

**Psychology 332L - Psychological Assessment
Spring 2021**

Instructor:	David Reuman	Office Hours:	Tues 10:30 – noon
Office:	LSC 215	(all by Zoom)	Thurs 2 – 3:30
email:	David.Reuman@trincoll.edu		or by appointment

OBJECTIVES

This course will examine the methods used to assess differences among individuals in personality characteristics, intellectual qualities, and overt behavior. Topics to be covered include theory underlying psychological testing, principles of test construction and test evaluation, and applications of psychological tests in educational, clinical, and organizational decision-making. The types of assessment to be considered include interviews, surveys, intelligence and achievement tests, projective tests, and behavioral observations.

This course will review and develop your knowledge of statistics, research design, and computer applications (including SPSS and Excel). You will be expected to apply that knowledge to laboratory problems and original research involving psychological tests. Course prerequisites are Psychology 221L (Research Design and Analysis in Psychology) and four previous courses in psychology.

As is true for all psychology courses at Trinity College classified at the “advanced” level, this course will be “writing intensive”. The course will focus on modes of writing – particularly critical analysis and reports involving research synthesis and empirical analyses – that are characteristic of the discipline of psychology. You will be expected to revise your own writing after receiving feedback from the instructor. Be prepared to challenge yourself as a writer.

Core Text

Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2018). Psychological Testing: Principles, Applications, & Issues (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning. ISBN 978-1-377-09813-7 [KS]

COURSE OUTLINE

The lecture/seminar portion of class will meet on Wednesdays and Fridays from 2:00 to 3:15 via Zoom. Lab sessions will meet on Mondays from 2:00 to 4:40 via Zoom. Zoom links are available on the course Moodle site.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
<u>Principles</u>		
Mon, 2/8	Lab 1: Test administrations	
Wed, 2/10	Course overview	
Fri, 2/12	Introduction	KS, Ch 1
Mon, 2/15	Lab 2: Training in content analysis of thematic apperceptive measures	Selected readings
Wed, 2/17	Norms and Basic Statistics for Testing	KS, Ch 2

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
Fri, 2/19	Correlation and Regression	KS, Ch 3
Mon, 2/22	Lab 3: Application of content analysis to class-generated TAT protocols	
Wed, 2/24	Reliability	KS, Ch 4
Fri, 2/26	Reliability	
Mon, 3/1	Lab 4: Norms for psychological tests	Selected readings
Wed, 3/3	Validity	KS, Ch 5
Fri, 3/5	Convergent and discriminant validation	Campbell & Fiske (1959); Wong et al. (1990)
Mon, 3/8	Lab 5: Multitrait-multimethod analysis of thematic apperceptive, self-report, and acquaintance-rating measures of motives	Selected reading
Wed, 3/10	Convergent and discriminant validation	
Fri, 3/12	Writing and Evaluating Test Items	KS, Ch 6
Mon, 3/15	First EXAM	
Wed, 3/17	Test Administration	KS, Ch 7
<u>Issues</u>		
Fri, 3/19	Test Bias	KS, Ch 19; selected reading
Mon, 3/22	Lab 6: Planning for debates	MTMM Analysis Report
Wed, 3/24	Testing and the Law	KS, Ch 20
<u>Applications</u>		
Fri, 3/26	Interviewing Techniques	KS, Ch 8; selected reading
Mon, 3/29	Lab 7: Criterion validity (using class data From Lab 1)	Selected readings
Wed, 3/31	Theories of Intelligence and the Binet Scales	KS, Ch 9
Fri, 4/2	The Wechsler Intelligence Scales	KS, Ch 10
Mon, 4/5	Lab 8: Debate readings on Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness	Selected readings

