

Article

The Use of Psychometric Tests for Personality Assessment in Public Administration Personnel Selection Processes

Paula Elosua¹ , Ana Hernández²  & Francisco J. Abad³ 

¹ Universidad del País Vasco, Spain

² Universidad de Valencia, Spain

³ Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Received: October 16, 2024

Accepted: October 29, 2024

Keywords

Selection process

Personality tests

Equity

Use of tests

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of non-cognitive variables, such as personality factors, is key in personnel selection processes in public administration, although its application presents certain challenges. This article addresses the need to ensure the validity of these processes by integrating the principles of transparency and publicity with best practices in the use of tests. Based on the report from the Test Commission of the General Council of the Spanish Psychological Association on the use of psychometric tests in selection processes in public administration, 16 recommendations are provided, organized into seven areas: objectives, test application, scoring, selection criteria, reports, functional diversity, and qualifications. We emphasize the need to document and justify each stage to guarantee fair and well-founded decisions. These guidelines solve some of the issues that arise in the application of non-cognitive tests, and ensure alignment with the principles of publicity, transparency, and fairness in public sector selection.

El Uso de Test Psicométricos para la Evaluación de la Personalidad en los Procesos de Selección de Personal de las Administraciones Públicas

RESUMEN

La evaluación de variables no cognitivas, como los factores de personalidad, es clave en los procesos de selección de personal en las administraciones públicas, si bien su implementación presenta ciertos desafíos. Este artículo aborda la importancia de validar estos procesos integrando los principios de publicidad y transparencia con las buenas prácticas en el uso de test. Basándonos en el informe de la Comisión de Test del Consejo General de la Psicología sobre el uso de test psicométricos en los procesos de selección en las administraciones públicas, se presentan 16 recomendaciones organizadas en siete áreas: objetivos, aplicación de test, puntuaciones, criterios de selección, informes, diversidad funcional y cualificación. Se enfatiza la necesidad de documentar y justificar cada etapa para garantizar la fundamentación de las decisiones. Las directrices resuelven dudas y alinean el uso de las pruebas con los principios de publicidad, transparencia y equidad que rigen la selección pública.

Palabras clave

Procesos selectivos

Test de personalidad

Equidad

Uso de test

Introduction

The validity of selection processes depends to a large extent on the accurate and efficient assessment of both knowledge and skills of a cognitive nature and of personal characteristics and behavioral patterns that predict performance. The assessment of knowledge and cognitive skills is carried out through the administration of maximum performance tests that usually take the form of questionnaires or practical tasks. Their scoring is based on the existence of correct and incorrect answers, the value of which is determined objectively. Often, these tests are complemented by 'non-cognitive' or typical performance tests, focused on assessing behavioral patterns, attitudes, and personality traits in everyday situations (e.g. openness to experience, responsibility, extraversion, agreeableness, etc.). In this type of questionnaire, the objective is to accurately capture the personal characteristics of the person being assessed, with there being no right or wrong answers. Personality tests are among the most common tests, although other types of variables, such as emotional intelligence, integrity or vocational interests, can contribute to better results in selection processes for certain positions (e.g., Berga & Austers, 2022; Drasgow, 2020; O'Boyle et al., 2011; Zell & Lesick, 2022).

While the use of non-cognitive tests, especially personality tests, is common in the selective processes of public administrations, their application and scoring generate debate and controversy. Numerous legal remedies have been sought against administrative decisions based on the results of the application of personality tests, alleging bad faith, lack of protection, or bias. These invoke, among other arguments, the equality of opportunities to access the civil service, established in the Constitution (Art. 23.2), and the principles of publicity, transparency, impartiality, and technical discretion in the actions of the selection bodies, as stated in Article 55.2 of the Basic Statute of the Public Employee (EBEP in Spanish, RLD 5/2015). In relation to these principles, Casas (2022) notes that these are impeccable principles and of unavoidable necessity, although their implementation and development diverge from their original intent.

The intersection between the legal field and the use of psychological tests raises the need for an adequate integration that guarantees both the technical validity of the assessments and strict compliance with legal principles. The specialized literature has dealt with the use of personality tests in administration selective processes mainly from a legal perspective (see, Casas, 2022; Chaves, 2022; Fernández, 1992; Parejo, 1995; Fondevila, 2020, 2021). These works, of a technical nature, may seem somewhat distant from the specialized knowledge of professionals dedicated to the construction and use of psychometric personality tests, or those focused on people management within organizational psychology. However, it is important that specialists in these areas understand the legal framework and adapt their practices accordingly, and that the legal field, in turn, consider the specificities of non-cognitive tests, so that their use is contemplated without affecting the rigor and predictive validity they offer in the assessment of personality factors.

