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The book comprises six chapters. In Chapter 1 we set the scene for the historical account which follows. Chapters 2 to 5 offer readers a chronological account that delineates the phases of development of validity theory and validation practice. In Chapter 6 we propose a framework for the evaluation of testing policy, which we based on the original progressive matrix from Messick (1980).

Chapter 1: Validity and Validation

In Chapter 1 we begin by exploring a range of everyday and technical meanings of validity in order to set the scene for the historical account which follows. This is an account of validity as a technical term of educational and psychological measurement, which is important to bear in mind because the term ‘validity’ has very many different meanings, some of which are entirely independent of measurement. The main chapters of the book attempt to demonstrate how, even within this relatively narrow conceptualisation, its meaning is still nevertheless contested and resistant to precise definition. Yet it needs to be appreciated, from the outset, that it does mean something quite distinctive in this particular context, even if that ‘something’ might be difficult to articulate.

Following a discussion of the conventions used in the textbook we present an outline of the history of validity. The historical account is our attempt to describe and to explain how conceptions of validity and validation have evolved within the field of educational and psychological measurement.

Our historical account tends to focus more on concepts of validity theory than on the practice of validation. Good validation practice is the application of good validity theory. In the absence of validity theory there is nothing to guide or to defend validation practice. It is theory that constitutes the rational basis for validation practice. As we discuss each new contribution to the theory of validity, their implications in terms of a positive, operational impact upon validation practice become increasingly apparent.

Chapter 2: The Genesis of Validity (mid-1800s to 1951)

Chapter 2 covers the first two phases outlined above: a gestational period, from the mid-1800s to 1920; and a period of crystallisation, from 1921 to 1951. The chapter is heavily skewed towards the latter, as the period during which the concept of validity developed an explicit identity or, perhaps more correctly, a range of different identities.

In this chapter, we explore early conceptions of validity and validation, focusing particularly upon achievement tests, general intelligence tests, and special aptitude tests. We argue that the emergence of validity as a formal concept of educational and psychological measurement can only be understood in the context of major developments in testing for educational, clinical, occupational and experimental purposes which occurred during the second half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century, most notably in England, Germany, France and the USA. Upon this foundation was proposed the ‘classic’ definition of validity: the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure.

Although there are numerous accounts of the history of validity theory and validation practice during the early years (e.g. Anastasi, 1950; Geisinger, 1992; Shepard, 1993; Kane, 2001) the impression given is often of a period almost exclusively dominated by prediction, the empirical approach to validation, and the validity coefficient. Reflecting on this period, Cronbach (1971) observed that the theory of prediction was very nearly the whole of validity theory until about 1950; a characterisation later endorsed by Brennan (2006). Kane (2001) characterised the early years as the ‘criterion’ phase, where the criterion was typically understood as the thing that was to be predicted.

The impression given by a number of notable chroniclers (e.g. Moss, Girard and Haniford, 2006) is that the key developments in validity theory can be traced either to successive editions of Educational Measurement, beginning with Lindquist (1951) or to successive editions of professional standards documents, beginning with American Psychological Association/American Educational Research Association/ National Council on Measurements Used in Education (APA, AERA, NCMUE, 1954). We argue that there is a far more interesting story to be told about the early years. We contend that many of the developments in validity theory and validation practice, from the middle of the twentieth century onwards, are simply elaborations of earlier insights.

The earliest definition of validity was far more sophisticated than the idea of a validity coefficient might suggest, and the earliest approaches to validation were far more complex and involved. Education took a lead in formally defining the concept, and achievement testers, aptitude testers, intelligence testers and personality testers played their role in refining it and developing new techniques for investigating it.

The more interesting story of validity during the early years is one of sophistication and diversity; at least in terms of ideas, if not always in terms of practice. Because of its diversity, though, it is hard to characterise the period succinctly.

Chapter 3: The Fragmentation of Validity: 1952 to 1974

The diversity of ideas on validity and validation during the early years presented a challenge to test developers and publishers. Given a variety of approaches to validation to choose from, and with even the experts valuing those approaches quite differently, how were professionals in the field to decide what information on test quality they needed to make available to consumers? And, in the absence of agreement upon principles of best practice and specific guidelines about criteria for the evaluation of tests and testing practices, how were test developers and publishers to be held to account?