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
Wed, 4/7	Standardized Tests in Education, Civil Service, and the Military	KS, Ch 12; selected reading
Fri, 4/9	Testing in Industrial and Business Settings	KS, Ch 18; selected reading
Mon, 4/12	Lab 9: Debate readings on Explicit versus Implicit Measures of Intergroup Bias	Selected readings
Wed, 4/14	Test-optional college admissions	Selected readings
Fri, 4/16	Test-optional college admissions	Selected readings
Mon, 4/19	Lab 10: Debate groups: Research review and synthesis	Validity for Decisions Report
Wed, 4/21	Applications in Clinical and Counseling Settings	KS, Ch 13
Fri, 4/23	Testing in Counseling Psychology	KS, Ch 16
Mon, 4/26	Lab 11: Debate groups: Work on Group Presentations	Annotated References for Debate Topic
Wed, 4/28	Testing in Health Psychology and Health Care	KS, Ch 17
Fri, 4/30	The Future of Psychological Testing	KS, Ch 21
Mon, 5/3	Second EXAM	
Wed, 5/5	Project presentations: 2 debate teams	
Fri, 5/7	Project presentations: 3 debate teams	
Tues, 5/11 (3 pm)		Final Reports of Debate Project

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Grading criteria

Course grades will be determined from the following components:

First exam	20%
Second exam	20%
MTMM Analysis Report	15%
Validity for Decisions Report	15%
Debate topic: Research Review and Application	20%
Class discussion leaders / Participation in discussion	10%

Class discussion leaders / Participation in discussion

You are expected to participate actively in all class discussions. You will need to read all of the assigned chapters/articles before the class in which they are discussed and to spend some time thinking about what you have read.

In order to facilitate class discussions, we will form 2-person teams and rotate responsibility for preparing focus questions for several class discussions. As a team, you will briefly summarize major concepts and evidence in your chosen reading and generate focus questions or criticisms that help stimulate thought about a particular set of readings, or the relation of ideas in one session's readings to ideas in previous readings. Teams will distribute these focus questions via Moodle forums by 8 pm on the evening before the day that the readings are discussed. In class, the teams responsible for preparing the focus questions will facilitate a substantial part of the class discussion.

Alternatively, we will rotate responsibility for preparing answers to learning objectives that are presented at the beginning of chapters in the Kaplan & Saccuzzo text.

Format for Written Assignments

All assignments must be submitted in PDF or Word format via Moodle. I will not accept assignments in any other format (e.g., .jpeg) or through other modalities (e.g., email). All assignments must be submitted as a single file; that is, I will not accept individual pages of an assignment. If you prefer to submit your assignment as a PDF, there are a variety of smartphone apps that can be used, such as TurboScan or Tiny Scanner. When uploading/scanning documents, ensure that they are legible and that the edges are not cut off. I recommend using dark ink and leaving at least 0.5" margin to ensure that your work can be read. If I cannot read your submission, I will not be able to grade it. For remote help with technology-related issues, please visit Trinity's Remote Learning website (<https://edtech.domains.trincoll.edu/a-students-guide-to-remote-learning/>) or email sta-help@trincoll.edu.

Debate Projects

In this course we will focus on three long-standing debates in the field of psychological assessment:

1. How valid are college students' evaluations of instructors' teaching effectiveness? How should such evaluations be used?
2. What are the relative validities of explicit versus implicit measures of intergroup bias?
3. Should colleges/universities use standardized tests, such as the SAT and ACT, to make admissions decisions?

The overall objectives of these debates are (1) to learn about research evidence related to the criterion validity of these psychological measures; (2) to understand important controversies in the uses of these measures; (3) to conduct a selective review of research evidence (that goes beyond the course syllabus) related to one of the controversies; (4) to develop a reasoned personal position about one of the controversies; (5) to present oral and written arguments about one of the controversies; and (6) to work constructively in small groups, focusing on a controversy of shared interest.

The final report must incorporate references to at least eight scholarly sources (articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in edited volumes, or whole books) related to the debate topic you have chosen. The overall length of your paper must be at least 10 pages and not more than 15 pages, in APA format.

The schedule for writing up your debate topic will be:

	<u>Due</u>
Annotated References for Debate Topic	4/26
Class Presentations on Debate Topic	5/5 or 5/7
Final Report for Debate Topic	5/11

At the end of the semester you will give an oral (and PowerPoint) presentation on your research project. Each research team should take no more than 15 minutes for the presentation; we will allow about 6 minutes for comments and questions about each project.

