

EDITORIAL

A Diverse Mix of New Methods Added to the Repertoire of Romanian Psychologists: In Support of a Diverse Practice

DRAGOȘ ILIESCU

University of Bucharest, Romania

Guest Editor

It is a pleasure to edit another issue of the Human Resources Psychology journal dedicated to tests and testing. On one hand, I strongly believe that Work, Industrial and Organizational Psychology is very closely connected to assessment in its various forms – tests an important part of our methodological repertoire in both research and practice. On the other hand, more contributions in this domain are sorely needed in Romania: even though the gap in terms of availability of appropriate measures is slowly but surely closing in Romania, there are still a significant number of needs that have not been addressed so far through published instruments. Any contribution is therefore a step ahead, for both researchers and practitioners.

More specifically, each of the papers in this issue is in some way related to test adaptation. Test adaptation, often also going under the name of “test localization” or “test indigenization”, is a comprehensive scientific and professional activity which now spans the whole realm of the social and behavioral sciences. Test adaptation is a thorough scientific process, and as a result is guided by the principles of the scientific method, most prominent of all being the need to offer proof for the appropriateness of any linguistic and cultural transformations operated on the original form of the test, in terms of any and all

psychometric characteristics of the focal measure. All of the papers featured in this issue are true to this intent. Although none of these papers specifically and explicitly focuses on all of the 3 domains of equivalence usually investigated in linguistic and cultural adaptations, i.e., construct, method and item equivalence, but each of them only chooses only one of these domains, all have the advantage of also addressing and investigating the relationship of test scores with variables that are external to the test. As a result, these papers not only report on how the focal measure was adapted to the Romanian cultural context and how it performs from a psychometric point of view, but also offer evidence for the validity of the adapted form of the test, evidence that in every case generalizes to the original measure and extends the validity basis of the test in new and original ways. This is good practice and we salute the efforts that have went into carefully conducting the research that has enabled these contributions.

This issue reunites 4 interesting papers, presenting readers with a diverse mix.

Petrus’s paper on the construct validity of ideal implicit leadership and followership theories offers preliminary evidence regarding the Romanian adaptation of the scale on implicit leadership theories developed by Offerman et al (1994), and revised by Epitropaki and Martin

(2004). This scale is the measure of choice when addressing implicit leadership and followership theories, and the existence of a well-devised Romanian cultural adaptation is an important evolution. Aside from this contribution to test adaptation, the paper also offers evidence on the construct validity of implicit leadership (ILT) and followership (IFT) theories, covering an important gap in the substantive leadership literature. A multi-method approach was employed, combining both traditional confirmatory factor analysis (in an exploratory structural equation modeling approach) and the less often used, and therefore more exotic, network analysis approach. The two approaches converge in showing that ideal ILTs and IFTs have the same underlying factor structure, that they are distinct, stand-alone constructs and that they are also different from current perceptions about the leader or follower. Although the focus of this paper is psychometric, it also has a contribution to substantive literature by tackling a meaningful research objective that has not been investigated before.

Grama's paper on the Student Adaptation To College Questionnaire (SACQ) focuses on a well-known measure of student adaptation to the academic environment, and describes the translation and cultural adaptation process, as well as various psychometric characteristics of the Romanian form of the test, as reflected by the Romanian standardization data. The adaptation process was rather standard, conducted through a translation-backtranslation procedure, but a large normative sample of over 1800 participants was collected and analyzed. The Romanian form of the SACQ has good reliability indices, presents the expected inter-scale correlations and reports the expected gender and age differences. The availability of the SACQ for Romanian practitioners is a much expected evolution, enabling psychologists to offer better psychological services to students in the delicate and challenging period of transition from high-school life to university life.

The Lupşa & Virgă paper addresses the Romanian cultural adaptation of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire. The paper presents two studies. The first study offers evidence regarding the psychometric properties of the Romanian form of the

Psychological Capital Questionnaire; it is based on data collected from two samples totaling over 800 employees. This first study looks into the reliability and construct validity of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire, as well as into its convergent validity with other constructs: work engagement, mental and physical health, and performance. The second study focused in more detail on investigating the convergent and discriminant validity of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire when compared with Big Five personality traits, well-being, and performance. The picture presented by the results of these two studies rounds up the evidence for the good reliability and validity of the Romanian form of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire, and offers Romanian researchers and practitioners access to yet another excellent measure for an important personal resource, one that is positively associated desirable individual and organizational outcomes, among others well-being and performance.

The Liță paper focuses on the Toxic Leadership Scale and presents data from Romanian military organizations based on which it investigates the criterion validity of this measure. The study reports on samples of two different military organizations, with different organizational climates, in which subordinates have rated their leaders with the help of the Toxic Leadership Scale. The paper uses these data to report on the psychometric properties of the Romanian form of the scale, finding good reliabilities and an adequate factor structure. More interesting, the paper also focuses on substantive matters such as evidence in favor of the criterion validity of the Toxic Leadership Scale. Results show for example that the comparisons between scores obtained by the different leaders of the two military organizations strongly reflect the climate of these organizations (conflict-free vs. conflictual).

We commend the efforts of the authors featured in this issue, as well of those many others who contribute to a diverse mix of valid measures for the usage of Romanian researchers and practitioners and who, through their important work, also add to international scientific knowledge regarding these measures.