The first edition of what was to become known as the Standards (APA, AERA, NCMUE, 1954) was written to make sense of the landscape of the early years. As a consensus statement of the professions, the Standards included both implicit standards for thinking about validity and explicit standards for conducting and reporting validation research. The Standards emphasised ‘types’ of validity, specialised to the contexts of test use: content validity, predictive validity, concurrent validity, and construct validity. If, for example, you needed to validate an interpretation drawn in terms of achievement, then you needed to adopt a particular approach to validation, content validation, which meant establishing a particular kind of validity, content validity. Although these were explicitly described as “Four types of validity” (APA, AERA, NCMUE, 1954, p.13) the Standards was a little confused...
over the matter, also describing them as ‘aspects’ of a broader conception.

Between 1954 and 1974, the Standards was revised twice, in order to respond to constructive criticism, to take account of progress in the science and practice of educational and psychological measurement, and to respond to societal change. Yet, mixed messages continued to be promulgated over the nature of validity. For many who were influenced by the Standards during this time, they came to embody and to cement a fragmented view of validity and validation, whereby different uses to which test scores were to be put implied different approaches to validation and even different kinds of validity.

Unfortunately, Messick’s tribulation led to one of the most notorious debates of all time concerning the scope of validity theory. The field is now genuinely split as to whether, and if so how, evidence from consequences ought to be considered part of validity theory - an issue we tackle in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4: The (Re)Unification of Validity: 1975 to 1999

Samuel Messick’s account of validity and validation became the zeitgeist of late twentieth century thinking on validity during the 1980s and 1990s. Developing ideas from Harold Gulliksen and Jane Loevinger, and with the support of allies including Robert Guion, he brought the majority of measurement professionals of his generation around to the viewpoint that all validity ought to be understood as construct validity. His thesis was that measurement ought to be understood (once more) as the foundation for all validity; and therefore that construct validation – scientific inquiry into score meaning – ought to be understood as the foundation for all validation.

Through an extended discussion of Messick’s contribution to validity theory, we describe this period in terms of his triumph and his tribulation. Messick was enormously successful in promoting validity as a unitary concept, in contrast to earlier fragmented accounts. His triumph, therefore, concerned the science of validity; he convinced the educational and psychological measurement communities that measurement-based decision-making procedures (i.e. tests) needed to be evaluated holistically, on the basis of a scientific evaluation into score meaning. Enormously problematic, though, was his attempt to integrate values and consequences within validity theory through his famous (if not infamous) progressive matrix. Unfortunately, not only was his account confusing, it also seemed a little confused. His tribulation, it seems fair to conclude, concerned the ethics of validity. Messick failed to provide a convincing account of how ethical and scientific evaluation could straightforwardly be integrated.

In retrospect, it seems hard to disagree with the conclusion, drawn by Shepard (1997), that Messick’s progressive matrix was a mistake. Having said that, we believe that its underlying intention was an excellent one. It was an attempt to emphasise that the following two questions were both crucial to any thorough evaluation and were inherently interrelated:

1. Is the test any good as a measure of the characteristic it purports to assess?
2. Should the test be used for its present purpose?

Messick’s progressive matrix was supposed to explain the relationship between these two questions, and their relation to the concept of validity, but it was muddled. As Messick helped readers to find their way through the ambiguity of the matrix, his presentation became clearer, but also narrower, as scientific questions of test score meaning began to gain prominence while ethical questions of test score use were nudged into the wings.

Chapter 5: The Deconstruction of Validity (2000 to 2012)

During the 1990s, work on validity and validation was heavily influenced by Messick. The fifth edition of the Standards (American Educational Research Association/American Psychological Association/National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999) was essentially a consensus interpretation of his position, that is, a unified conception of validity. The Standards reflected the prevailing view of the time - a construct-centred approach to validity. Yet, with the turn of the millennium, cracks began to emerge. On one hand, it was unclear how to translate construct validity theory into validation practice. On the other hand, it was unclear whether construct validity was actually the best way to unify validity theory.

