

The Development of Psychological Assessment in Brazil and Current and Future Challenges

Ana Paula Porto Noronha^{1,*} , Caroline Tozzi Reppold² ,
Denise Ruchel Bandeira³ , & Acacia A. A. dos Santos⁴ 

¹Universidade São Francisco, Campinas, SP, Brasil

²Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

³Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

⁴Coordenação de Aprimoramento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, Brasília, DF, Brasil

ABSTRACT – Brazilian psychological assessment possesses several indicators that prove its quality, although by the early 1990s, the use of psychological tests in evaluative processes had fallen into disrepute in society. The present article recounts the history of Brazilian psychological assessment, told through the lens of the creation of a working group (WG) of the Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Psicologia (ANPEPP, National Association for Research and Graduate Studies in Psychology) and its subsequent achievements. The construction of the Sistema de Avaliação dos Testes Psicológicos (SATEPSI, Psychological Testing Assessment System) and its deployment, collectively, by the profession's regulating agency with the collaboration of scientific associations as well as of the WG and ANPEPP are also mentioned. Many initiatives were reunited, rehabilitating the credibility of the practice of assessment. The authors stress the advances that still need to be made, such as widening research with minority groups and including new statistical analyses and technologies that will impact the development of psychological assessment.

KEYWORDS: Psychological assessment, Psychological testing, Psychometrics

O Desenvolvimento da Avaliação Psicológica no Brasil e os Desafios Atuais e Futuros

RESUMO – A área de avaliação psicológica brasileira possui qualidade comprovada por vários indicadores, embora até o início da década de 1990, o uso de testes psicológicos em processos avaliativos tenha caído no descrédito da sociedade. O presente artigo explicita a história da avaliação psicológica brasileira, narrada à luz da criação de um grupo de trabalho da Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Psicologia e das conquistas subsequentes. A construção do Sistema de Avaliação dos Testes Psicológicos (SATEPSI) e seus desdobramentos, coletivamente, pelo órgão de classe, com a colaboração das associações científicas e do GT da ANPEPP, também são mencionados. Diversas iniciativas foram reunidas, trazendo de volta a credibilidade da prática de avaliação. As autoras destacam os avanços que ainda se fazem necessários, como a ampliação de pesquisas com grupos minoritários, a inclusão de novas análises estatísticas e de tecnologias, que seguramente, impactarão no desenvolvimento da avaliação psicológica.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Avaliação psicológica, Testes psicológicos, Psicometria

In 2022, Brazilian Psychology turns 60. Over this time, Brazilian practices and psychological assessment research have contributed significantly to advances in psychology. The development of psychological assessment (PA) in Brazil is a

story that needs to be continuously revisited. In this direction, this is another visit to this beautiful history of personal and institutional involvement related to PA.

* E-mail: ana.noronha8@gmail.com

■ Submetido: 15/12/2021; Aceito: 06/10/2022.

To this end, official documents from the Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Psicologia (ANPEPP, National Association for Research and Graduate Studies in Psychology) were used as sources to portray dates and historical facts adequately (www.anpepp.org) as well as various scientific publications concerning this theme. When taking up the history of PA in Brazil, there seems to be a consensus in the literature that many actors built it from different educational institutions with various educational backgrounds.

This article, organized into four sections, aims to elucidate how the Working Group (WG) of ANPEPP and researchers, assuming institutional roles, assisted in the development of Brazilian PA. The first one tells the Research in Psychological Assessment Working Group's participation throughout the ANPEPP symposia. The second one highlights different researchers who positively collaborate to develop the area. The third section places Brazilian PA in a global context, and the article ends by proposing future studies e needed advances.

HOW DID THE WORKING GROUP START?

Some say that the Research in Psychological Assessment WG, a title given in 1998, was present for the first time at ANPEPP's Seventh Symposium on Scientific Research and Exchange in Psychology, held that year, which is partially true. However, in 1989 and 1990 meetings, despite the name 'Perspective on Assessment and Diagnosis in Psychology' and its embryonic state, the group was already discussing issues relevant to the area's advance. Themes such as the construction of national standards for existing instruments or even the elaboration of new measurement instruments in light of the Brazilian reality were the focus of attention. Furthermore, the WG looked forward to unifying various studies under the same test to stimulate exchange between researchers.