Despite the importance of this integration, there are few works from the field of assessment that address and defend the particularities related to the use of personality tests in selection processes (Salgado & Moscoso, 2008). In this regard, a report prepared by the Test Commission of the General Council of the

Spanish Psychological Association stands out. This analyzes the use of psychometric tests in personnel selection processes in public administrations (Test Commission, 2023). The report, accessible at https://www.cop.es/uploads/PDF/InformeComision_Test_Procesos_seleccion_AAPP.pdf, addresses the impact of several rulings on the use of personality tests. Particularly noteworthy is judgment 74/2022 of the Third Chamber of the Supreme Court of January 27, 2022 (Rec. 8179/2019), which resolved the dispute of two candidates for regional police officers of the Community of Navarra who were deemed unfit based on personality tests.

In this interdisciplinary context, the aim of this paper is to present and summarize the recommendations of the Test Commission on the use of psychometric personality tests in the selection processes of the public administration. For clarity and contextualization, we begin by outlining the guiding principles and the regulatory framework that guide the selection processes. After that, we describe the particularities of psychometric tests as measuring instruments, ending with the most relevant recommendations.

Guiding Principles and Regulatory Framework

Selection processes are one of the keys to the configuration of an objective, neutral, and professional public administration (Fondevila, 2020), and personality tests play an important role in them, as they can significantly influence final decisions. However, their administration has sometimes suffered from a lack of transparency and adequate justification, which has even led to legal conflicts. In response to appeals in such situations, the courts have repeatedly stressed that the principles of openness and transparency require that applicants have access to information about the assessment process, including the scientific basis and methodology behind the use of the tests employed. Following this line, in the aforementioned ruling 74/2022, the Supreme Court issued a series of principles that underscore the need to clearly justify the use of personality tests in selective processes, ensuring their relevance, reliability, and conformity with the rights of the applicants. The ruling urges the administration to proceed as follows:

- To inform the participants in the selective tests, prior to their administration, of the professional profile that defines the traits or factors to be assessed in a test, as well as the norming and scoring system.
- The obligation to justify a declaration of unfitness (failure or non-passing) in a test assessing personality traits or factors and aptitudes must meet at least these main requirements: (a) express the material or sources of information on which the technical judgment will be based; (b) state the qualitative assessment criteria that will be used to make the technical judgment; and (c) express why the application of these criteria leads to the individualized result of denying a candidate's suitability.
- This duty must be complied with at the time of the administrative decision and, in any case, when responding to claims and appeals prior to judicial proceedings.

Psychometric Tests and Their use in Selection Processes

Psychometric tests are tools designed to assess psychological variables, such as cognitive abilities, personality traits, attitudes, and aptitudes, by means of standardized and empirically validated

procedures. The purpose of their use is to make accurate inferences in well-defined contexts. Initially used for selection purposes during the First World War, today they are used in personnel selection processes in the public and private spheres, since it has been scientifically proven that they provide accurate information on the competencies and suitability of candidates for the position (Salgado & Moscoso, 2008; Muñiz et al., 2020).

The above definition emphasizes that psychometric tests must meet rigorous scientific criteria, including standardization, reliability, and validity. This is the only way to ensure consistency of scores, accuracy of inferences, and fairness in their application, limiting any potential bias. In addition, it is the way to ensure uniform conditions of administration¹, scoring, and interpretation, so that all those evaluated respond under equivalent circumstances and the results do not depend on the subjectivity of the professional in charge of the process.

The fundamental principles that guide the construction, evaluation, and use of psychometric tests constitute a field of study with a long tradition in psychology, known as psychometrics (see Abad et al., 2011; Linn, 1989; Muñiz, 2002; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Rust et al., 2009; Kline, 2000; Crocker & Algina, 1986). One of the main objectives of this discipline is to establish the bases and methods that ensure the technical quality of the tests. Following these principles, several national and international organizations dedicated to psychological measurement and assessment have developed important reference documents on the quality criteria that tests must meet. Among the most influential are the manual co-published by the American Psychological Association (American Educational Research Association et al., 2014) and, at the national level, the questionnaire for test evaluation of the General Council of the Spanish Psychological Association (Hernández et al., 2016), based on the model approved by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (see Evers et al., 2013).

However, the technical quality of a test, although fundamental, does not in itself guarantee excellence in the assessment process. It must be carried out by well-trained professionals who understand the fundamental principles of measurement and, in addition, have knowledge of the domain being assessed. In this regard, ISO-10667 (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2023), which regulates the assessment of people in work and organizational contexts, is a significant frame of reference. The principles contained in the standard are aligned with those of the American Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP, 2018), validated by the American Psychological Association (APA) as well as with the manuals and guides of good practices in recruitment and personnel selection of the *Colegio de Psicólogos de Madrid* [Madrid Psychological Association] (Castaño et al., 2011a; 2011b).

