 230). The committee comprises standards specialists and industry experts in the area of assessment drawn from many different ISO member countries, including most of the European Union, the USA and China. A working group creates drafts which the project committee then reviews, both centrally and through national committees. In the UK, this committee input is managed by BSI, the UK's National Standards Body. Publication of the standard is expected in 2010, with a draft becoming available for consultation in 2009. To learn more about the work or to participate, contact BSI.

## **What are the practical implications of the standard for assessment service providers and users of assessment services?**

This standard is a benchmark that providers of assessment services can use to demonstrate that they have the necessary experience and expertise to provide assessments that are fit for purpose. For assessment providers who work on multi-national and cross-cultural assessments, demonstrating that they meet an ISO standard will be of tremendous value to their clients.

One of the areas the ISO standard will focus on is personnel decisions to be made as part of recruitment and selection programmes. Typically, graduate recruitment involves a number of stages of assessment: from an initial application, an initial interview, further assessments, interviews and possibly assessment centres. At each stage, some of the would-be employees will be successful and others will be rejected. The ISO standard will look at the overall process from initial application through to final acceptance, from an assessment perspective, with all the relevant service-provider and client procedures involved. It is designed to apply equally to internal service providers (for example the HR department within a large organisation) as to external ones (such as assessment consultancies).

Once the standard is published it can be used as the basis for certification procedures. These can range from organisations self-assessing against the standard as part of their internal QA procedures to the development of independently accredited certification procedures. How this develops in practice will depend on market pressures from the assessment services client base. Consumers of such services (whether in the public or private sector) may come to see this standard as defining minimum requirements that they would expect of anyone they contract with. We would hope that such process would over time lead to an increase the quality and hence the value of objective assessment as applied in the work and organizational sector.