In the first two meetings, coordination was the responsibility of Professor Odette Lourenção Van Kolck from the University of São Paulo. Additionally, the attendance of the same members in the 1989 and 1990 gatherings was noted. The participation of professors André Jacquemin, Latife Yazigi, and Claudio Hutz, respectively, from the University of São Paulo, the Paulista School of Medicine, and the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, who stayed, except for the first, for years in the ANPEPP WG deserves mention.

There are no records of the WG meetings in the following years. In 1998, though, the WG came to be called Research in Psychological Assessment, as stated in the opening lines of this article, a title it has held until today. On that occasion, the ANPEPP event took place in Gramado, Rio Grande do Sul, and ten members attended, all with productive activity in the area. Solange Muglia Wechsler coordinated it and, of the members of the previous meeting (1990), only Claudio Hutz remained. In the few existing documents, it is possible to find each researcher's contribution through the presentation of their investigations. These presentations were used to share the study's topic of each researcher, which would allow the development of joint work (ANPEPP, 2021).

In 2002, the WG was significantly strengthened by the dizzying increase in the number of participants and the inclusion of graduate students. It was observed over the years that the students became researchers and advanced in the

development of Brazilian PA cyclically. The 2002 edition, in Águas de Lindóia, São Paulo, counted 16 researchers and 13 students present. It is important to highlight that, today, the graduate students of that time have their own research network and educate new researchers, greatly multiplying those involved in the area, which had been quite small up to then.

It is worth remembering that the WG, since their first meetings, was present at many milestones marking the advance of Brazilian PA. As one example, as a result of discussions promoted among the members, the Instituto Brasileiro de Avaliação e Pesquisa em Psicologia (IBAPP, Brazilian Institute for Assessment and Research in Psychology), later renamed to the Instituto Brasileiro de Avaliação Psicológica (IBAP, Brazilian Institute for Psychological Assessment) in the 2000s (Hutz, 2002). The scientific journal published by IBAP, Psychological Assessment, was also born in ANPEPP meetings. Similarly, the building of the Sistema de Avaliação dos Testes Psicológicos (SATEPSI, Psychological Testing Assessment System) by the Conselho Federal de Psicologia (CFP, Federal Psychology Council) was a Research in Psychological Assessment WG discussion topic, as were research projects supported by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP, São Paulo Research Foundation) (Noronha et al., 2004). Finally, in the early 2000s, an e-mail list was created to facilitate communication (avalpsi@yahoogrupos.com.br). Of course, by today's standards, such a resource seems obtuse. However, it is worth remembering that we are speaking of two decades ago when technological solutions were not so developed.

This e-mail list markedly aided communication between WG members and possessed a large community interested in PA at that time, particularly in tense moments, such as the publication of Resolution CFP 02/2003 (CFP, 2003). Cardoso and Silva-Filho (2018) endorsed that the WG allowed regular meetings of researchers and helped groups and laboratories coordinate from different teaching institutions. Being in the south or northeast of the country does not hinder researcher coordination from pursuing a common goal. Thus, distances were minimized, and working partnerships were built. 'Psychological assessment' professionals came to be recognized and created an identity.

On the 11th ANPEPP seminar, held in Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, in 2006, the WG was divided into three groups: Projective Methods in Psychological Assessment, Child and Adolescent Psychological Assessment, and Research in Psychological Assessment, which kept the original name. This organization persisted through the 12th, 13th, and 14th symposia. Finally, in 2014, at the 15th symposium, there was a new subdivision of the groups. Child and Adolescent Psychological Assessment split into Cognitive Assessment and Neuropsychology, Assessment in Positive Psychology and Creativity, and Psychological Assessment: Personality and Psychopathology (Nascimento & Vasconcelos, 2016). Currently, the PA area has six working groups, which is not seen in other fields, those being: 1) Assessment and Intervention in Child and Adolescent Development; 2) Projective Methods in Psychological Assessment Contexts; 3) Psychological

and Psychopathological Assessment; 4) Assessment in Positive Psychology and Creativity; 5) Psychometrics; and 6) Research in Psychological Assessment.