Recommendations on the use of Psychometric Tests in Public Access Processes to Administration

In the context of public access processes to the administration, it is relevant to highlight the jurisprudential evolution that has promoted greater transparency and rigor in the application of psychometric tests (see Casas, 2022). In this area, the concept of technical discretion refers to the autonomy of selection bodies to

make technical judgments based on their specialized knowledge. This technical judgment, considered the material core of the decision, encompasses evaluations that require specific knowledge that only experts can provide and, therefore, are not reviewable in their substantive content by the courts. However, case law has established that there are limits to this discretion, known as “contiguities” (*aledaños* in Spanish), which are subject to judicial control. These include the preparatory or instrumental activities necessary to structure the technical decision, such as the definition of the assessment criteria and their uniform application. Likewise, the normative principles require that these processes respect fundamentals such as equal conditions, merit, and ability, and the prohibition of arbitrariness. Jurisprudence has also emphasized the obligation of justification, i.e. the need to substantiate the technical judgment when it is requested or challenged, detailing in such circumstances the sources of information, the evaluation criteria applied, and the reason why these lead to the particular outcome reached. This approach guarantees transparency and fairness in the selection process and allows the courts to verify that technical discretion is not abused, especially in decisions that affect the rights of the applicants. Thus, although the technical decisions of a selection board enjoy a presumption of validity, this can be questioned if it is not adequately grounded, and even refuted if sufficient and rigorous evidence is presented, such as expert reports proving a manifest error, beyond a simple disagreement or different approach. Therefore, a complete, clear, and orderly statement of reasons is not only the best proof of the transparency of the process but also the best legal guarantee that the rights of the interested parties are respected.

In line with the criteria governing selection processes, a review of a sample of published rulings has been carried out, identifying the most controversial points. In response to these issues, recommendations have been formulated, organized in seven sections that address the aspects involved with the use of tests in selection processes. All of them are linked to the principles of publicity and transparency that must govern access to the civil service.

1. Objectives of the evaluation: job profile
2. Test administration
3. Scoring process
4. Selection criteria
5. Score reporting
6. Diversity assessment
7. Qualification

Section 1. Objectives of the Evaluation: Job Profile

Recommendation 1.1: *Publish descriptions of candidate requirements in accordance with the Basic Statute of the Public Employee, which requires abstract and generalized information on such requirements. Exceptions to this general recommendation must be well-founded.*

Recommendation 1.2: *Document, prior to the selection process, the characteristics and attributes to be evaluated through tests, creating a detailed document to serve as a reference in case of claims.*

Recommendation 1.3: *Ensure that the stated evaluation objective matches what was actually evaluated and used in the selective decision. Any deviation from the planned process must be properly justified and documented.*

¹ A separate consideration is the adequacy to eliminate barriers and meet the demands related to the response to personal needs.

Justification: The publication of the job profile in the terms and conditions of the call for applications allows candidates to know which traits and competencies are to be evaluated. While this is true, the principles of legal transparency and good practices related to the use of tests do not require detailing all the details of the psychological attributes to be evaluated. In fact, this practice is discouraged, as it could compromise the validity of the scores, due to the possible manipulation of the answers (faking) by the candidates. Such distortions significantly modify the mean scores in the direction perceived as desirable and reduce their reliability and variability, or the capacity to differentiate candidates regarding the trait or attribute of interest (Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999; Salgado, 2005, 2016).

Section 2. Test Administration

Recommendation 2.1: *The specific names of the tests to be administered should not be published, although it is necessary to justify and document the selection of these tests, which must be done taking into consideration their purpose, the target population, their psychometric quality, and the adequacy of their scales.*

Recommendation 2.2: *If an ad-hoc test is created for the selective process, it must be developed with the support of experienced psychometricians, using validated item banks and pilot studies, complemented with evidence of the quality of the tests obtained with the candidates' scores.*

Justification: Disclosure in a selective procedure of the specific tests to be applied or their names would compromise the validity of the results. In this sense, the Supreme Court notes that "It is acceptable that the content of the test should not be known beforehand", since it is important to safeguard the tests in order to maintain the validity of the scores (American Psychological Association, 2015, International Test Commission, 2014).

However, although the name of the tests should not be disclosed, it is necessary to document the appropriateness of the tests selected for the evaluation context, including those specifically designed for the process. This documentation ensures transparency and justifies the selection, guaranteeing the absence of arbitrariness in the procedure.

Section 3. Scoring Process

Recommendation 3.1: *Provide general information on the procedures used in the calculation of partial and final scores (e.g., use of response templates, item response models, weighting of different tests). These procedures must be justified and documented with evidence of their psychometric quality.*

Justification: Individual test scores are obtained through two main procedures: observable or direct procedures, which allocate a score to each item based on the candidate's response, and latent procedures, used to estimate scores related to underlying traits. The direct procedures are based on response templates, optical reading, and automated scoring. Latent procedures rely on psychometric models, such as item response theory, deriving the final score from the complete pattern of responses observed (de Ayala, 2009; Thissen & Wainer, 2001).

In situations where the final score is derived from subscores, it is essential to specify whether compensatory or non-compensatory models will be used in the calculation. In addition, where necessary,

the weight assigned to each of the subscores should be clearly indicated. It is essential that the procedures are based on the psychometric quality of the test and have sufficient technical information to assess their adequacy (De Corte et al., 2007; Finch et al., 2009).

