

# Similarities and differences in challenges of test development, adaptation, and standardization: A descriptive study of Croatian and Italian psychologists' attitudes

Adriana Lis<sup>1</sup>, Krunoslav Matešić (Jr.)<sup>2</sup>, Ariana Antonelli<sup>3</sup>,  
Krunoslav Matešić<sup>4</sup>, Filippo Aschieri<sup>5</sup>

1 University of Padova, Via 8. Febbraio 2, I-32122 Padova

2 Catholic University of Croatia, Ilica 242, 10000 Zagreb

3 Scuola di Psicoterapia Integrata, Via Rossini 75, I-54100 Massa

4 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb

5 The European Center for Therapeutic Assessment, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Largo Agostino Gemelli 1, I-20123 Milan

**Abstract:** Psychological evaluation is a method that uses a variety of methodologies to develop hypotheses about people's strengths and weaknesses, skills, and limits in terms of their behavior, personality, and talents. The goal of this initial qualitative study was to show parallels and variations in attitudes toward test formulation and adaption in Italy and Croatia, taking into account the historical context of psychologists' development in these two countries. A questionnaire having 32 attitude items was completed by 565 Croatian and 1474 Italian psychologists. Psychologists in both countries said they utilize tests regularly, with Croatians using them substantially more often than Italians, although the standard deviation in Italy was higher. In both countries, there was broad agreement that the use of psychological tests should be limited to certified psychologists and that although non-psychologists may administer and score tests, only psychologists should interpret them and provide feedback. As for online administration, in general, both countries had a moderate agreement concerning the benefits of this kind of administration, the enhancement of its quality, the potential risk of fraud, privacy violation, and poor test administration quality. Italian psychologists were substantially less happy with their bachelor's and master's degree training than Croatian psychologists in Croatia. Although the two countries under investigation had quite different origins, these descriptive first findings revealed many parallels in the answers and, more importantly, in the significance of "safeguarding" tests and testing against misuse.

**Keywords:** psychological testing, testing practice, test use, European Federation of Psychologists' Association

## INTRODUCTION

---

The EFPA (European Federation of Psychologists Association) Board of Assessment agreed on the following definition of assessment: “a systematic method or procedure for ascertaining the psychological characteristics or the performance of an individual or group of individuals” (EFPA, 2022). As for the “psychological characteristics,” the Board emphasizes that the term is used to differentiate between physical and psychological characteristics rather than imply any restriction to trait-like attributes. The definition is based on that developed for the ISO 10667 standard on assessment and this makes clear that it covers all types of psychological attributes, assessed at an individual as well as aggregate levels (team, organization, network, family, social group, etc.). The Board realizes that future use of the definitions needs to include statements that ‘unpack’ what is meant by ‘psychological characteristics’ and ‘performance’. In this direction, Framingham (2017) suggested that psychological assessment is a process that uses a combination of techniques to help develop some hypotheses about people and their strengths and weaknesses, their competencies, as well as their limitations concerning their behavior, personality, and capabilities.

Psychologists’ task is to evaluate the information gathered from psychological assessment and weave it into a comprehensive and complete picture of the person being tested and report on them objectively but helpfully. Four components of psychological assessment have been identified: norm-referenced testing, interview, observation, and informal assessment (including testing when scientific validity is not fully assessed) (Framingham, 2017). Psychologists can use all types of tools to observe and measure a client’s (patient’s) behavior, understand the nature of the prob-

lem (diagnosis), and figure out the best way to go about addressing it (treatment plan).

Researchers have developed and evaluated norm-referenced tests and proven them effective for measuring a particular trait or disorder. Psychological testing (NRT; norm-referenced tests) can gather invaluable accurate and specific information through their unique perspective regarding numerous facets of a person’s life. Data of an individual functioning (e.g., interpersonal, intrapersonal, emotional, behavioral, and cognitive) gathered through NRT can aid in identifying specific challenges, areas of need, clarifying diagnoses, and highlighting strengths and difficulties to be incorporated, all of which can lead to helping clients thrive by providing more effective prevention, intervention, and specifically treatment planning tailored and effective for each unique individual.