What has been intended to be communicated? That the area of PA has grown until large proportions over the last three decades (Noronha & Reppold, 2010; Reppold & Noronha, 2018) due to its complexity, the inclusion of new subjects to explore, and as a result of the collective efforts and the determination of a common good. According to Primi (2010), advances in theory and methodology were noted more than ten years ago. The author references the increase in publications and the impact of these advances on professional practice. Certainly, none of this would have been possible if not for the professors and researchers brought together by the opportunity of the ANPEPP symposia and other scientific events. In what follows, the development of SATEPSI will be explored.

HOW HAVE RESEARCHERS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT CONTRIBUTED TO THE ADVANCE OF THE FIELD IN BRAZIL AND TO SATEPSI?

Despite Brazilian Psychology is turning 60, even before Law no. 4.119/62, which regulated the professional practice of psychologists in Brazil, national studies in PA resulted in scientific publications and the creation of various psychological tests. These tests sought to assess, in children and adults, individual differences in aptitude, intelligence, and interest, thereby offering resources to the work of school adaption and person selection (Wechsler et al., 2019).

With government and private funding for research in the 1950s and 1960s, the development of Brazilian psychological instruments and the diffusion of the psychotechnical exam in multi-professional assessment proliferated. This contributed to the practices of PA being valued as the profession was first being regulated. At the time, noteworthy Decree n° 53.464/64 determined that among the few exclusive functions of a psychologist, the use of psychological methods and techniques to psychological diagnosis came to be reserved to the profession as well.

However, starting in the 1970s, PA research declined in Brazil. Among other reasons, a lack of qualified graduates, particularly in the scientific field, lowered the technical quality of available tests over time. From 1980 to 2000, PA languished in the country, such that many available tests possessed neither psychometric studies regarding updated norms nor evidence of validity. In some cases, the material was only an unadopted translation of international tests (Bandeira et al., 2006; Noronha, 2002). In the face of this situation, many who felt undermined by PA, be it in public service exams or driver's license acquisition, for example, challenged the relevance and scientific basis of the psychological tests then in use (Bandeira et al., 2006; Noronha, 2002).

One of the results of these challenges was seen in 1998 when then-President Fernando Henrique Cardoso vetoed, in

the proposed National Transit Code, the requirement for PA for granting a drivers' license, despite the psychotechnical exam having been a legal requirement for receiving it since 1966. That veto, later reversed, provoked a significant mobilization among researchers and psychologists and was a remarkable moment for the class to seek to qualify the area of PA based on technical-scientific precepts.

Thus, in response to civil society's critics of the low quality of available psychometric tests and the various legal cases involving the inappropriate use of PA techniques, the CFP created the SATEPSI (CFP, 2003; for more information, see Reppold, & Noronha, 2018 and Cardoso & Silva-Filho, 2018). The system flows continuously and involves the regulation of the PA area and the evaluation of minimum technical requirements a psychological test must possess to demonstrate scientific quality. It also involves divulging information about psychological tests to the community as well as continuing education for psychologists and the dissemination of best practices related to the PA field's professional exercise and research. The system underwent improvements in 2018 (CFP, 2018).

Defined by Federal Psychology Council (CFP, 2019a) regulation, SATEPSI is operationalized via a Psychological Assessment Consulting Council (CCAP), which has the following powers: "I – Issuing opinions in response to demands addressed to the CFP in matters of psychological assessment; II – Elaborating and proposing updates for the CFP's technical and normative documents related to psychological assessment; III – Conducting the process of evaluating instruments submitted to SATEPSI; IV – Discussing issues and providing subsidies to the CFP to underwrite actions in the field of psychological assessment".