Including information in the terms and conditions on how the scores are obtained does not threaten the usefulness or validity of the scores, neither does it affect the equality or fairness of the process. Candidates should receive information about the scoring method at the beginning of each test, preferably in writing, so that they are aware of the conditions of the examination and can act accordingly. It is important that the evaluators are able to objectively prove that the same answer patterns produce the same scores, providing, in each case, evidence of the reasons that justify the score obtained.

Section 4. Selection Criteria

Recommendation 4.1: *Determine the most appropriate procedure for defining the criterion or criteria for the selection and inclusion of candidates.*

Recommendation 4.2: *If cut-off scores are used, include information on the procedures used to estimate them.*

Recommendation 4.3: *Publish information on the combination of scores from different psychometric tests and other tests, specifying the weights assigned to each. If the terms of the call for applications do not detail the specific traits, general references should be provided and the weights of the different traits should be specified in an official document before starting the selection process.*

Justification: A selection criterion defines a value or values below which candidates are excluded from the selection process. The decision on the most appropriate exclusion criterion applicable to a selection process is supported by factors such as the estimated cost-benefit ratio, the number of vacancies, and the selection rate (APA, 2018). If the need is determined to establish a cut-off score (or scores) as a selection criterion, two types of procedures are possible. The first relies on ranking candidates based on the scores obtained (rank order or top-down), and the second is constructed based on specific criteria related to performance or competence, either absolute or in comparison with a normative reference group. In any case, and given that there is no single method applicable to all selection conditions, the choice must be justified and documented (Cascio & Aguinis, 2001; Kolen & Hendrickson, 2013; Mueller et al., 2007).

Section 5. Score Reporting

Recommendation 5.1: *Prepare individualized reports that include the attributes evaluated, the scores obtained, and the observations and recommendations based on scientific evidence. In massive selective processes, this can be replaced by an ordered list with the scores and exclusion criteria.*

Recommendation 5.2: *The candidate will be able to access their results and the reports justifying their exclusion, but not the test materials, which are protected by ethical codes and copyrights. The evaluation teams may meet with the candidate to show their answers and explain the results, always ensuring data protection and the integrity of the materials.*

Recommendation 5.3: *In the event of a court order requiring the provision of psychometric test materials, mechanisms should be*

implemented to ensure the protection of these materials and limited access to them.

Justification: It is recommended to prepare individual reports that present the results of the candidates and justify the conclusions and recommendations, without the need to include the names of the psychometric tests. These reports should contain the attributes assessed, the scores obtained, and relevant observations (Hambleton & Zenisky, 2013; Romeo, 2011; Zapata-Rivero, 2019). The information should be consistent with the reasons for excluding candidates, and it is recommended to provide a brief report to all excluded candidates. In mass selection processes, individual reports can be replaced by a collective report with the scores of the candidates. The reports should not include the candidates' responses, but these should be recorded and kept by qualified psychologists in case of complaints. Formal agreements on decision making based on the psychological evaluation should be established, guaranteeing confidentiality and safekeeping of the information.

While the candidate should be able to obtain a reasoned report on their results in the selective process, this report should not include access to the test materials, as this would compromise the security and integrity of the tests (APA, 2015; ITC; 2014). In this sense, it is important to establish procedures that ensure protection and limited access to these materials. In case of strict necessity, such as a court injunction, the materials will only be shared with qualified and designated professionals for the case. Meetings with excluded candidates can be considered to show and explain their results, ensuring data protection and integrity of evidence.

Section 6. Diversity Assessment

Recommendation 6.1: *Design accommodations to remove irrelevant barriers that interfere with the purpose of the assessment (e.g., high desks, Braille, text reader, extra time).*

Recommendation 6.2: *Establish clear eligibility rules and procedures for requesting and evaluating accommodations. Document and ensure proper implementation of these procedures and inform applicants about the process and the confidentiality of their data.*

Recommendation 6.3: *Ensure that accommodations do not affect the validity of inferences derived from the scores. Document any modifications that change the construct assessed and how they affect the interpretation of the results.*

Justification: Assessing candidates with disabilities may require special accommodations that differ from standardized procedures in order to remove irrelevant barriers that interfere with the assessment objectives. These accommodations seek to minimize the impact of known disabilities that are not relevant to the object of assessment (e.g., a motor impairment). Accommodations may include modifications to the environment, test format, and time limit. The appropriate accommodation for a candidate should be determined according to their specific situation, with standardized rules on eligibility, requesting, and evaluating the accommodation. Accommodations should ensure that scoring reflects the assessment objective and not irrelevant disabilities. Communication and documentation of accommodations should be clear, indicating any deviations from standard procedures in score reports. Screening procedures for candidates with disabilities should be as similar as possible to those used for other candidates (APA, 2022; Andrews, 2020).

