Training and Education in Professional Psychology
2012, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1–7

1931-3918/12/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/a0026823

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology: New Data–Practical Implications

Jack B. Schaffer
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Emil Rodolfa
University of California – Davis

Jesse Owen
University of Louisville

Robert Lipkins
Professional Examination Service, New York, New York

Carol Webb
Emory University

Jacqueline Horn
University of California – Davis

This paper provides a summary of the data released by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards describing the performance of 7,402 doctoral candidates for licensure who took the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) from April 2008 through July 2010. The data provide a snapshot of the factors (gender, type of degree, program accreditation status, program specialty, program size, time since graduation, study method, amount of time spent studying) that were related to performance on the EPPP. Implications of these performance factors are discussed and suggestions are provided.

Keywords: licensure, licensure examination, EPPP performance, training standards, degree program

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) is one of the requirements for licensure in all 50 states and three territories of the United States and nine provinces in Canada. The EPPP was originally developed in 1964 by the American Association of State Psychology Boards (AASPB), later renamed the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) to reflect its Canadian membership, as part of an international effort to provide consistency and quality of regulation in the practice of psychology in order to provide enhanced protection to the public (Schaffer, DeMers, & Rodolfa, 2010).

The purpose of the EPPP is to examine the breadth and depth of knowledge of the field of psychology possessed by a candidate for licensure, including 1) biological bases of behavior; 2) cognitive–affective bases of behavior; 3) social and cultural bases of behavior; 4) growth and life span development; 5) assessment and diagnosis; 6) treatment, intervention, and prevention; 7) research and statistics; and 8) ethical/legal/professional issues (ASPPB, 2011). The ASPPB Information for Candidates Brochure (ASPPB, 2011) describes the content domains and the percentage of items in each domain. ASPPB, through its Item Development Committee and Examination Committee, and in conjunction with its testing contractor, the Professional Examination Service (PES), develops and maintains the examination for use by licensing boards in the United States and Canada. In order to remain current and to protect the integrity of the examination, two new forms of the EPPP, which include a mix of new and previously used items, are developed and two forms are retired each year. At any point in time, four

JACK B. SCHAFFER received a PhD in clinical psychology from the University of North Dakota in 1977 and is a diplomate in clinical and clinical health psychology (ABPP). Mostly retired, he maintains a small practice in forensic psychology and consultation. His interests include ethics, regulation, assessment of competence, supervision, and training.

EMIL RODOLFA received his PhD from Texas A&M University. He is the Director of the University of California, Davis Counseling and Psychological Services. He is Vice President of the California Board of Psychology and his research interests include supervision, training, ethics, and boundaries.

JESSE OWEN, PhD, is a licensed psychologist and assistant professor in the Counseling Psychology Program at the University of Louisville. His research interests include psychotherapy process and outcome, romantic relationships/couple therapy, and training issues in professional psychology.

ROBERT LIPKINS received his PhD in educational psychology from New York University in 1987. Currently a senior program director at Professional Examination Service, he was Program Director for the EPPP from 1999 to 2009. Areas of interest include credentialling of psychologists and other health care professionals, assessment, and psychometrics.

CAROL WEBB earned her doctoral degree from the University of Delaware in clinical psychology. She currently is the Director of Internship Training at the Emory University School of Medicine in Atlanta, GA and President of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards.

JACQUELINE HORN, PhD, earned her doctorate in clinical psychology from Vanderbilt University. For the past 30 years she has been a lecturer in psychology at the University of California at Davis, and has also maintained a clinical practice. Her research interests center around issues confronting psychology regulation, including professional competence.

SPONSORED by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Jack B. Schaffer, Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, 256 Spring Street, #119, St. Paul, MN, 55102. E-mail: jack_b_schaffer@yahoo.com

forms of the examination are in use in order to maintain a fair and objective examination experience for licensure candidates.