The CCAP consists of members of the CFP Plenary and researchers of recognized knowledge with PhDs and scientific publications in PA. These researchers, recommended by scientific associations in the area [IBAP and the Associação Brasileira de Rorschach e Métodos Projetivos (ASBRo, Brazilian Rorschach and Projective Methods Association)], come from different areas of Brazil and study subjects related to building psychological tests, the search for validity evidence, interpretation norms for the instruments, and/or the application of PA in differing contexts of professional practice. This diversity that characterizes CCAP enabled attention to cultural specificities that impact the elaboration of instruments and contributes to the usual demands of each sort of PA (scales, inventories, questionnaires, and projective/expressive methods) are considered in normative documents proposed by the system.

Since 2003, CCAP has had 11 different memberships, always consisting of 12 councilors, 29 researchers, and seven CFP technical analysts, each management being composed of at least one counselor, eight researchers and one technician. The work commission is aided by the ad hoc consultancy of reviewers selected via CFP's statute, which establishes, among other criteria for inclusion, a doctorate in the area of PA and proof of scientific activity in this area in the form of qualified scientific periodicals. Currently, 45 doctors from various subfields of psychology (e.g., clinical assessment, neuropsychology, traffic, legal, organizational, school, health, etc.) with verified scientific production are registered as ad hoc SATEPSI reviewers. This varied composition is important to cover specific scientific demands in the evaluation of the tests received by SATEPSI, being coherent with the scientific precepts that govern PA. It is important to state that, over 18 years, SATEPSI has favored an impressive increase in tests made available for professional practices. Due to its guidelines, the tests are only approved if they prove, through scientific evidence, that they evaluate what they propose to evaluate, that they have a theoretical and empirical basis and, also, that they comply with the principles of justice and respect for human rights. Note that in June 2022, the list of psychological tests (private and not private) considered approved for professional use totaled 189 instruments, a number at least four times greater than the 41 tests favorably considered by SATEPSI evaluation in 2003, the year of its inception.

Thus, what is seen over time is that SATEPSI contributed immensely to psychologists being better informed about the technical characteristics of the instruments available for their use (Cardoso & Silva-Filho, 2018; Noronha & Reppold, 2010; Reppold & Noronha, 2018). This is a relevant data point. According to Resolution CFP 09/2018 (CFP, 2018), it is the responsibility of the psychologist to choose the most appropriate fundamental sources for the assessment context and the population being assessed. Before SATEPSI, as it turns out, there was no unified information on the indications and psychometric parameters of commercial tests, which hampered selection

by psychologists, who many times had to purchase manuals to familiarize themselves with the tests.

SATEPSI contributed as well to qualifying scientific studies related to the creation/adaptation of new instruments and the updating of norms. In recent years, new statistical resources for data analysis and new methods for finding validity evidence have been seen by researchers in the tests' technical manuals, motivated by the regulation of the system. It is noteworthy that the test qualification criteria proposed in the appendices of Resolutions CFP 02/2003 and 09/2018 have been increased over time, which has resulted in studies with samples more representative of the population and with more detailed statistical analyses in many cases. Thus, currently, for a test to be considered excellent in terms of its correcting system and classifying norms, it must have participants from all five geographic regions of the country (CFP, 2018). When evaluating the validity parameters of objective tests, there should be a validity study based on internal structure and a minimum of three other studies using different sources of validity evidence, with broad and diverse samples (CFP, 2018).

In order to qualify the area of PA, SATEPSI also contributed to the elaboration of various other regulatory CFP documents. These documents include the regulation of PA in public tenders and public and private selection processes [Resolution No. 02/2016 (CFP, 2016)]; establishment of rules and procedures in the field of transit [Resolution CFP 01/2019 (CFP, 2019b)]; and guidelines for the writing of psychological documents produced by a psychologist from the PA [Resolution CFP 06/2019 (CFP, 2019c)].

Also deserving of mention are the technical notes of guidance for psychologists, researchers, publishers, and laboratories responsible for research into the construction, adaptation, and study of psychological equivalency tests for people with deficiencies (CFP, 2019d); for psychologists for evaluating the decision-making capacity of people with deficiencies and/or chronic illnesses (CFP, 2019e); and for psychologists concerning the use of psychological tests in services carried out through informational and communication technologies (CFP, 2019f).