This paper aimed to investigate attitudes toward NRT in two European countries, Croatia and Italy, within the framework and a specific survey proposed by the EFPA Board of Assessment. The study is an initial descriptive paper that tries to highlight similarities and differences in attitudes toward NRT in these two countries, taking into account the historical background of the development of psychologists in these two countries.

EFPA initially took the initiative to investigate psychologists’ attitudes toward various aspects of testing in 2000 (Muñiz et al., 2001) in six European countries using a specifically devised survey. The results showed that European psychologists generally had a positive attitude toward tests and testing. Their scores also indicated a desire for greater involvement of professional organizations in the regulation of tests and more control on qualifications in the use of tests. Concern over incorrect use of tests was also underlined. Moreover, results indicated a demand for ongoing training because training provided up to the first-degree level

was insufficient (Muñiz et al., 2001). Croatia, but not Italy participated in this first investigation. Croatian sample included 218 psychologists (82.6% females) (Matešić, 1999).

Almost ten years later, in 2009, the EFPA Standing Committee on Tests and Testing (EFPA-SCTT) reassessed European psychologists' opinions of tests (Evers et al., 2012). Seventeen European countries participated in this survey, including the six countries participating in the first survey. Important reasons for this reassessment were (a) to perform a follow-up of the results obtained in the first survey, (b) to broaden the number of included countries, (c) to assess the opinions of psychologists regarding technical advances (computer-based and Internet testing). The Internet had a noticeable impact on the way psychologists practice their profession in general and particularly on the use of tests over the past decade. In the 2009 survey, various questions were added addressing these issues and related issues of unsupervised testing and computer-generated feedback.

Compared to the six countries surveyed in 2000, psychologists in 2009 were more satisfied with the sufficiency of information about test quality ( $d = 0.33$ ), demonstrated less concern over the need for enforceable test quality standards ( $d = 0.50$ ), but showed more concern about illegal copying of test materials ( $d = 0.23$ ).

As for the new overall sample, five main dimensions were identified. Three dimensions were similar to those found in the previous survey: appreciation of tests, concern over incorrect test use, and knowledge and training relating to tests and testing. A fourth dimension, regulations on tests and testing, looked like a merge of two factors found in the previous investigation regulations on tests and testing and qualifications for test use: finally, the fifth factor was labelled Internet testing.

In the overall sample, appreciation of tests reached a higher score, but a relatively low level of appreciation of internet or computer-based testing emerged. Participating psychologists felt better equipped for test use after completing their master's degrees, but they reported that their knowledge was based on training after their master's degrees than during the degree program itself. Although the appreciation of tests was high in all countries, significant differences between countries were found for the other four dimensions. As for Croatia, participating psychologists were the most satisfied with test-related education during their psychology studies, showed a most positive attitude toward testing by the internet and had a medium score regarding concern over test use.

In 2012, the EFPA Board of Assessment again investigated opinions about tests extending the survey to countries worldwide to identify possible differences from countries in Europe to understand the state of psychological testing better worldwide. The study was published in 2017 (Evers et al., 2017). Data from 12 additional countries in all parts of the world were added. The same questionnaire was used as in the 2009 study. Five dimensions used in the 2009 study were identified using exploratory factor analysis. However, only four dimensions were investigated (training was not included in the analyses). Although the results showed a high appreciation of tests in general, the appreciation of internet and computerized testing was again low. Croatia was again a participating country with 327 (88% female) participants (Matešić, 2012.). Italy was a participating country with 5482 (80% female) participants for the first time, but the paper did not include item and factor means and standard deviations. However, some qualitative data can be derived for the four dimensions in the two countries, referring to how "Countries were Significantly Different Than

Overall Intercept in Multilevel Models". As for Croatia, appreciation of tests was high; instead, the three other dimensions reached a medium level. For Italy, internet testing and appreciation of testing were low; instead, concern over incorrect test use and regulation of testing was high.

In 2019, ten years after the 2009 administration in European countries, the EFPA Board of Assessment decided to re-propose the same survey on test attitude of a psychologist using the same questionnaire used in the 2009 and 2012 administration (see details in the method session).