The test is validated and updated by periodic practice analyses (see Greenberg & Jesuitus, 2003; ASPPB, 2010), which, through focus groups and surveys, gather input from large numbers of practicing psychologists regarding knowledge areas deemed by them necessary for competent practice (Rehm & Lipkins, 2006). The practice analysis on which the current examination is based (ASPPB, 2010) received input from 1,180 licensed psychologists in the United States and Canada.

Demographic data are collected from candidates for licensure on a number of categories, such as type of training, theoretical orientation, place of employment, gender, and methods of preparation for the examination. In 2007, the ASPPB board of directors revised the questionnaire used to gather these data and decided to report not only average scores but also pass rates for demographic categories and graduate programs. The current data set is based on this questionnaire. Pass rates are used because they provide the most accurate measure of candidate performance, given that the test is designed specifically to distinguish candidates who possess the requisite knowledge at the pass point to practice independently, as defined by the practice analysis.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of recently collected data, in part to respond to misperceptions about the examination (such as a high overall failure rate and differential pass rates as a function of the nature of the student's training) and the anxiety students feel about how to study for the examination (Sharpless & Barber, 2009; DeMers, 2009), as well as to provide useful information to graduate programs, prospective candidates, and the profession about the aggregate performance of students' performance on the EPPP.

Method

Sample

During the time period from April 2008 through July 2010, 7,402 doctoral level candidates took the EPPP. Data from the 6,937 candidates (94% of the sample) who responded to the question regarding gender indicate that 75% of the candidates were female and 25% were male. Forty-eight percent were from PsyD programs, 51% were from PhD programs, and the other one percent was from EdD, joint degree, or respecialization programs.

Procedure

The database used for this paper includes the scores and questionnaire responses of all doctoral candidates who applied for the EPPP electronically during the time period April 2008 through July 2010. Candidates for licensure fill out a questionnaire, partially before and partially after taking the examination, that poses 19 specific background questions. Those deemed most relevant to candidates and the educational and training communities include the following: degree type (i.e., PhD, PsyD, EdD), type of training program (i.e., specialty; each program accredited by APA or CPA or designated by the ASPPB/National Register is considered a separate program for the purposes of this study), whether the program and internship are accredited (yes/no), gender, time spent studying (range less than 100 hours to over 400 hours), and methods used to study for the EPPP (e.g., independent study, commercial workshop, commercial materials). In addition, based on the graduation date provided by the candidate, the time since completion of the degree was computed and used as an independent variable, and program size was computed based on the number of candidates taking the examination from a given program. Although completing the questionnaire is voluntary, almost all candidates (99%) answered the questionnaire.

Results

General Pass Rate Findings

Approximately 76% of all candidates during the time period assessed who indicated they were applying to take the examination based on a doctoral degree ($N = 7{,}402$) received a passing score, while 82% of the doctoral candidates who took the test for the first time ($N = 6{,}100$) passed. Much of the difference between these two pass rates can be accounted for by the fact that a higher percentage of those who initially failed the exam also failed on subsequent attempts when compared with test takers in general (nonfirst-timers, $N = 1{,}302$, passed at a 47% rate). The difference in pass rates between first-timers and nonfirst-timers was statistically significant, with the effect size relatively strong ($\chi^2 = 693.71$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .31$).

Some candidates for licensure are concerned that there may be differential difficulty between various forms of the EPPP and worry that they may be unlucky enough to take a particularly difficult form of the exam. A comparison of mean scaled scores of the eight forms administered during the period of this study (mean [*M*] about 560 ± 5, standard deviation [*SD*] about 100 ± 10) revealed relatively small variation. More important, whenever these variations exist, passing scores for examination forms are equated, so that passing scores take into account the relative difficulty of the specific form of the examination. Thus, the number of test items that must be answered correctly is lower on those forms of the exam that are determined empirically to be relatively more difficult.

Pass Rate and Candidate Variables

Gender had a statistically significant but weak relationship with pass rates. Of the women, 77% passed, while 73% of the men passed ($\chi^2 = 7.96$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$, $\varphi = .03$).