Along with psychologists and civil society, SATEPSI also has an important educational function. Since 2003, the system's various efforts have contributed to community understanding of psychological assessment's limits and potential benefits. Some worthy examples have been: I) the publication of primers and guidelines on the practice of PA (CFP, 2007, 2010, 2013); II) the institution of the professional award "Psychological Assessment from the Perspective of Human Rights," which integrated the activities of CFP's Psychological Assessment Theme Year from 2011 to 2012; III) the public campaign titled "The Banalization of Psychological Testing Harms All of Society," proposed in 2013 by a partnership between CFP and the Brazilian Psychology National Entities Forum; IV) the organization of the professional award "Psychological Assessment Directed at People with Deficiencies," proposed with the aim of leading

the field to consider and integrate new forms of inclusive action in its professional practice and, more recently, the

organization of books and publication of guidance documents on best practices for PA in pandemic contexts (CFP, 2020).

COMPARING TO OTHER COUNTRIES, WHAT IS THE STATUS OF BRAZILIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT?

As in Brazil, psychological tests are also evaluated in another countries. However, there are differences in relation to training and education that permit the use of psychological tests. As PA frequently involves the use of psychological tests, it is helpful to acquaint oneself with the forms of assessment and the restrictions on the use of psychological tests.

Internationally, the psychologist's practice in PA requires significant training and specific education in subjects related to this practice. In most countries, a degree alone does not allow a professional to act as a psychologist, despite the generalist education. As reported in Bandeira et al. (2021), countries such as the United States and Canada require a Ph.D. to practice psychological assessment. European countries, in turn, have education policies based on the Treaty of Bologna (Lima et al., 2008) and understand that higher education requires, in addition to the five years of college, at least one more year of specialization with a supervised training period.

Furthermore, authorization to act in the area requires a series of certification exams that include evaluating basic knowledge of the use of psychological instruments as well as all the activities involved in the assessment process. These contents depend on the field of practice but may include disciplines such as developmental psychology, personality psychology, psychopathology, psychological assessment, psychometry, interview techniques, research psychology, clinical psychology, and neuropsychology, among others (Bandeira et al., 2016). A few more specific areas, such as forensics or organizational, may require additional knowledge. We can affirm that psychologists will necessarily act in their area of expertise, which they have specifically studied, thereby guaranteeing higher quality work.

Beyond education, differing from Brazil's, the main foreign countries customarily control the sale of psychological tests by rules generally based on the education/competence of the professional. In most countries, the tests are divided into categories. According to Bandeira (2018), they are distributed on three levels: A, B, and C, each one requiring some sort of education, which means the professional is responsible for proving their training. Level A is the first and has no educational requirements. The instruments are easy to understand and apply, and reading the manual allows for use without difficulty. This level generally includes instruments from the academic learning field, some neuropsychological batteries, and scales for evaluating well-being.

Level B demands professionals at least be trained in the ethical administration of the instrument as well as the collection and interpretation of the results, encompassing

several areas (psychology, education, occupational therapy, or others). This level includes instruments for adaptive behavior evaluation, complex neuropsychological batteries, scales for assessing child development, psychopathological symptoms, and personality (16PF, for example). Level C requires qualified education in test interpretation related to one's area of expertise. On this level, we can find instruments requiring the applier's intervention, such as the Wechsler and Rorschach scales and personality instruments whose results require greater theoretical knowledge to interpret (Millon's Inventory, for example).

The level of competence the test user must have been determined by the skills required to use the test. The test authors determine this skill information, and the publishers representing them explicitly stated in the manual. The publishers are the ones who control the sales, guided by the rules established in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (Bandeira, 2018).

The requirement for various levels of qualification is not necessarily reality in all countries. However, countries that do not divide psychological tests by levels do demand professional qualifications related to the construct measured by the test. Thus, it can be concluded that the tests are protected from the general population. This posture is adopted by the publishers, who own the tests' authorial rights, and their distributors. According to Pearson, for example, their tests are protected. They state that the questions, answers, manuals, and other materials related to the tests are highly confidential (<https://www.pearsonassessments.com/footer/legal-policies.html>). With this international reality in place, we can see that the tests are private material. Protecting them is essential to preserve the validity of the tests' findings. *Where do we go from here?*

The answer to this question is complex and has implications on various levels, beyond psychology and PA. As highlighted by Noronha et al. (2021), the Federal Supreme Court, in ruling on the Ação Direta de Inconstitucionalidade (Direct Action of Unconstitutionality, DAU 3481), stated that psychological tests should be released to the general population and no longer be exclusive to psychologists. Although the Federal Psychology Council filed a preliminary injunction and an Action for Declaratory Embargo, the final decision was for keeping the previous state: anyone can have access to the test's material.