The specific objective of this paper was to compare results from this new administration in two European Countries: Croatia and Italy. Croatia has 56,594 km<sup>2</sup>, 3,871,833 inhabitants (census 2021), a GDP per capita of \$ 17,398, has been internationally recognized since January 15, 1992, before which it was part of Yugoslavia, and since July 1, 2013, has been a member of the EU. Six universities offer psychology degrees in the Republic of Croatia, and about 340 to 360 students enroll annually. The first Chair of Psychology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb was founded in 1929. A seventh university initiated; is in English, up to the bachelor's degree. The Croatian Psychological Society was founded in 1953, and membership is not binding. Membership in the Croatian Psychological Chamber is mandatory for all psychologists working in practice. The first Law on Psychological Praxis, in which psychology became a regulated profession, passed in 1993. It was the basis for the establishment of the Croatian Psychological Chamber. The revised round of the Psychological Praxis Law was adopted in 2019. On April 16, 2021, the Draft Proposal of the Law on Amendments to the Psychological Praxis Law was initiated. The Croatian Psychological Chamber, during the survey period, included 3669 members.

Apart from formal education programs on the theory of testing and assessment provided by University courses, there have been several continuing education courses and training seminars in NRT offered mainly by the Croatian Psychological Chamber. In 2007: Members of both the Health Psychology Professional Division and the Clinical Psychology Professional Division of the Croatian Psychological Chamber put in a lot of effort to create a document on work standards for health and clinical psychologists. The areas of work include prevention, psychodiagnostic evaluation, psychological treatments and research. The most significant achievement was the official announcement of the Work Standards for Clinical and Health Psychologists that have been passed by the Board of the Croatian Psychological Chamber on 16th May 2008.

Compared with Croatia, Italy shows many differences. Italy has 301,340 km<sup>2</sup>, has 60,380,339 inhabitants (census 2020), a GDP per capita of \$35,551. (Italy became a united country in 1861, i.e. since 1870 when Rome became the capital city). Today, Italy has been Republic since 1948, and it is one of the founders of the EU. First Institutes of Psychology were founded in different Universities starting from 1924 (e.g., Father Agostino Gemelli created the Psychology Laboratory of the Università Cattolica, defining it as "the youngest in Italy", in Padua, there were Vittorio Benussi and Cesare Musatti). The number of Institutes and Departments where courses of Psychology are offered immensely increased with the passing of years after the second world war in many Italian universities. In 1971, the first two university degrees in Psychology were open in Padova and Rome. To date, there are bachelor and master courses degrees in Psychology in many Italian Universities. They focus, among others, on experimental psychology, clinical psychology, developmental psychology, neuropsychology, and organizational psychology.

Recent data (2016) reported that 6754 students reach a master's degree in psychology every year. In 1989, Law 59 D.M. 240 of 01/13/1992 was approved with regulation for the organization of the profession of psychology. The CNOP (National Council of Professional Psychologists) was founded in 1992, and all professionals who want to exercise the profession need to be registered after a state exam. There are two levels of "psychologists": Junior (bachelor's degree and state exam) and Psychologists. Most Italian psychologists are "second level psychologists". Their actual number is 120.601.

The first EFPA questionnaire that included data from Croatia and Italy was analyzed about ten years ago. This presentation aims to report data from a new administration. Previous surveys showed, in general, a lack of training in tests, positive appreciation for testing, low appreciation for Internet use of tests, and relevance of concern for incorrect use of tests. This paper describes the latest data from Croatia and Italy and strives to specify unique trends in the two countries, also considering that, based on 2012 data, Croatian psychologists appreciated more tests than their Italian counterparts, and that Italian psychologists were more concerned than Croatian ones about incorrect test use and about the need for strong regulation of their use.

## SUBJECTS AND METHODS

---

### Participants

The questionnaire was sent to 3669 members of the Croatian Psychological chamber. Eighty-nine messages remained undelivered. Of the 3580 sent e-mail messages, 565 completed questionnaires were returned (15%), and of those 480 (85%) were females. The

sample was representative of the population according to gender, age, and year of inscription in the Croatian Psychological Chamber.

A total of 2412 Italian psychologists participated in the current study, a percentage of 2% of the psychologists registered in the Order of Psychologists 120.601 (2%). However, altogether 1474 were completed (1.2%). 1276 (90%) were females. Seen that only a low percentage of the population answered the questionnaire, the first question concerned the representativeness of the sample. A similar distribution in the sample and in the population was found for: gender, age groups, regions in which the psychologists worked, and year of inscription in the order of psychologists. As for age, Italian Psychologists were significantly older than Croatian's ones (Cr:  $M_{age} = 39.45$ ,  $SD = 10.77$ ; It:  $M_{age} = 45.38$ ,  $SD = 11.83$ ;  $t(2038) = 10.59$   $p < .0001$  Cohen's  $d = .51$ ).