Section 7. Qualification

Recommendation 7.1: *Psychologists involved in the assessment of psychological variables through psychometric tests in selection processes must have accredited training and experience in organizational, work, and human resources psychology, as well as in psychometrics and testing.*

Justification: In psychological assessment by means of tests in selection processes, the good practice guide of the Madrid Psychological Association (COP) and the EFPA standards for the use of tests in organizational contexts indicate the need for psychologists with solid training and experience in psychometrics and assessment, as well as mastery of the models and theories of work, organizational, and human resources psychology.

In this context, it is important to remember that, since the [General Law of Public Health \(33/2011\)](#), there are two figures with specific competences in the health field: the Specialist Psychologist in Clinical Psychology, trained through the PIR (Psychologist in Residence), and the General Health Psychologist, accessed through the Master's Degree in General Health Psychology. Unlike these profiles, work and organizational psychology does not require health training, since personnel selection is not considered an activity of this type.

Discussion

The use of psychometric tests, especially those aimed at measuring personality factors, continues to be a central issue in the personnel selection processes of public administrations. Although advances in psychometrics have demonstrated the validity of these tools for predicting performance (Salgado, 2005), recent appeals questioning certain aspects of their use underline the importance of balancing technical standards of evaluation with the principles of transparency and fairness that should govern any selective process. The psychometric principles fundamental to ensuring the quality of a test—such as validity, reliability, and standardization—are fully compatible with the legal requirements governing selection processes in the public administration and can be effectively integrated. In this line, recent rulings, such as [Supreme Court 74/2022](#), highlight the importance of clearly justifying the use of typical performance tests, such as personality tests, taking into account the characteristics of the positions offered and ensuring, at the same time, transparency in the evaluation procedures.

Compatibility between psychometric requirements and legal principles is key to maintaining public confidence in selection processes. The recommendations developed by the [Test Commission of the General Council of the Spanish Psychological Association \(2023\)](#) reinforce the importance of establishing a structured framework in which tests are used rigorously and consistently with the principles of publicity and fairness, ensuring that the decisions made are both technically and legally sound. In line with the need to harmonize technical and legal standards, the review of rulings and appeals related to the use of psychometric tests for personality assessment has resulted in 16 recommendations that combine good practice in the use of tests with the principles of transparency, publicity, and fairness. These recommendations, organized in seven sections, support the idea that complying with the principle of transparency in selection processes requires exhaustively documenting each of the decisions that affect

the process. Such documentation includes defining the attributes to be assessed, specifying who will conduct the assessment, establishing selection and exclusion criteria, determining how scores will be obtained and combined, providing information to participants on the rationale for the decision taken, and considering the need for test adaptations when some candidates have special needs due to functional diversity. All decisions regarding the design of the process must be aligned with the assessment objectives, scientific evidence, and available resources.

The recommendations also apply to other tests of typical performance, such as those designed to assess attitudes, values, or emotional intelligence, which, although less common in selection processes, are used in certain contexts. They are equally relevant for competency-based tests, which are gaining importance in the modernization of public administrations (Novales et al., 2022). A competency-based approach, such as the one implemented by the EPSO (the European Personnel Selection Office) in its assessment center, uses situational tests, such as the e-tray, and observational assessments to evaluate candidates in a more comprehensive way (EPSO, 2022; EU Careers, 2022). These methods focus primarily on assessing practical skills such as problem solving, decision making, leadership, and teamwork skills. Situational assessments focused on key competencies ensure that the selected individuals possess the necessary skills to perform effectively in modern, complex environments. Examples of processes that include competency-based assessment can be found in pilot projects in the Valencian Community, which align the processes to Law 4/2021 of the Valencian Civil Service (<https://www.boe.es/eli/es-vc/l/2021/04/16/4>), or in the experience developed by the Sabadell City Council (Amorós, 2022). In these tests, beyond correct or incorrect answers, the actions are evaluated according to their appropriateness to the situations and demands presented at each moment.

An effective implementation of psychometric tests in selection processes requires both a thorough understanding of their theoretical basis and the particularities of psychological measurement compared to other forms of measurement. These specific characteristics directly influence the design and practical administration of the tests. Although the foundations of the measurement of psychological variables have been debated since the beginnings of psychology (Aftanas et al., 2018; Bartlett, 1939; Borsboom, 2005; Maul et al., 2016; Michell, 1997), this theoretical debate does not call into question the predictive capacity of tests (Borman et al., 1997; Salgado & Moscoso, 2008; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). From a methodological and applied perspective, it is essential that the validity of scores in a specific context be empirically demonstrated through studies designed for that purpose. The quality and rigor of these studies, which must be adequately documented, are what really add value to the tests used.