The authors discuss the risk of such measures to the individual and societal life. Regarding the former, laypeople's indiscriminate use of psychological analysis will allow a myopic analysis of the self (Zanini et al., 2021). Only a

psychologist is prepared to understand the tests' results in the overall process of understanding a person, which includes, for example, other sources of information. What benefits will the test results bring to a person who does not have sufficient depth of knowledge to do that? Likewise, reflecting on the consequences for society, considering that the instruments can be used in high-stakes situations, an individual's knowledge of the tests being applied may undermine the evaluation process.

When we examine the reality of PA in other countries, they all have some level of protection of the instruments, which are sold only to people with some sort of education compatible with the construct evaluated by them. With this decision, the Supreme brings another very 'Brazilian' judicial miscarriage to the country.

The discussions on the subject continue in the various forums of Brazilian PA. Besides the WGs of ANPEPP, scientific associations have been actively participating in the spread of accurate information about the DAU and its implications through live streams, publications, and participation in scientific articles. The CCAP, in its management report, counted the actions addressing the theme. In the last twelve months, 17 meetings were held, of which seven were exclusively about the DAU. Similarly, all the Regional Councils of Psychology (24) held meetings, a total of 27 (three needed an extra meeting). Furthermore, publishers who sell psychological tests participated in the debate, such that the CCAP held a meeting with all the publishers. Finally, the publication of a special edition of the scientific journal *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, in which six articles about the DAU were written as well as the five live streams also promoted by CCAP.

The participation of CCAP in specific workgroups of the CFP involving subjects related to PA, such as the working group on mental health tests, on neuropsychological assessment, and compulsory assessments, among others, discussing issues such as criteria for opening the tests

to other professional areas and evaluation criteria, for example. Facing all this, we researchers must be creative and innovate in the evaluation area. The possibility of using Multidimensional Item Response Theory models to construct and create norms for multidimensional instruments is already a reality in a few already available in the market. This form of normalization requires repeated computerized application, which happens with only a few instruments in Brazil. The same can be said of adaptive testing (Wechsler et al., 2019). Thus, the new challenge becomes joint work between researchers, publishers, and promoting agencies focusing on upgrading or creating new instruments with these characteristics. Also mentioned is the importance of studies of equivalence between paper and pencil tests and their online version, especially after the pandemic period, in which computerized tests rapidly advanced in Brazil.

Techniques such as machine learning allow for the automated discovery of computational algorithms that represent patterns in the data and possible behavioral predictions (Primi, 2018). These techniques are recent entries into the search for new assessment resources in psychology (Orrù et al., 2020). However, they can aid in the construction of instruments, diagnostic screening, and interpretation of assessment processes involving big data, that is, data coming from multiple applications installed on electronic platforms (such as smartphones, notebooks, and wearables). This data relates to behaviors and user preferences that are continuously collected in a "more ecological" way than through a psychological test and which can eventually be considered a complementary source of evaluation. The models of predictive machine learning potentially represent a revolution in health assessment, not only for supplying preliminary data about the participants in an evaluation (less susceptible to answer biases) but also for helping define predictive models for a response to specific treatments, thereby contributing to a more effective referral within the psychodiagnostics field.

WHAT CAN WE CONCLUDE?

A review of Brazil's history shows the existence of important advances and the overcoming of challenges that could compromise the development of our area. The importance of the work of the various ANPEPP WGs is evident: they have allowed the meeting of Brazilian researchers who, together, have contributed significantly such that relevant questions were debated and investigated from different perspectives.