### Measures

The questionnaire used for the 2019/2020 administration (EFPA Questionnaire on Test Attitudes of Psychologists—EQTAP) was the same used in the 2009 administration and included 32 attitude items (All items are reported in Table1). The items were administered on 5-point Likert-type scales. The items were originally formulated in English. In Italy and Croatia, the national representatives of EFPA were responsible for organizing the translation into the country's language and used a translation-back-translation procedure as recommended by ITC (Hambleton, Merenda, & Spielberger, 2004).

### Procedure

Both in Italy and Croatia, the survey was administered via the internet. Most of the Croatian answers were given right after the survey was sent out, so the survey remained open for

only 15 days. All members of the Italian Board of Psychologists (the CNOP) were invited to participate. The survey was open for answers for three months. A reminder was sent some weeks after the first e-mail.

## Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all items, and the answers between Croatia and Italy were compared using t-test (Table 1). Student's t-test for independent samples

was used to compare mean scores for all questions in the two countries. Moreover, Cohen's *d* (Cohen, 1992; Richardson, 2011) to assess effect size was considered. Cohen suggested that  $d = 0.2$  be considered a 'small' effect size, 0.5 represents a 'medium' effect size and 0.8 a 'large' effect size. Only significant differences with at least medium effect sizes were interpreted.

Item-level results will be described following the five dimensions identified in the previous surveys: appreciation of tests, knowledge

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics for all items and t-test results

	Croatia (N=565)		Italy (N=1440)		t	p	d
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
<b>Concerns over incorrect test use</b>							
25. Indicate the frequency with which you believe the following test-use problems occur within your professional speciality:							
a. Making photocopies of copyrighted materials	3.30	1.17	3.84	1.06	-9.99	.001	.50
b. Making evaluations using inappropriate tests	2.79	1.04	3.00	1.03	-4.01	.001	.20
c. Not keeping up with the field	3.49	.92	3.53	.99	-.83	.41	.01
d. Failing to check one's own interpretations with others	3.56	.96	3.57	1.02	-.21	.84	.01
e. Not considering errors of measurement of a test score	3.18	1.00	3.36	1.00	-3.61	.001	.20
f. Not restricting test administration to qualified personnel	2.88	1.10	3.26	1.16	-6.66	.001	.33
g. Not taking into account conditions that cast doubt on reported validity for a local situation	3.01	.97	3.29	1.04	-5.55	.001	.28
h. Making interpretations which go beyond the limits of the test	2.96	1.03	3.32	1.03	-7.07	.001	.45
<b>Regulation on test and testing</b>							
3. The ITC, the EFPA, or any other international organization should establish a global system to accredit the certification of test users	3.12	1.18	3.59	1.16	-8.21	.001	.41

8. The use of psychological tests should be restricted to qualified psychologists	4.45	.77	4.32	.96	2.72	.01	.14
9. While non-psychologists may administer and score tests, interpretation and feedback should be restricted to psychologists	4.60	.74	3.08	1.62	21.48	.001	1.06
11. Standards [e.g., those of the EFPA or the American Psychological Association (APA)] defining the minimum technical qualities of a test should be enforceable	3.91	.76	4.04	.83	-3.33	.01	.17
12. Legislation is needed to control the more severe testing abuses	4.10	.91	4.26	.89	-3.59	.001	.18
14. Anyone who can demonstrate their competence as a test user (whether a psychologist or not) should be allowed to use tests	1.84	.99	1.41	.76	10.65	.001	.53
16. Controls on tests and testing should be minimal, as controls discourage the development of new ideas and new procedures	2.08	.83	2.11	.96	-.635	.526	.03
18. Publishers should be allowed to sell whatever tests they think fit	2.45	1.09	2.64	1.03	-3.67	.001	.18
19. Our National Psychological Association should take a more active role in the regulation and improvement of test use	4.20	.85	4.04	.84	3.97	.001	.20
<b>Internet testing</b>							
5. In my professional field, computer-based testing is progressively replacing paper and pencil tests	2.18	1.15	2.80	1.10	-11.27	.001	.55
7. Test administration over the internet has many advantages compared with paper-and-pencil administration.	3.02	1.03	2.82	1.07	3.73	.001	.19
10. Computer-generated interpretive reports do not have any validity	2.64	.90	2.92	1.01	-5.39	.001	.29
13. Test administration over the internet sets some test takers at a disadvantage	3.51	.91	3.83	.89	-7.36	.001	.36
15. If adequately managed, the internet can significantly improve the quality of test administration	3.08	.99	3.23	1.01	-2.83	.01	.14
17. The privacy of the test taker is not protected when testing by the Internet	2.72	1.03	2.71	.99	.29	.77	.01
20. Testing over the internet opens the way to fraud	3.33	.92	3.10	.97	4.84	.001	.24
<b>Appreciation of tests</b>							
21. I use tests regularly in the exercise of my profession	3.89	1.17	3.24	1.41	9.76	.001	.48