Course preparation expectations

“One Trinity course credit is the equivalent of 3.5 semester hours, or approximately 157.5 hours of student engagement per semester, as defined by federal guidelines. For each credit hour awarded, students generally complete no fewer than 150 minutes of in-class instructional or studio/lab time, **and 9 hours of unsupervised out-of-class work per week**, including final exams, final projects, take home examinations etc.” – (Bulletin, 2020 – 2021, p. 59, emphasis added). The laboratory portion of this course will typically require 3-4 hours of out-of-lab work per week, including reading, writing, applying content analysis coding systems, and identifying articles related to your debate projects.

Intellectual honesty

In this course you will be working together with your classmates. There is an important difference between collaborating with others and plagiarism. If you incorporate a published author's ideas or reviewers' suggestions in your work, be sure to give credit where credit is due in an acknowledgments section or reference list. If you are not familiar with the College policy on academic dishonesty or are unclear about the definition of plagiarism, read the College Handbook or talk with the instructor.

The Writing Center

You are encouraged to use the Writing Center, staffed by specially trained Writing Associates, to improve your writing – no matter your skill level. The Writing Center is entirely online during the spring semester. You may choose to upload and discuss your work via live video conference (called Online Tutoring in our system) or upload your paper and receive feedback with the Writing Center (called eTutoring in our system). You can also share the instructions for the assignment and meet with a Writing Associate to discuss plans to successfully complete the assignment. Visit the Writing Center for further information and procedures. You can make appointments online by registering at <https://trincoll.mywconline.com/>.

Students with Academic Accommodations

Trinity College is committed to creating an inclusive and accessible learning environment consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Like many things, the need for disability accommodations and the process for arranging them may be altered by the COVID-19 changes we are experiencing and the safety protocols currently in place. Students with disabilities who may need some accommodation in order to fully participate in this class are urged to contact the Student Accessibility Resource Center, as soon as possible, to explore what arrangements need to be made to assure access. If you have approval for academic accommodations, please provide notification electronically using SARC Online during the first two weeks of the semester. For those students with accommodations approved after the start of the semester, a minimum of ten days notice is required prior to needing your accommodations. Following notification, students are required to meet with faculty to further discuss implementation of accommodations. If you do not have approved accommodations, but have a disability requiring accommodations, or have questions about applying, please contact Lori Clapis, Coordinator of Accessibility Resources at Lori.Clapis@trincoll.edu, or SARC@trincoll.edu, or refer to the Student Accessibility Resources (SARC) website:

<https://www.trincoll.edu/StudentLife/StudentAccessibilityResources/students>.

Student Emergency and Equity Fund

The Student Emergency and Equity Fund provides students with financial assistance for emergency expenses that are temporary, significant, unforeseen, and unavoidable. If you are in need of such funds, please see the link below:

<https://www.trincoll.edu/dean-of-students/campus-life-resources/student-emergency-fund/>

Disclaimer

This syllabus may change during the semester at the discretion of the instructor.

Selected Readings

The following readings will be available on Moodle at <https://moodle.trincoll.edu/login> . You may print them out, download them to your own computer, or read them online. Only one printed copy per student (copyright laws).

Readings for Lab 2 (2/15/21): Training in content analysis of thematic apperceptive measures

Everyone:

Smith, C. P., Feld, S. C., & Franz, C. E. (1992). Methodological considerations: Steps in research employing content analysis systems. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 515-536). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. P., & Franz, C. E. (1992a). Appendix I: Practice materials for learning the scoring systems. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 537-560). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Only members of the "Achievement" scoring team:

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1992). A scoring manual for the achievement motive. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 153-178). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. P., & Franz, C. E. (1992b). Appendix I: Practice materials for learning the scoring systems. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 560-568). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Only members of the "Affiliation" scoring team:

Heyns, R. W., Veroff, J., & Atkinson, J. W. (1992). A scoring manual for the affiliation motive. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 211-223). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. P., & Franz, C. E. (1992c). Appendix I: Practice materials for learning the scoring systems. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 573-582). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Only members of the "Power" scoring team:

Winter, D. G. (1992). A revised scoring system for the power motive. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 311-324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. P., & Franz, C. E. (1992d). Appendix I: Practice materials for learning the scoring systems. In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 596-601). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Readings for Lab 4 (3/1/21): Norms for psychological tests

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Harris, A. C. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Sex Roles, 31, 241-273.