In turn, the creation of SATEPSI permitted the joint action of researchers and members of the Federal Council of Psychology, abetting the creation of rules governing the conduct of psychology professionals and the construction and use of psychological tests. It is noteworthy that all regulations from the Federal Psychology Council have been

supported by the discussions promoted by the CCAP, which provides technical and scientific support to psychologists in their different areas of expertise where it involves the use of psychological instruments. Discussions have been used by committee members in scientific associations and regional psychology councils to better disseminate ideas and proposals to the entire field.

Since the early 2000s, there has been an intense debate over the private use of psychological tests provided for in the federal law of 1962 that created the profession of psychologist. Different opinions about restriction's real consequences have been presented, and some researchers (Bandeira, 2018; Primi, 2018) defend making them available for general use with well-founded arguments. Either way,

there have already been signs that psychology should prepare itself to contemplate a revision of the regulation, in the sense of permitting the use by other health professionals and avoiding impasses, such as what occurred in the area of speech and hearing therapy involving the NEUPSILIN test.

The most varied initiatives, such as the universal design model applied to PA, an approach based on principles of

user accessibility (Johnstone et al., 2006), the evaluation of minorities, and machine learning have been undertaken with the purpose of making isonomic access to processes of PA available to the greatest number of people viable. This path cannot be obstructed by external measures that prevent the evolution of PA as an area of knowledge and as a professional practice.

REFERENCES

- Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Psicologia (ANPEPP) (2021). https://www.anpepp.org.br/conteudo/view?ID_CONTEUDO=557
- Bandeira, D. R. (2018). A controvérsia do uso dos testes psicológicos por psicólogos e não psicólogos. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 38(num. especial), 159-166. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703000208860>
- Bandeira, D. R., Andrade, J. M., & Peixoto, E. M. (2021). O uso de testes psicológicos: Formação, avaliação e critérios de restrição. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 41, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703003252970>
- Bandeira, D. R., Trentini, C. M., Winck, G. E., & Lieberknecht, L. (2006). Considerações sobre as técnicas projetivas no contexto atual. In A. P. P. Noronha, A. A. A. Santos, & F. F. Sisto. (Org.), *Facetas do fazer em avaliação psicológica* (pp. 125-139). 1ª ed. São Paulo: Vetor Editora.
- Cardoso, L. M. & Silva-Filho, J. H. (2018). Satepsi e a qualidade técnica dos testes psicológicos no Brasil. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 38(num. esp.), 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703000209112>
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2003). Resolução CFP nº 002 de 23 de março de 2003. Define e regulamenta o uso, a elaboração e a comercialização de testes psicológicos e revoga a Resolução CFP nº 025/2001. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2016). Resolução CFP nº 002 de 21 de janeiro de 2016. Regulamenta a Avaliação Psicológica em Concurso Público e processos seletivos de natureza pública e privada e revoga a Resolução CFP nº 001/2002. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2018). Resolução CFP nº 009, de 25 de abril de 2018. Estabelece diretrizes para a realização de avaliação psicológica no exercício profissional da psicóloga e do psicólogo, regulamenta o Sistema de Avaliação de Testes Psicológicos - SATEPSI e revoga as Resoluções nº 002/2003, nº 006/2004 e nº 005/2012 e Notas Técnicas nº 01/2017 e 02/2017. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019a). Resolução CFP nº 017, de 04 de setembro de 2019. Altera a Resolução CFP nº 03/2017, que define e regulamenta a Comissão Consultiva em Avaliação Psicológica. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019b). Resolução CFP nº 001, de 07 de fevereiro de 2019. Institui normas e procedimentos para a perícia psicológica no contexto do trânsito e revoga as Resoluções CFP nº 007/2009 e 009/2011. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019c). Resolução CFP nº 006, de 29 de março de 2019. Institui regras para a elaboração de documentos escritos produzidos pela(o) psicóloga(o) no exercício profissional e revoga a Resolução CFP nº 15/1996, a Resolução CFP nº 07/2003 e a Resolução CFP nº 04/2019. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019d). Nota Técnica GETEC/CG nº 04. Orienta psicólogas(os), pesquisadores, editoras e laboratórios responsáveis quanto às pesquisas para construção, adaptação e estudos de equivalência de testes psicológicos para pessoas com deficiência e altera a Nota Técnica "Construção, adaptação e validação de instrumentos para pessoas com deficiência". Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019e). Nota Técnica GETEC/CG nº 06. Orientação às(aos) Psicólogas(os) sobre avaliação da capacidade decisional de pessoas com deficiência e/ou com doenças crônicas. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2019f). Nota Técnica GETEC/CG nº 07. Orienta psicólogas(os) sobre a utilização de testes psicológicos em serviços realizados por meio de tecnologias de informação e da comunicação. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia (2020). *Cartilha de boas práticas para avaliação psicológica em contextos de pandemia*. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Decreto Nº 53.464, de 21 de janeiro de 1964. Regulamenta a Lei nº 4.119, de 27 de agosto de 1962, que dispõe sobre a profissão de psicólogo. Brasília: Presidência da República. *Diário Oficial da União*, 24 jan. 1964.
- Hutz, C. S. (2002). Pesquisa em avaliação psicológica, grupo de trabalho. In Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Psicologia (Eds.), *Anais, IX Simpósio de Pesquisa e Intercâmbio Científico* (p. 79-89). Águas de Lindoia, SP: ANPEPP.
- Johnstone, C., Altman, J., & Thurlow, M. (2006). *A state guide to the development of universally designed assessments*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED495885.pdf>
- Lei nº 4.119, de 27 de agosto de 1962. Dispõe sobre os cursos de formação em psicologia e regulamenta a profissão de psicólogo. *Diário Oficial da União*, 5 set. 1962.
- Lima, L. C., Azevedo, M. L. N., & Catani, A. M. (2008). O processo de Bolonha, a avaliação da educação superior e algumas considerações sobre a Universidade Nova. *Avaliação: Revista da Avaliação da Educação Superior*, 13(1), 7-36. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772008000100002>
- Nascimento, E., & Vasconcelos, A. G. (2016). O percurso da avaliação psicológica nos Simpósios da ANPEPP. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 15(1), 125-128. <https://doi.org/10.15689/ap.2016.1501.13>
- Noronha, A. P. P., Resende, A. C., Oliveira, K. L., Muniz, M., & Reppold, C. T. (2021). Os impactos da Ação Direta de Inconstitucionalidade nº 3481 na psicologia e na sociedade. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 41(núm. especial), e252730, 1-11.
- Noronha, A. P. (2002). Os problemas mais graves e mais frequentes no uso dos testes psicológicos. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 15(1), 135-142. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703003252730>
- Noronha, A. P. P., Primi, R., & Alchieri, J. C. (2004). Parâmetros psicométricos: Uma análise de testes psicológicos comercializados no Brasil. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 24(4), 88-99.