22. Tests constitute an excellent source of information if they are combined and complemented with other psychological data	4.58	.58	4.39	.86	4.76	.001	.24
23. Used correctly, tests are of great help to the psychologist	4.57	.59	4.27	.88	7.41	.001	.37
24. All things considered, in the last decade, tests and testing practices have improved in my country	3.26	1.01	3.32	.80	-1.23	.22	.06
<b>Training</b>							
1. The training received in psychology bachelor's degree courses is sufficient for the correct use of most tests	2.55	1.17	1.81	.90	15.06	.001	.74
2. The training received in psychology master's degree courses is sufficient for the correct use of most tests	3.10	1,06	2,33	1.09	14.29	.001	.61
4. Professionals are provided with sufficient information (independent reviews, research, documentation, etc.) on the quality of tests published in my country	2.40	1.02	2.54	1.02	-2.73	.01	.14
6. My current knowledge concerning tests is that which I learned on my psychology degree course	2.25	1.10	2.24	1.27	.20	.84	.10

and training, regulations on tests and testing and permissiveness or qualifications for test use, (concern over) incorrect test use, and internet testing.

## RESULTS

Means, standard deviation, Student's t-test and Cohen's d for all the items proposed in the questionnaire are shown in Table 1.

The highest concerns in both countries were remaining updated in the development to the field and making sure that interpretations are valid (items 25c and 25d). The only relevant significant difference between Croatian and Italian respondents was connected to higher concern over use of photocopied materials in Italy (25a).

Both countries strongly claim that only qualified psychologists should use tests (items 8 and 14) and these concerns are stronger among Italian psychologists when interpretation and test feedback are considered (item 8 and 14, *d* respectively 0.14 and .53). In both countries, psychologists share the need for a system to qualify test users (item 3), set standards (item 11), and offer a regulation to avoid incorrect test use (item 12). In both countries, respondents agree that national societies (the Italian Board of Psychologists and the Croatian Psychological Chamber) should take a more active part to regulate test use (item 19).

In both countries, internet testing is seen similarly, and scores are oscillating around the center of the response scale. There seems to be a lack of strong opinions around tests. The only relevant difference between countries is that in Italy, computer-based testing is seen as



developing more, potentially replacing paper and pencil testing (item 5,  $d = .55$ ), than in Croatia.

Overall, respondents were not happy about the training in tests they received during their studies (items 1, 2, and 6), and the availability of information on the quality of tests (item 4). Of note, Italian psychologists were significantly less satisfied with their training in tests than their Croatian counterparts ( $d$  respectively .74 and .61).

In both countries, respondents showed variability in the degree to which they use tests regularly (item 21). There was a very high rating on items 22 and 23 in both countries, suggesting the psychologists' strong belief that if used correctly, tests are of great help and constitute an excellent source of information when complemented with other psychological data. In both countries, respondents reported a moderate satisfaction in how test and testing practices improved in the previous decade (item 24).

## CONCLUSIONS, LIMITS, AND PERSPECTIVES

---

First, these data suggest that the culture of tests and testing is similar aligned between different nations. Compared to previous findings in Croatia and Italy, these results suggest that the gap in test and testing appreciation between Croatia and Italy have decreased and that in 2021 tests and testing are widely appreciated. Unique to the Italian sample, there is higher variability in the extent to which tests are used.

