**Fairness EPSY 5221**

From the *Testing Standards* (2014):

* “Fairness is a fundamental validity issue and requires attention throughout all stages of test development and use” (p. 49).
* Measurement bias is a central threat to fairness, but two additional concepts include accessibility (“unobstructed opportunity to demonstrate their standing on the construct(s) being measured,” p. 49) and universal design (approaches that maximize accessibility for all intended test takers, p. 50).
* Fairness is “responsiveness to individual characteristics and testing contexts so that individual test scores will yield valid interpretations for intended uses. …A test that is fair within the meaning of the *Standards* reflects the same construct(s) for all test takers, and scores from it have the same meaning for all individuals in the intended population; a fair test does not advantage or disadvantage some individuals because of characteristics irrelevant to the intended construct.” (p. 50).
* The *Standards* describe general views of fairness
  + equitable treatment during the testing process
  + lack of measurement bias (introducing a new range of definitions)
  + access to the intended measured constructs (a test bias issue)
  + validity of individual test score interpretation and use
* The core fairness standard (3.0) implies that attention to fairness is intended to “minimize construct-irrelevant variance and to promote valid score interpretations for the intended uses for all examinees in the intended population” (p. 63).
* “The central idea of fairness in testing is to identify and remove construct-irrelevant barriers to maximal performance for any examinee. Removing these barriers allows for the comparable and valid interpretation of test scores for all examinees. Fairness is thus central to the validity and comparability of the interpretation of test scores for intended uses” (p. 63).

**From others:**

Willingham & Cole (1997), fair tests measure the same construct(s) for all test takers and scores have the same meaning for all individuals in the intended population – a concern that covers all stages of test development and use.

And a series of chapters in the edited book, *Fairness in educational assessment and measurement* (Dorans & Cook, 2016):

Zieky (2016), fairness is a matter of validity, and a fair test is one that is valid for different groups of test takers. Construct-relevant sources of score variance allow valid and fair inferences about test takers. CIV leads to unfair inferences if the irrelevant variance is associated with group membership. He also suggests that different views of fairness may vary in usefulness to different audiences.

Wollack & Case (2016), fairness is supported through standardization and securing comparable administration conditions. Fairness relates to equal treatment of all examinees.

Penfield (2016), each scored element should hold the same meaning regarding the proficiency measured and multiple independent scores should be consistent for all test takers regardless of background characteristics.

Sinharay (2016), fairness is concerned with protecting test takers and users in all aspects of testing.

Worrell (2016), when it comes to test fairness, communications and public relations are important vehicles and contexts to promote fair test score interpretation and use.
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