- Noronha, A. P. P. & Reppold, C. T. (2010). Considerações sobre a avaliação Psicológica no Brasil. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão, 30*, 192-201. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932010000500009>
- Orrù, G., Monara, M., Conversano, C., Gemignani, A., & Sartori, G. (2020). Machine Learning in Psychometrics and Psychological Research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 2970. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02970>
- Primi, R. (2010). Avaliação psicológica no Brasil: Fundamentos, situação atual e direções para o futuro. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa, 26*, 25-35.
- Primi, R. (2018). Avaliação psicológica no século XXI: De onde viemos e para onde vamos. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão, 38*(num. especial), 87-97. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703000209814>
- Reppold, C. T., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2018). Impacto dos 15 Anos do Satepsi na avaliação psicológica brasileira. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão, 38*(num. especial), 6-15. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703000208638>
- Wechsler, S. M., Hutz, C. S., & Primi, R. (2019) O desenvolvimento da avaliação psicológica no Brasil: Avanços históricos e desafios. *Avaliação Psicológica, 18*(2), 121-128. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15689/ap.2019.1802.15466.02>
- Zanini, D. S., Reppold, C. T., Muniz, M., Noronha, A. P. P., & Rueda, F. J. M. (2021). Por que regulamentar o uso e acesso aos testes psicológicos? *Avaliação Psicológica, 20*(3), 390-399. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15689/ap.2021.2003.22437.13>