This study offers a glimpse into the challenges of psychologists, that are concerned by both maintaining updated knowledge about this aspect of their professional practice, but also by the problems of their day-to-day prac-

tice in which photocopying tests materials shows up as the most challenging problem for Italian respondents.

While in Croatia and Italy the legislative frameworks for psychologists are different (a chamber of psychologists in Croatia and a board of psychologists in Italy), both frameworks require their members to appreciate tests and testing, and take an active role in the protection of test integrity and quality in test use by the institutions. This similarity seems to have an impact on the general agreement of both countries on three of the five dimensions: appreciation of tests, regulations of tests and testing and permissiveness or qualifications for test use, (concern over) incorrect test use. High scores in these last dimensions underlined the importance of "protecting" tests and testing from abuse. However, some differences emerged – again, and in line with previously collected data – particularly heart-felt in Italy where professionals would need more definite rules to maintain testing interpretation and feedback unique to their profession.

Internet testing seems to be, so far, featured by a "cold" reception. As visible in previous surveys, it seems that professionals have not developed a strong and clear view of this field of work, even if Italian respondents have a stronger sense that internet testing may be more frequent in the current situation.

Training in test and testing is unique to this survey, since in Evers and colleagues (2017) this area was not analysed throughout. In our two samples, psychologists highlight dissatisfaction for the teaching of tests in their university courses. Assuming that this type of studies can inform policy makers (Evers et al., 2017), the reform of the studies in Italy toward a more profession-oriented University curriculum should consider this result.

The so-called "proficiency model" of assessment and the EFPA testing review model

(EFPA, 2013) could represent the foundations to develop a more useful model of training in testing and assessment in university programs.

One limit of this study is the low percentage of male respondents. Compared to Evers and colleagues, who found significant differences in test attitudes based on gender, we could not address this aspect. Another limit of this study is the lack of specification of the field of work of respondents, which may impact their view of test and testing. Future studies should take these variables into account and provide a more field-specific description of the way tests and testing are seen by professionals.

## REFERENCES

---

- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current directions in psychological science*, 1(3), 98-101.
- EFPA (2013). EFPA Review model for the descriptions and evaluation of psychological and educational tests. Test review form and notes for reviewers Version 4.2. Test Review Form – Version 4.2.- 6 09-04-2013.
- Evers, A., McCormick, C. M., Hawley, L. R., Muñiz, J., Balboni, G., Bartram, D., et al. (2017). Testing practices and attitudes toward tests and testing: An international survey. *International Journal of Testing*, 17(2), 158-190.
- Evers, A., Muñiz, J., Bartram, D., Boben, D., Ege-land, J., Fernández-Hermida, J. R., et al. (2012). Testing practices in the 21st century: Developments and European psychologists' opinions. *European Psychologist*, 17(4), 300.
- Framingham, J. (2017). How is Psychological Assessment Used?. Available from: <https://psychcentral.com/lib/how-is-psychological-assessment-used#1>
- Hambleton, R. K., Merenda, P. F., Spielberger, C. D. (eds.) (2004). *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment*. Psychology Press.
- Matešić, K. (2012). Čestina uporabe psihodijagnostičkih sredstava u Republici Hrvatskoj - Pregled aktualnog stanja [The frequency of use of psychodiagnostic instruments in the Republic of Croatia - A review of the current situation] *Radovi zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad u Požegi*. Jelčić, D., Tomić, F., Jakobović, S., Zrnić, A., (Eds.). Zagreb-Požega: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, pp. 161-168.
- Matešić, K. (1999). Aktualni problemi testova i testiranja u Republici Hrvatskoj: Rezultati EFPPA-ine ankete [Actual problems of tests and testing in the Republic of Croatia: The results of EFPPA's survey – in croatian]. *Suvremena psihologija*, 2, 1-2; 115-126.
- Muñiz, J., Bartram, D., Evers, A., Boben, D., Matešić, K., Glabeke, K., et al. (2001). Testing practices in European countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 17(3), 201.
- Richardson, J. T. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review*, 6(2), 135-147.