Furthermore, these unique features of psychological measurement, often poorly understood by professionals in other disciplines, have significant implications in a number of areas beyond the selection processes. Examples include the debates that have arisen around Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council on medical devices (European Commission, 2020), and the regulation of artificial intelligence (COM/2021/206; European Commission, 2023). These regulations have led the assessment community to adopt clear positions, not

only in defense of the achievements in measurement in psychology, but also to highlight the idiosyncrasy of its methods and the fundamental contribution of this science to the evaluation of various constructs (EFPA, 2021; Ziegler & Iliescu, 2023). Both examples underscore the need for continued work in disseminating and understanding the unique characteristics of psychological measurement, promoting an appropriate integration of its methods and advances in regulatory and professional frameworks, both in the social sciences and in other fields.

Regardless of the type of variables to be assessed (aptitudes, personality, attitudes, competencies, etc.), the integration of psychometric criteria with legal requirements is possible and ensures that selection processes meet the highest technical standards. It is advisable that those who manage these assessments in public administrations work closely with assessment experts to foster a culture of continuous improvement. Such cooperation could include the periodic review of instruments, ongoing training, and the implementation of robust procedures to ensure that psychometric tests are accurate and valid, and that their inclusion in the process is transparent. The Test Commission, committed to its mission of studying, advancing, and improving the use of assessment tests, considers it essential to participate in this initiative and to approach it with the scientific rigor and ethical principles that guide its work. Only through this joint effort will it be possible to ensure that the selective processes meet the highest standards of transparency, fairness, and technical validity, thus consolidating public confidence in these methods.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest in relation to the content of this article.

Funding

Partially funded by the AEI: PID2024-155252OB-100.

References

- Abad, F. J., Olea, J., Ponsoda, V., & García, C. (2011). *Medición en ciencias sociales y de la salud [Measurement in social and health sciences]*. Síntesis.
- Aftanas, M. S., & Solomon, J. (2018). Historical traces of a general measurement theory in psychology. *Review of General Psychology*, 22(3), 278-289. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000143>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. https://www.testingstandards.net/uploads/7/6/6/4/76643089/standards_2014edition.pdf
- American Psychological Association. (2015). *Requests for Test Data and Materials: Respond with Care*. APA Practice Organization, 2-19.
- American Psychological Association. (2018). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*. APA. <https://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/personnel-selection-procedures.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2022). *Guidelines for Assessment and Intervention with Persons with Disabilities*. <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-assessment-intervention-disabilities.pdf>