For the UK, further information from Nick Fleming, Committee Manager, [nick.fleming@bsigroup.com](mailto:nick.fleming@bsigroup.com).

~~~

## **Second European Survey on Test Attitudes of Psychologists to be carried out by EFPA.**

**Dave Bartram  
Convener, EFPA SCTT**

The Standing Committee on Tests and Testing (SCTT) of EFPA (the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations – [www.efpa.eu](http://www.efpa.eu)), has representatives of many of the EFPA 34 member countries sitting on it. The SCTT is supporting a second European Survey on tests attitudes of psy-

chologists. The first survey was held in 1999 under the leadership of Jose Muniz (who was then the SCTT Convener), Arne Evers, and Dave Bartram. For that survey six countries participated: Spain, the UK, the Netherlands, Belgium, Croatia and Slovenia. The number of respondents in the first three countries was big enough to allow for factor analysis (over 2000 in each case). Five interpretable factors emerged. The factor structure in the three countries proved to be similar. The scores of all six countries on these factors were compared. The results were published in 2001 (Muniz et al) in the European Journal of Psychological Assessment as well as in some national journals. In general, European Psychologists showed a positive attitude towards tests and testing, while at the same time expressing the need for institutions to adopt a more active role in promoting good testing practices.

At its meeting earlier this year, the SCTS agreed to repeat this survey in 2009: ten years after the first survey. It will again be managed by Muniz, Evers and Bartram. As before, though, wide participation from the countries represented on the SCTT will be encouraged. Much of the content will remain the same to allow for comparisons between the earlier survey and this one. However, new content is being included to cover advances in testing, such as the use of online delivery. It is important to know if and how attitudes within the profession have changed over the past decade.

All members of the EFPA SCTT are being invited to participate by distributing the questionnaire in their countries. We hope to increase the participation rate over the 1999 study especially as we can now distribute the questionnaire online and hence avoid a large element of cost.

As in the 1999 survey the target population will be practicing psychologists. It will not be restricted to test users and will not include non-psychologist test users, as the purpose is to assess attitudes to tests and testing within the psychology profession as a whole. The aim is to complete the survey in 2009 and be in a position to publish the result in 2010 or soon after. Publication will be targeted at relevant European journals as well as national journals. We will also plan to present preliminary results at the EFPA Congress in Oslo in 2009 and have more detailed results at the 2010 ITC Conference in Hong Kong and the 2010 IAAP Congress in Melbourne. We look forward to a high level of participation in this project, and hope to at least double the number of participating countries from the 1999 level.

Reference: Muniz, J., Bartram, D., Evers, A., Boben, D., Matesic, K., Glabeke, K., Fernandez-Hermida, J.R., & Zaal, J.N. (2001). Testing Practices in European Countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 17, 201-211.

**ITC 2008 Liverpool Conference**  
**A Personal Report : Testing and its stakeholders**  
**Nico Smid**

Half a career ago I used to be a university employed personality researcher with quite a psychometric flavour. Of course, psychometric conferences and symposia were part of my yearly menu then. Since the mid-eighties until recently, however, I have worked in various work organizations outside the academic realm, in several HR consulting roles, with psychometric issues more in the periphery of my attention. And, of course, viewed from a practical application stand. For a number of years I have been back in test and questionnaire construction again, but not so much as a theoretical researcher per se, but geared towards making practically applicable, yet smartly constructed psychometric tools for use in daily HR practice in organizations. So, I joined ITC.

The first ITC conference I took part in as a delegate was the 2006 Brussels one. I was happily surprised by the quality and the practicality of the contributions, getting quickly my interest and understanding on the psychometric track again. This year I went to the Liverpool 2008 conference. Against my professional background the conference theme of "The impact of testing on people and society: enhancing the value of test use" was appealing.

I was not disappointed, as an extensive range of high quality keynote speakers and other contributions were presented which made me wish to be able to replicate myself and attend many sessions. Fortunately however, many contributions have been made available in digital format on the ITC website.

Testing and its stakeholders, that's what the program was about. Of course, testing is a quite practical affair, and its stakeholders are first and foremost to be found in practical applications. Institutions in society and – more in particular – tested individuals themselves. Especially enlightening in this respect was the concluding keynote by Rob Roe from Maastricht University. He emphatically stressed that tests in isolation are not really our product but that they are "just part of services that are offered to clients". Thus – to quote Rob again – "the *'added value of tests'* should not be confused with the *'added value of test-based services'*" (italics his). As far as market share is concerned test-based services still make only a modest contribution to the majority of decisions about policies and individual careers, Rob stated. There is a lot to be won there, especially if we take into account the great number of test technological innovations that have taken place recently and of which the confer-



ence program gave a comprehensive impression. But that's all on the 'product out' side, so to speak. How well do our stakeholders – the 'market in' side – profit from all those innovations? Could be much better than it is now. A serious stumbling block to such dissemination is a poor understanding among our stakeholders of how professional test-based services really can further their interests. In particular, understanding what is the added value of a well-constructed test above just lists of questions, which abound on the internet. Really a challenge to ourselves is to further such understanding! To anyone interested in a well-considered overview of what our present impact on our stakeholders is and how we can improve upon it, I recommend to read Rob's keynote on the ITC website.

At the conference itself I attended some interesting keynotes and symposia as well as individual presentations. From my practical standpoint to gather some interesting ideas and developments I did not choose them very systematically, more like grazing. The starting keynote of Colin Cooper set the stage. In a well-thought and often also funny presentation he sketched the differences and also misunderstandings between the general public and test designers on what tests should and could deliver, based upon his experience in designing the "test the nation IQ tests", broadcasted to millions of people. In particular, he showed how the use of BBC bulletin boards and phone-in shows provided us with a host of relevant public feedback, summarized by Rob Roe as "we struggle with ignorance and bias among audiences, poor understanding of tests scores, unpopularity of certain tests".

Other interesting issues widely covered comprised: Cross cultural testing. Especially, may we use transnational norms? How can we prevent cheating and faking? How can we guarantee our quality for our stakeholders? Recent developments

**Write a review of test development or issues in YOUR country, or any general articles, news or reviews  
Submit for consideration to the Editor of Testing International, Jan Bogg, [jbogg@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:jbogg@liverpool.ac.uk)**

## CONFERENCES

in European harmonization of certification of tests and test users were also reviewed. In my opinion a very important development for a profession that wants to safeguard the interests of its stakeholders in a transparent way.

Furthermore, a great number of reports of ongoing research in parallel presentations, as well as poster sessions were presented, too much to review here but all of them I visited much to my liking. Especially the poster sessions were in a nice big hall in which also the coffee and lunch breaks took place. Offering me in any case ample opportunity for networking among the pleasantly mixed delegate groups: researchers, practitioners, publishers.

The venue as a whole also contributed to a nice atmosphere. A wonderful new Congress centre in a newly constructed part of Liverpool along the river Mersey. Liverpool not only showed its atmosphere as European City of Culture 2008, but it also gave a vital impression of a booming city. This was very pleasant to stroll around between presentations.



And then for a sentimental journey. I took part in an evening dinner for conference delegates in the Cavern Club where the Beatles once started their career.

A tribute 'look and sound alike' band which very well brought the atmosphere back was enough to invite a lot of more senior people like myself to enter the dancing floor again. Surely an agreeable experience.



ITC showed itself well and alive in Liverpool. Its focus on its stakeholders turned out to be a fruitful professional platform for a wide range of contributions. The informal interpersonal atmosphere contributed to the quality of the networking that is necessary for realizing a common dedication to the interests of our stakeholders.

**International Journal of Testing  
Volume 8, Issue 4  
Special Issue on  
Global Norming**

**Latest Issue NOW AVAILABLE**

### **4th International Conference Interdisciplinary Social Sciences**

**8-11 July 2009, University of Athens**

**Athens, Greece**

The International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Sciences examines the nature of disciplinary practices, and the interdisciplinary practices that arise in the context of 'real world' applications. It also interrogates what constitutes 'science' in a social context, and the connections between the social and other sciences. Of particular interest to ITC members will be conference Theme 4: *Social Science Methods What's scientific about the social sciences?* The theme includes quantitative social science methods: surveys, quantification, statistical modelling, quantitative analysis and the ethics of social research.

Conference details on the Conference website. <http://www.SocialSciencesConference.com>

### **7th ITC Conference, July 19-21, 2010 Hong Kong**

The next ITC Conference, will be held in Hong Kong from 19-21 July 2010, with pre-conference workshops on 18 July 2010. The conference will be hosted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong in the English language, and will take place right after the 27th ICAP conference in Melbourne, Australia. Hong Kong is one of the safest cities in the world to visit, English is widely spoken, and travelling and accommodation are easy and comfortable. We invite you to attend ITC's 7<sup>th</sup> conference in this very dynamic part of the world, where the field of psychological and educational testing and assessment is moving forward rapidly.

The conference will be the 7<sup>th</sup> ITC conference in a line of very successful conventions, all of which have been at the cutting-edge of the field of psychological and educational testing. The 7<sup>th</sup> ITC conference is a historic event. For the very first time an ITC conference will be held in a non-Western country, evidencing the global significance of the field of psychological and educational testing. The conference will provide opportunity for a variety of themes, among which themes such as Testing across borders, Testing and policy issues, Professionalization and training in testing, and Testing standards. The conference will contain eminent keynote speakers and invited symposia organizers, an interesting scientific program, and a range of workshops.