## **Somiglianze e differenze nelle problematiche relative allo sviluppo, adattamento e standardizzazione dei test: Uno studio descrittivo degli atteggiamenti degli psicologi Croati e Italiani**

**Riassunto:** La valutazione psicologica è un metodo che utilizza una varietà di metodologie per sviluppare ipotesi relativamente alle forze e debolezze, capacità e limiti delle persone tenendo presente il loro comportamento, la loro personalità ed le loro doti. Lo scopo di questo iniziale studio qualitativo era mostrare parallelismi e variazioni nei confronti della formulazione e adattamento dei test in Italia ed in Croazia, tenendo presente il contesto storico dello svilupparsi degli psicologi in queste due nazioni. Un questionario che includeva 32 items relativo all'atteggiamento in esame è stato completato da 565 psicologi Croati e da 1474 psicologi Italiani. Gli psicologi di entrambe le nazioni hanno affermato di usare i test regolarmente, ma con un uso sostanzialmente superiore da parte degli psicologi Croati rispetto agli Italiani, anche se la deviazione standard era più alta negli psicologi italiani. In entrambe le nazioni si è riscontrato un ampio accordo sul fatto che l'uso dei test psicologici debba essere limitato agli psicologi certificati e che se anche i non-psicologi possano somministrare e attribuire punteggi ai test, solo gli psicologi debbano interpretarli e fornire un feedback. Relativamente alla somministrazione online, in generale entrambe le nazioni hanno mostrato un accordo moderato relativamente ai benefici di questo tipo di somministrazione, al miglioramento della loro qualità, al rischio potenziale della frode, della violazione della privacy e la qualità di una somministrazione non adeguata. Nonostante le due nazioni esaminate evidenzino origini molto diverse, questi primi risultati descrittivi hanno evidenziato molti parallelismi nelle risposte e soprattutto in modo molto importante il significato di „salvaguardare“ test e testing da un loro uso non corretto.

**Parole chiave:** test psicologici, prassi nell'uso dei tests, uso dei test, Federazione Europea delle Associazioni degli Psicologi

## **Sličnosti i razlike razvoja, adaptacije i standardizacije testova: Prikaz stavova hrvatskih i talijanskih psihologa**

**Sažetak:** Psihologijska procjena je postupak koji koristi različite metodologije za razvoj pretpostavki o snagama i slabostima pojedinaca, vještina i ograničenja u okviru njihova ponašanja, ličnosti i nadarenosti. Cilj ovog inicijalnog kvalitativnog prikaza je iznijeti paralele i varijacije u stavovima prema formulaciji i adaptaciji testova u Italiji i Hrvatskoj, uzimajući u obzir povijesni kontekst razvoja psihologa u ovim državama. Uпитnik s 32 čestice ispunilo je 565 hrvatskih i 1474 talijanskih psihologa. Psiholozi u obje zemlje izjavili su da redovito koriste testove, s češćom primjenom u Hrvatskoj nego u Italiji, iako je standardna devijacija bila viša u Italiji. U obje zemlje postignuta je suglasnost da primjenu psihologijskih testova treba ograničiti na ovlaštene psihologe te, iako ne-psiholozi mogu primijeniti i ocjenjivati testove, samo psiholozi mogu provesti interpretaciju te pružiti povratne informacije. U odgovorima vezanim uz online primjenu testova postigla je umjerenu suglasnost vezanu uz korist te vrste primjene, napretka u kvaliteti potencijalne opasnosti od varanja, narušavanja privatnosti i nekvalitetne primjene testa. Talijanski psiholozi značajno su manje zadovoljni

preddiplomskim i postdiplomskim obrazovanje od hrvatskih psihologa. Bez obzira na to da dvije zemlje imaju različitu povijest, opisni rezultati pokazali su brojne sličnosti u odgovorima i, što je još važnije, u važnosti zaštite testova od zlouporabe.

**Ključne riječi:** psihologijsko testiranje, praksa testiranja, primjena testova, Europski savez psiholoških udruga

Korespondencija: [adriana.lis@unipd.it](mailto:adriana.lis@unipd.it)

Primljeno: 21. 03. 2022.  
Ispravljeno: 27. 01. 2023.  
Prihvaćeno: 10. 02. 2023.  
Online: 17. 02. 2023.