It seemed that an element of deconstruction might be in order, reflecting the desire to simplify validation practice as well as the desire to simplify validity theory.

In terms of validation practice, this period was characterised by growing consensus over the value of a new methodology for guiding, and simplifying, validation practice. Argumentation, it now seemed, held the key. Michael Kane had developed a methodology to support validation practice, grounded in argumentation (e.g. Kane, 1992). This provided a framework, or scaffold, for constructing and defending validity claims. Thus, while Messick defined the claim to validity in terms of an overall evaluative judgement, Kane explained exactly how that claim to validity could be constructed and defended. The argument-based approach took a long time to take root, though, and only began to have a significant impact well into the new millennium. In fact, even having begun to take root, it still proved surprisingly challenging to implement. Goldstein and Behuniak (2011) noted that very few examples are available to the research community of validity arguments for large-scale educational assessments.

In terms of validity theory, this period was characterised by growing controversy, embodied in two major debates. The first concerned the nature and significance of construct validity; a debate over the relatively narrow, scientific issue of score meaning. A critical question was whether construct validity ought to be considered the foundation of all validity, as Messick had argued. Related questions concerned whether all validation needed to be understood in terms of constructs; whether the nomological networks of Cronbach and Meehl (1955) were useful or even relevant to validation; whether validity was a concept more like truth or more like justified belief; whether validity ought to be theorised in terms of measurement; and whether the concept of validity could be applied in the absence of standardised procedures.

The second concerned the scope of validity: a debate over whether the concept ought to be expanded beyond the relatively narrow, scientific issue of score meaning, to embrace broader ethical issues concerning the consequences of testing. Various ‘camps’ developed: from liberals, who extended the use of ‘validity’ to embrace social considerations of test score use; to conservatives, who restricted the use of ‘validity’ to technical considerations of test score meaning.
Chapter 6: 21st Century Evaluation

The concept of validity has assumed a pivotal role across decades of debate on the characteristics of quality in educational and psychological measurement. Despite this, it has proved extremely resistant to definition. In Chapter 6, we respond to the concerns of the more conservatively minded, who object that the concept of validity is becoming so large as to present an obstacle to validation practice. We do so by proposing a new framework for the evaluation of testing policy. In fact, we see this as a revision of the original progressive matrix from Messick (1980), which we have redesigned to dispel some of the confusion engendered by its original presentation. After first defending the new framework we then provide a more detailed analysis of technical and social evaluation, before considering evaluation within each of the cells respectively.

Validity in Educational and Psychological Assessment will be available from March 2014. The authors believe that this book will be of interest to anyone with a professional or academic interest in evaluating the quality of educational or psychological assessments, measurements and diagnoses.
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Conferences and seminars

The Future of Education International Conference

In June, Sanjana Mehta attended The Future of Education Conference in Florence, Italy. The conference aims to promote transnational cooperation and share good practice in the field of innovation for education. Sanjana presented a paper on Thrown in at the deep end? Exploring students’, lecturers’ and teachers’ views on additional support lessons at university.

The Assessment in Higher Education Conference

Held in Birmingham in June, this fourth biennial conference provided an opportunity to debate key issues and developments in current assessment, policy and practice. Simon Child presented a paper entitled “I’ve never done one of these before”. A comparison of the assessment ‘diet’ at A level and the first year of university.

British Education Studies Association (BESA)

The ninth BESA Annual Conference took place at Swansea Metropolitan University in June. The key theme of the conference was Education: Past, Present and Future. Jackie Creatorex presented on Using scales of cognitive demand in a validation study of Cambridge International A and AS level Economics.

Journal of Vocational Education and Training (JVET)

The JVET tenth international conference was held in July at Worcester College, Oxford. Colleagues from the Research Division presented the following papers:

Jackie Creatorex: How can major research findings about returns to qualifications illuminate the comparability of qualifications?

Martin Johnson: Insights into contextualised learning: how does feedback on performance contribute to professional examiners’ shared understanding?