- Amorós, V. V. (2022). La selección de personal público por competencias es posible: la experiencia en el proceso continuado de mejora de los procesos selectivos del Ayuntamiento de Sabadell [The selection of public personnel by competencies is possible: The experience in the continuous process of improvement of the selection processes of Sabadell City Council]. *Revista Vasca de Gestión de Personas y Organizaciones Públicas*, 23, 90-112. <https://doi.org/10.47623/ivap-rvvp.23.2022.05>
- Andrews, E. E. (2020). *Disability as Diversity: Developing Cultural Competence*. University Press.
- Ayala, R. J. de (2009). *The theory and practice of item response theory*. Guilford Press.
- Bartlett, R. (1939). Measurement in Psychology. *Nature*, 144, 498-502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/144498A0>
- Berga, L., & Austers, I. (2022). Job performance predictors in a group of information and communication technology specialists. *Baltic Journal of Psychology*, 23(1/2), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.22364/bjp.23.01>
- Borman, W., Hanson, M., & Hedge, J. (1997). Personnel selection. *Annual review of psychology*, 48, 299-337. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.299>
- Borsboom, D. (2005). *Measuring the mind: Conceptual issues in contemporary psychometrics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490026>
- Casas, M. G. (2022). Sobre la discrecionalidad técnica en los procesos selectivos. Especial referencia a los cuerpos policiales y a las pruebas de personalidad. Saliendo de la zona de confort [On technical discretionality in selection processes. Special reference to police forces and personality tests. Stepping out of the comfort zone]. *Revista Vasca de Gestión de Personas y Organizaciones Públicas*, 23, 8-35. <https://doi.org/10.47623/ivap-rvvp.23.2022.01>
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2001). The federal uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures (1978). An update on selected issues. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 21(3), 200-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X0102100303>
- Castaño, G., López, G. M., & Prieto, J. M. (2011a). *Manual de buenas prácticas en reclutamiento y selección de personal [Recruitment and selection best practices handbook]*. Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos de Madrid. <https://www.copmadrid.org/web/publicaciones/manual-de-buenas-practicas-en-reclutamiento-y-seleccion-de-personal-rs>
- Castaño, G., López, G. M., & Prieto, J. M. (2011b). *Guía técnica y de buenas prácticas en reclutamiento y selección de personal [Technical guide and best practices in recruitment and selection of personnel]*. Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos de Madrid. <http://www.copmadrid.org/webcopm/recursos/guiatecnicabuenaspracticas.pdf>
- Chaves, J. R. (2022). *Vademécum de oposiciones y concursos. Control jurisprudencial de la discrecionalidad técnica, los errores y los abusos en los procedimientos selectivos (Actualización 2022) [Vade mecum of competitive examinations and competitions. Jurisprudential control of technical discretion, errors, and abuses in selective procedures (Update 2022)]*. Amarante.
- Comisión Europea [European Commission]. (2023). *Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por el que se establecen normas armonizadas en materia de inteligencia artificial (Ley de Inteligencia Artificial) y se modifican determinados actos legislativos de la Unión [Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonized rules in the field of artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain legislative acts of the Union]*. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2023-0236_EN.html
- Comisión Europea [European Commission]. (2020, April). *Medical Devices Regulation (MDR)*. EC. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32017R0745>
- Comisión Europea [European Commission]. (2021). *Propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por el que se establecen normas armonizadas en materia de inteligencia artificial (COM/2021/206) [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonized rules in the field of artificial intelligence (COM/2021/206)]*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu>.
- Comisión de Test del Consejo General de la Psicología. (2023). *Informe sobre el uso de los test psicométricos en los procesos de selección de personal de las administraciones públicas [Report on the use of psychometric tests in personnel selection processes of public administrations]*. Consejo General de la Psicología [General Council of the Spanish Psychological Association]. https://www.cop.es/uploads/PDF/InformeComision_Test_Procesos_seleccion_AAPP.pdf.
- Corte, W. de, Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Combining predictors to achieve optimal trade-offs between selection quality and adverse impact. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1380-1393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1380>
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Drasgow, F. (2020). Prediction of performance by non-cognitive traits. *Military Psychology*, 32(1), 127-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2F08995605.2019.1652479>
- EU Careers. (2022). Marco de competencias [Competency Framework]. <https://eu-careers.europa.eu/es/system/files?file=2023-04/ES.pdf>
- European Federation of Psychologists' Associations. (2021). *European Federation of Psychologists' Associations, Board of Assessment response to EU Regulatory Proposal on Artificial Intelligence*. https://www.efpa.eu/sites/default/files/2023-06/efpa_response_to_eu_regulatory_framework_proposal_on_ai.pdf
- European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO). (2022). EPSO's competency framework. <https://eu-careers.europa.eu/en/documents/epsos-competency-framework>
- Evers, A., Muñoz, J., Hagemeister, C., Høstmælingen, A., Lindley, P., Sjöberg, A., & Bartram, D. (2013). Assessing the quality of tests: Revision of the EFPA review model. *Psicothema*, 25(3), 283-291. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2013.97>
- Fernández, G. (1992). Régimen jurídico de la función pública y jurisprudencia constitucional [Legal regime of the civil service and constitutional jurisprudence]. *Revista del Centro de Estudios Constitucionales*, 12, 61-121. <https://www.cepc.gob.es/publicaciones/revistas/revista-del-centro-de-estudios-constitucionales/numero-12-mayoagosto-1992/regimen-juridico-de-la-funcion-publica-y-jurisprudencia-constitucional-1>
- Finch, D. M., Edwards, B. D., & Wallace, J. C. (2009). Multistage selection strategies: Simulating the effects on adverse impact and expected performance for various predictor combinations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 318-340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013775>
- Fondevila, J. (2020). Los claros y oscuros del EBEP en los procedimientos de concurrencia competitiva: reflexiones empíricas y propuestas innovadoras [The light and shadows of the EBEP in competitive selection procedures: Empirical reflections and innovative proposals]. *Documentación Administrativa*, 7, 63-87. <https://doi.org/10.24965/da.i7.10898>
- Fondevila, J. (2021). *Manual para la selección de empleados públicos* (3.ª ed.) [Manual for the selection of public employees (3rd ed.)]. Wolters Kluwer.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Zenisky, A. L. (2013). Reporting test scores in more meaningful ways: A research-based approach to score report design. In K. F. Geisinger, B. A. Bracken, J. F. Carlson, J.-I. C. Hansen, N. R. Kuncel, S. P. Reise, & M. C. Rodríguez (Eds.), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology, Vol. 3: Testing and assessment in school psychology and education* (pp. 479-494). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14049-023>