There was a negative relationship between length of time since completion of the degree and pass rates on the EPPP ($\chi^2 = 561.46$, $df = 5$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .27$, $r = -.22$; see Table 1). The longer candidates waited to take the EPPP, at least up to about five years postgraduation, the lower the score on the EPPP, with a leveling off of the scores after about five years. There is a possibility that this relationship reflects the fact that candidates who do not pass the first time have to wait longer to take the examination on additional occasions. When that question was tested statistically, the relationship between the number of times a candidate took the exam and the length of time since graduation was nonsignificant ($r = .02$, $p = .77$).

Candidates also spent varying amounts of time studying for the exam. As might be expected and as shown in Table 1, increased amounts of time studying generally translated into higher pass

Table 1
Pass Rates by Year of Degree, Time Spent Preparing, and Specialty Training

Year highest degree obtained	*N*	Pass rate
2009–2010	1,087	84%
2008	2,505	83%
2006–2007	2,442	74%
2004–2005	837	50%
2002–2003	406	56%
1990–2001	487	58%
Time spent preparing		
None	4	50%
Less than 100 hours	442	66%
100–199 hours	1,360	79%
200–299 hours	1,648	81%
300–399 hours	1,170	79%
400 or more hours	1,132	69%
Specialty training		
Clinical	5,028	76%
Counseling	852	79%
Clinical child and adolescent	391	86%
School	317	78%
Clinical neuropsychology	167	87%
Clinical health	154	73%
Forensic	114	48%

rates ($\chi^2 = 56.08$, $df = 5$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .1$). However, beyond 199 hours of study, the pass rates did not continue to increase significantly and beyond 399 hours, pass rates decreased.

Method of study for the exam was examined, although the statistical analysis should be considered quite tentative, because candidates were allowed to report more than one preparation option and thus response categories were not independent. However, the data set available for this study did not allow a more appropriate form of statistical analysis. Table 2 provides the data for the more common types of EPPP preparation. The pass rates related to the methods of study varied from 69% (commercially sponsored workshop) to 83% (informal study group). Although these pass rates differed significantly from chance ($\chi^2 = 107.50$, $df = 9$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .07$), this weak effect must be interpreted in light of the absence of independent categories.

Pass Rate by Training Variables

The degree the training program confers appears to be a relevant variable with regard to pass rates. Those who were trained in PhD programs passed at a rate of 82%, while those trained in PsyD programs passed at the rate of 69% ($\chi^2 = 170.97$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .15$). An insufficient number of EdD candidates took the examination in the time period to provide reliable data.

Also of interest are the relative pass rates by type of training program. Table 1 provides the number of candidates and pass rates for each of the types of specialty programs that had more than 100 candidates take the EPPP during the time period used in this study. These pass rates range from 87% for clinical neuropsychology to 48% for forensic psychology. Table 1 also reveals that the vast majority of candidates seeking licensure are from clinical and clinically related programs, only 12% of the candidates are from counseling psychology programs, and 4% are from school psychology programs. There is a statistically significant, but weak, relationship between type of graduate program and pass rates ($\chi^2 = 33.53$, $df = 6$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .07$).

An important perception in the field of psychology is that accreditation of the training program is an important determinant of quality (cf., Nelson, Belar, Grus, & Zlotlow, 2008). The pass-rate data from this data set support that contention. Those candidates from degree programs that were accredited by either the American Psychological Association (APA) or the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA; 6,320 candidates) passed at the rate of 78%, while those from programs not accredited by APA or CPA (905 candidates) passed at the rate of 58% ($\chi^2 = 179.33$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .16$).

Of the 4,750 candidates who responded in the affirmative to the question of whether their internships were APA or CPA accredited or were Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) member programs, 82% received passing scores on the EPPP. Of the 1,891 who responded no, 68% passed. In addition, interestingly, 544 did not know whether their internship was accredited (of whom 58% passed) and 175 had not had a predoctoral internship (of whom 59% passed) ($\chi^2 = 285$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .2$).