Convergent and Discriminant Validation (3/5/21)

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Wong, F. Y., McCreary, D. R., & Duffy, K. G. (1990). A further validation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A multitrait-multimethod study. Sex Roles, 22, 249-259.

Reading for Lab 5 (3/8/21): Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis

McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1992). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? In Charles P. Smith (Ed.), Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis (pp. 49-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Test Bias (3/19/21)

Anastasi, A. (1982). Statistical analyses of test bias. In A. Anastasi, Psychological Testing (5th ed.) (pp. 183-191). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Interviewing Techniques (3/26/21)

Eva, K. W., Rosenfeld, J., Reiter, H. I., & Norman, G. R. (2004). An admissions OSCE: The multiple mini-interview. Medical Education, 38, 314-326.

Readings for Lab 7 (3/29/21): Criterion validity

Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6, 287-300.

Peterson, C., & Villanova, P. (1988). An expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97, 87-89.

Sweeney, P. D., Anderson, K., & Bailey, S. (1986). Attributional style in depression: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 974-991.

Tennen, H., & Herzberger, S. (1985). Attributional Style Questionnaire. In D. J. Keyser and R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), Test Critiques (Vol. 4) (pp. 20-32). Test Corporation of America.

Debate Readings for Lab 8 (4/5/21): Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 54, 22-42.

Grades versus Standardized Tests as Predictors of College Success (4/7/21)

Geiser, S., & Santelices, M. V. (2007). Validity of high-school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year: High-school record vs. standardized tests as indicators of four-year college outcomes. Research and Occasional Paper Series, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California – Berkeley.

Validity for Decisions (4/9/21)

Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2005). Validity for decisions: Criterion-related validity. In K. R. Murphy and C. O. Davidshofer, Psychological Testing: Principles and Applications (6th ed.) (pp. 178-201). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson / Prentice Hall.

Debate Readings for Lab 9 (4/12/21): Explicit versus Implicit Measures of Intergroup Bias

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.

Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97, 17-41.

Kurdi, B., Seitchik, A. E., Axt, J. R., Carroll, T. J., Karapetyan, A., Kaushik, N., Tomezsko, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2019). Relationship between the Implicit Association Test and intergroup behavior: A meta-analysis. American Psychologist, 74, 569-586.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In John F. Dovidio and Samuel L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism (pp. 91-125). San Diego: Academic Press.

Oswald, F. L., Mitchell, G., Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., & Tetlock, P. E. (2013). Predicting ethnic and racial discrimination: A meta-analysis of IAT criterion studies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105, 171-192.

Test-optional College Admissions (4/14/21)

Shaw, E. J. (2018). The core case for testing: The state of our research knowledge. In J. Buckley, L. Letukas, and B. Wildavsky (Eds.), Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions (pp. 40-63). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Maguire, E. (2018). Going test-optional: A case study. In J. Buckley, L. Letukas, and B. Wildavsky (Eds.), Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions (pp. 171-192). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Test-optional College Admissions (4/16/21)

Bowen, W. G., Chingos, M. M., & McPherson, M. S. (2018). Test scores and high school grades as predictors. In J. Buckley, L. Letukas, and B. Wildavsky (Eds.), Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions (pp. 193-226). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Belasco, A. S., Rosinger, K. O., & Hearn, J. C. (2018). The test-optional movement at America's selective liberal arts colleges: A boon for equity or something else? In J. Buckley, L. Letukas, and B. Wildavsky (Eds.), Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions (pp. 260-287). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.