

## COURSE OUTLINE

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>SCHOOL</b>	SOCIAL SCIENCES		
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	PSYCHOLOGY		
<b>LEVEL</b>	UNDERGRADUATE		
<b>COURSE CODE</b>	<b>PS-3113</b>	<b>SEMESTER</b>	6
<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	Cognitive dimensions in psychometric assessment and interpretation		
<b>TEACHING ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>WEEKLY TEACHING HOURS</b>	<b>ECTS</b>	
Instructor lectures and case study presentations. Student presentations and discussion of research articles.	3	6	
<b>COURSE TYPE</b>	Skills development (seminar)		
<b>PREREQUISITES</b>	Research Methodology in Social Sciences I		
<b>LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT</b>	Greek		
<b>COURSE OFFERED TO ERASMUS STUDENTS</b>	No		
<b>COURSE WEBSITE (URL)</b>	<a href="https://elearn.uoc.gr/course/view.php?id=5785">https://elearn.uoc.gr/course/view.php?id=5785</a>		

### 2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

#### Learning outcomes

Psychometric assessment constitutes a fundamental pillar of the scientific approach in psychology. However, completing and interpreting psychometric instruments is not a neutral process of recording behaviours, beliefs, and experiences. Individuals' responses to questionnaire items are influenced by various cognitive and metacognitive mechanisms, which may threaten the validity and reliability of results. These mechanisms include, as an example, the level of item comprehension, attentional processes, memory processes, and response strategies. Furthermore, the evaluator's judgment during the interpretation of a psychometric profile may also be influenced by heuristics and cognitive biases, potentially affecting the accuracy and justification of conclusions.

The seminar focuses on understanding the core cognitive processes involved in psychometric assessment, as well as on identifying practices that improve the quality of data and their interpretation. Through theoretical perspectives, critical reading of empirical findings, and applications based on internationally recognised personality assessment instruments, students will develop the ability to formulate evidence-based and objective hypotheses that support professional judgment.

Upon successful completion of the seminar, students will be able to:

- Analyse cognitive processes that influence responses to psychometric instruments
- Critically evaluate the nature and consequences of biased responding and identify factors that enhance such biases
- Develop skills in the critical interpretation of psychometric data, taking into account common sources of error and validity limitations
- Connect theoretical concepts from cognitive psychology with practical issues in psychometric assessment (e.g., self-report, self-presentation)

- Identify and consider cognitive biases when forming hypotheses and interpreting results
- Propose best practices in psychometric assessment depending on the applied context

#### General skills

Students will develop the ability to:

- Search for, analyze, and synthesize data and information using appropriate technologies
- Apply critical thinking and self-reflection
- Conduct independent study and work
- Make informed decisions and exercise professional judgment
- Plan and manage projects
- Apply knowledge in applied and professional contexts

### 3. COURSE CONTENT

The course content is aligned with the five core pillars of the curriculum: [1] Scientific foundations, [2] Scientific research and critical thinking, [3] Ethics and social responsibility, [4] Communication skills, [5] Career preparation and professional development

**Week 1:** Introduction to the cognitive foundations of psychometric assessment [1, 2]

**Week 2:** Historical development of psychological measurement and the emergence of the concept of validity [1, 2]

**Week 3:** Response strategies and validity problems I: Inconsistent responding [1, 2]

**Week 4:** Response strategies and validity problems II: Over-reporting and under-reporting [1, 2, 3]

**Week 5:** Individual presentations I – Inconsistent responses and non-content responding [2, 4]

**Week 6:** Individual presentations II – Over-reporting [2, 4]

**Week 7:** Individual presentations III – Context, motivation, and response strategies [2, 4]

**Week 8:** Individual presentations IV – Under-reporting and defensiveness [2, 4]

**Εβδομάδα 9:** Individual presentations V – Metacognitive processes and self-evaluation [2, 4]

**Week 10:** Integrative discussion and analysis of response mechanisms [2, 4]

**Week 11:** Case studies I [2, 3, 5]

**Week 12:** Case studies II [2, 3, 5]

**Week 13:** Synthesis and reflection [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

### 4. TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS – ASSESSMENT

<b>DELIVERY MODE</b>	Πρόσωπο με πρόσωπο		
<b>USE OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES</b>	PowerPoint presentations, visual materials, online resources, email communication, use of the e-learn platform		
<b>COURSE ORGANISATION</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Workload (hours)</b>	<b>ECTS</b>
	Lectures/meetings	39	1.56

	Weekly activities	18	0.72
	Individual presentations	18	0.72
	Group assignment	25	1.00
	Independent study	50	2.00
	<b>Total workload</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>6,00</b>
<b>STUDENT ASSESSMENT</b>	<p>For enrolled students, the language of assessment is Greek.</p> <p><b>Individual presentation (50%):</b> A 15–20 minute oral presentation supported by slides (PowerPoint). Students analyse a specific response mechanism and discuss its relationship with cognitive processes and psychometric validity.</p> <p><b>Group assignment (40%):</b> A critical analysis of a selected category of response strategies and their implications for the validity and interpretation of psychometric data. Total length: 6,000–7,000 words.</p> <p><b>Participation (10%):</b> Active participation in discussions of weekly presentations and assignments.</p>		

## 5. RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dunning, D., Heath, C., & Suls, J. (2004). Flawed self-assessment: Implications for health, education, and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5, 69-106. doi: 10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00018.x
- Fleming, S. M., & Dolan, R. J. (2012). The neural basis of metacognitive ability. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 367, 1338–1349. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2011.0417
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 213–236. doi: 10.1002/acp.2350050305
- Robinson, M. & Clore, G. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 934–960. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.934
- Tourangeau, R., Rips, L., & Rasinski, K. (2000). *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge University Press.