- Hernández, A., Ponsoda, V., Muñoz, J., Prieto, G., & Elosua, P. (2016). Revisión del modelo para evaluar la calidad de los tests utilizados en España [Assessing The Quality Of Tests In Spain: Revision Of The Spanish Test Review Model]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 37(3), 192-197.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2023). *Prestación de servicios de evaluación. Procedimientos y métodos para evaluar a las personas en entornos laborales y organizacionales [Provision of assessment services. Procedures and methods for assessing people in work and organizational settings]*. ISO.
- International Test Commission. (2014). *International Guidelines on the Security of Test, Examinations, and Other Assessments*. [<https://www.intestcom.org>]
- Kline, P. (2000). *Handbook of Psychological Testing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kolen, M. J., & Hendrickson, A. B. (2013). Scaling, norming, and equating. In K. F. Geisinger, B. A. Bracken, J. F. Carlson, J.-I. C. Hansen, N. R. Kuncel, S. P. Reise, & M. C. Rodriguez (Eds.), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology, Vol. 1: Test theory and testing and assessment in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 201-222). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14047-011>
- Ley 4/2021, de 16 de abril, de la Función Pública Valenciana [Law 4/2021, of April 16, 21, on the Valencian Civil Service]. *Boletín Oficial del Estado [Official State Gazette]*, No. 127, May 28, 2021, pp. 64542-685. Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/eli/es-vc/l/2021/04/16/4>.
- Ley 33/2011, de 4 de octubre, General de Salud Pública [Law 33/2011, of October 4, 2011, General Law on Public Health]. *Boletín Oficial del Estado, [Official State Gazette]*, No. 240, October 5, 2011, pp. 104593-105231]. <https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2011-15623>
- Linn, R. L. (Ed.). (1989). *Educational measurement* (3rd ed.). Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc; American Council on Education.
- Maul, A., Irribarra, D., & Wilson, M. (2016). On the philosophical foundations of psychological measurement. *Measurement*, 79, 311-320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MEASUREMENT.2015.11.001>
- Michell, J. (1997). Quantitative science and the definition of measurement in psychology. *British Journal of Psychology*, 88, 355-383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02641.x>
- Mueller, L., Norris, D., & Oppler, S. (2007). Implementation based on alternate validation procedures: Ranking, cuts scores, banding, and compensatory models. In S. M. McPhail (Ed.), *Alternative validation strategies: Developing new and leveraging existing validity evidence* (pp. 349-405). Jossey-Bass.
- Muñoz, J. (2002). *Teoría clásica de test [Classical test theory]*. Pirámide.
- Muñoz, J., Hernández, A., & Fernández-Hermida, J. R. (2020). Utilización de los test en España: el punto de vista de los psicólogos [Test Use In Spain: The Psychologists' Viewpoint]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 41(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.23923/pap.psicol2020.2921>
- Novalés, A., Andrés, J., Fuente, A. de la, Rus, G. de, Gonzáles, L., Fernández, M., ... & Rebollar, R. (2022). *Modernización de la administración pública [The modernization of public administration]*. Policy Paper. <https://www.ucm.es/icei/file/fpp2022-01-modernizacion-de-la-administracion-publica>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788-818. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.714>
- Parejo, L. (1995). Administración y Función pública [Administration and Civil Service]. *Documentación Administrativa*, 243, 68-87. <https://doi.org/10.24965/da.v0i243.5406>
- Real Decreto Legislativo 5/2015, de 30 de octubre, por el que se aprueba el Texto Refundido de la Ley del Estatuto Básico del Empleado Público [Royal Legislative Decree 5/2015, of October 30, 2015, approving the Consolidated Text of the Basic Statute of the Public Employee Law]. *Boletín Oficial del Estado [Official State Gazette]*, No. 261, October 31, 2015. https://www.boe.es/biblioteca_juridica/abrir_pdf.php?id=PUB-PB-2024-193.
- Romeo, M. A. (2011). La elaboración del informe de resultados [The development of the performance report]. In M. G. Castaño, G. López, & J. M. Prieto (Coords.), *Manual de buenas prácticas en reclutamiento y selección de personal [Manual of Best Practices in Recruitment and Selection of Personnel]*. Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos de Madrid [Madrid Psychological Association].
- Rust, J., Golombok, S., & Skuse, D. (2009). *Modern Psychometrics: The Science of Psychological Assessment* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Salgado, J. F. (2005). Personalidad y deseabilidad social en contextos organizacionales: implicaciones para la práctica de la psicología del trabajo y las organizaciones [Personality and Social Desirability in Organizational Settings: Practical Implications for Work and Organizational Psychology]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 92, 115-128. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/778/77809207.pdf>
- Salgado, J. F. (2016). A theoretical model of psychometric effects of faking on assessment procedures: Empirical findings and implications for personality at work. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(3), 209-228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12142>
- Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2008). Selección de personal en la empresa y las AAPP: de la visión tradicional a la visión estratégica [Personnel selection in business and public administrations: From the traditional vision to the strategic vision]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 29(1), 16-24. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/778/77829103.pdf>
- Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262-274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262>
- SIOF (Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology) (2018) *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*. American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/personnel-selection-procedures.pdf>
- Thissen, D., & Wainer, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Test scoring*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Tribunal Supremo, Sala de lo Contencioso-Administrativo, Sección Cuarta [Supreme Court, Contentious-Administrative Chamber, Fourth Section]. (2022). *Sentencia núm. 74/2022*.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: Implications for personality measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(2), 197-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131649921969802>
- Zapata-Rivero, D. (Ed.). (2019). *Score Reporting Research and Applications*. Routledge.
- Zell, E., & Lesick, T. L. (2022). Big five personality traits and performance: A quantitative synthesis of 50+ meta-analyses. *Journal of Personality*, 90(4), 559-573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12683>
- Ziegler, M., & Iliescu, D. (2023). Measurement does not take place in a legal vacuum: Ideas regarding regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Medical Devices [Editorial]. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 39(2), 79-84. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000764>