

M.A. IIIrd sem. Psychology II Paper
Unit - 1 continue

Examiner and Situational Variables —

Performance on individually administered intelligence tests and on projective techniques has been investigated in relation to many examiner variables, including age, sex, ethnicity, professional or socioeconomic status, training and experience, personality characteristics and appearance. Although several significant relationships have been found, the results are often inclusive inconclusive or misleading because the experimental design failed to control or isolate the influence of different examiner or examinee characteristics.

that test results may be influenced by the examiner's behaviour immediately preceding and during test administration has been more clearly demonstrated. For example, controlled investigations have yielded significant differences in intelligence test person performance as a result of a 'warm' versus 'cold' interpersonal relation between examiner and examinees, or a rigid or aloof versus a natural manner on the part of examiner (Exner, 1966; Masling, 1959). Moreover, there may be significant interactions between examiner and examinee characteristics or testing manner may have a different effect on different examinees as a function of the examinee's own personality characteristics. Similar interactions may occur with task variables, such as the nature of the test, the purpose of the testing, and the instructions given to test taker. Dyer (1973) added even more variables ~~of~~ to the list, calling

attention to the possible influence of the test givers' and the test takers' diverse perceptions of the functions and goals of testing. Still another way in which an examiner may ~~add~~ inadvertently effect the test taker's responses is through the examiner's own expectations.

Apart from the examiner, other aspects of the testing situation may significantly affect test performance. Several studies have been concerned with the effects of feedback regarding test scores on the individual's subsequent test performance. In a study of seventh-grade students Bridgeman (1974) found that "success" feedback was followed by significantly higher performance on a similar test than was "failure" feedback in students who had actually performed equally well to begin with. This type of motivational feedback may operate largely through the goals the participants set for themselves in subsequent performance and may thus represent another example of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Such general motivational feedback, however, should not be confused with corrective feedback, whereby the individual is informed about the specific items he or she missed and given remedial instruction; under those conditions, feedback is much more likely to improve the performance of initially low-scoring persons.