



# **The test review system and the German standard for proficiency assessment procedures**

Carmen Hagemeister, Lothar Hellfritsch, Lutz Hornke,  
Martin Kersting, Klaus Kubinger, Fredi Lang,  
Helfried Moosbrugger, Gerd Reimann & Karl Westhoff



## Overview

---

- **Testkuratorium: who made the system?**
- **The test review system**
  - Aims
  - Scope
  - Procedure



## Who made the system?

- **Testkuratorium: Committee of the Federation of German Psychological Associations on testing and diagnostical issues**
  
- **Federation:**
  - Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologinnen und Psychologen
  - Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychologie
  
- **in the committee: at present 3 members per association**



## Aims of the test review system

### ● Aim:

- improve quality of tests
  - ◆ test authors
  - ◆ publishers
  - ◆ distributors
  - ◆ reviewer
- criteria
  - ◆ transparent
  - ◆ standardized

### ● other test review systems in Europe

- EFPA - European Federation of Psychologists' Associations
- COTAN - Commissie Testaangelegenheden Nederland van het Nederlands Instituut van Psychologen/NIP



## Effect in the Netherlands

---

- **Is it worth the work?**

- statistics of COTAN
- within decades the share of judgements "insufficient" decreased in all categories



## Scope

---

- "Test"

- intelligence tests
- performance tests
- personality questionnaires
- objective personality tests
- projective tests
  
- standardised interviews
- procedures for workplace analysis



## Procedure

---

- **Choice of tests:** Testkuratorium
- **Two reviewers**, one with an examination in the German standard for proficiency assessment procedures (DIN 33430), part 5 (psychometric basis of proficiency assessment)
- **3 steps** - two independent reviewers



## Procedure

- **Step 1**
  - Requests of 33430 to test manuals granted?**
    - DIN 33430
      - ◆ Proficiency assessment
      - ◆ Specific aspects
      - ◆ Requests to tests: can be applied to all areas
    - Information must be present about
      - ◆ Construction
      - ◆ Empiric tests
      - ◆ Application
      - ◆ Analysis
      - ◆ Interpretation





## Procedure

---

- Checklist 1 of DIN-Screen (Kersting, 2006)
- If possible filled in by publisher, page number manual
- Test "suited to review"?
  - ◆ Not suited to review: "The test does not grant the requests of DIN 33430 for information and documentation."
    - ◆ Negative screening of tests, preparation of test review
    - ◆ No positive screening: use may be inadequate



## Procedure

---

- **Step 2**  
**Categorisation according to systems of ZPID and EFPA**
  - If possible information by the publisher



## Procedure

---

- **Step 3**
  - Review by reviewers
  - 7 categories



## Categories of the review

	<b>Review</b>	<b>max. length</b>
General information, description, aims	free & formalised	1000 characters
Theory	free	1000
Objectivity	free & formalised	1000
Norms	free	1000
Reliability	free & formalised	1000
Validity	free & formalised (if applicable fairness)	1000
further criteria	free	1000
final judgement, recommendation	free	2000



## Procedure

### ● Step 3

- Formalised reviews
  - ◆ The test meets the requests
    - ◆ Completely
    - ◆ To a large extent
    - ◆ Partly
    - ◆ Not
- Final judgement
  - ◆ Not "automatically" from formalised single judgements
  - ◆ Reviewer is to include all aspects in the final acknowledgement and recommendation
  - ◆ Test is to be judged by its claims (aim of assessment, manual)



## Procedure

- **No fixed coefficients**

- Results of studies dependent on
  - ◆ Test
  - ◆ Sample
    - ◆ Coefficients
      - High: heterogeneous sample
      - Real: often selected samples

- **Aim:**

- Studies which give much information about the tests
- Not: high coefficients which cannot be transferred to practical work



## Procedure

---

- **After step 3:**
  - Reviewers send results to Testkuratorium (TK)
  - TK abolishes mutual anonymity of reviewers
  - TK asks for joint version of review
  - If reviewers do not reach consensus:
    - ◆ about joint review: both reviews about disputed parts
    - ◆ about suitability to review: TK decides
  
- **At present**
  - Publishers' suggestions for tests for reviews



**Thank you for your attention!**





## Published

---

(published in the journal of both psychologists' associations, identical text)

Testkuratorium (2006). TBS-TK. Testbeurteilungssystem des Testkuratoriums der Föderation Deutscher Psychologenvereinigungen. *Report Psychologie*, 31, 492-499.

Testkuratorium (2007). TBS-TK. Testbeurteilungssystem des Testkuratoriums der Föderation Deutscher Psychologenvereinigungen. *Psychologische Rundschau*, 58, 25-30.