Pass Rates in Multivariate Context

To test whether these univariate results would remain in a multivariate context (i.e., after controlling for the variance in the other predictors) we conducted a two-level multilevel regression analysis with full maximum likelihood estimation. That is, students (level 1) were nested within their respective programs (level 2). Multilevel modeling is advantageous as it accounts for the interdependency in participants' scores that may have some commonalities, such as students who are from the same program. Since some individuals did not list their program ($n = 852$), we first tested whether these individuals differed in pass rates as compared with the rest of the sample. The result from the chi-square was significant, ($\chi^2 = 213.70$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). Those individuals who did not list their programs or were from nonaccredited programs passed at a rate of 55.0%, as compared to 78.3% of those individuals who listed their program. Nonetheless, given that we could not adequately identify the specific programs for these

Table 2
Methods of Preparation for the EPPP

Method of study	*N*[a]	Pass rate
Commercial in print	4,727	80%
Individual study	3,658	80%
Commercial audiotape	3,154	80%
Commercial online	2,908	81%
ASPPB retired items	2,284	79%
Commercial workshop	1,431	69%
ASPPB online practice test	1,099	74%
Informal group sessions	929	83%
Test prep listserv	824	80%
ASPPB prometric practice test	304	77%

Note. ASPPB = Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards; EPPP = Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology.
[a] *N* does not represent number of candidates, but number of responses, as candidates could endorse more than one option.

students because ASPPB does not track nonaccredited, nondesignated programs in its database, we could not include them in the multilevel analysis (*N*s for multilevel analysis at level 1 = 6,468, level 2 = 447). Accordingly, the following analyses only pertain to accredited or designated doctoral programs.

We tested our main multivariate model wherein pass rate (yes = 1, no = 0) was the outcome variable and the predictor variables at the student level (level 1) included: sex (men = 1, women = 0, uncentered), time since degree (grand mean centered), hours preparing (grand mean centered), first time taking EPPP (1 = yes, 0 = no, uncentered), internship accredited (1 = yes, 0 = no/not known, uncentered), and type of program (with clinical as reference group, uncentered). At the program level (level 2), we included whether the program was a PhD v PsyD (1 = PhD, 0 = other: PsyD or EdD[1]; uncentered) and the number of students who took the EPPP as a proxy for program size (grand mean centered). This analysis, as described below, allows us to report the association of each predictor variable with pass rates after controlling for the variance in the other predictors.

As seen in Table 3, the variable with the largest odds ratio in relationship to pass rate was whether the candidate had taken the test more than once. First-time test takers were 220% more likely to pass the examination than repeat test takers. Second, students from PhD programs as compared with PsyD and EdD programs were 106% more likely to pass the EPPP. However, there was more variability among the pass rates in PsyD programs as compared to PhD programs, as evidenced by the fact that the largest contributors to the failure rates were 13 PsyD programs. Thus, a relatively small number of PsyD programs are disproportionately contributing to the variability between PhD and PsyD outcomes. Third, students who had an accredited internship were 43% more likely to pass the EPPP. Fourth, the amount of time students spent preparing for the examination was related to pass rate. For every 100 hours change in time preparing for the EPPP there was a 15% increased likelihood of passing. However, as noted above, there is likely a diminished return at the higher ends of time preparing.

Table 3
Summary of Fixed Effects for Multilevel Model Predicting Pass Rates

	Coefficient (*SE*)	Odds ratio	95% CI
Intercept	0.37* (0.18)	1.45	1.01, 2.08
Program size	–0.01*** (0.002)	0.99	0.988, 0.997
PhD vs. PsyD	0.72*** (0.17)	2.06	1.49, 2.86
Sex	–0.01 (0.09)	0.99	0.83, 1.19
Internship accredited	0.36*** (.09)	1.43	1.19, 1.72
First time taking	1.16*** (0.11)	3.20	2.59, 3.96
Prep time	0.14*** (0.04)	1.15	1.08, 1.24
Time since degree	–0.29*** (0.03)	0.74	0.70, 0.79
Program			
Counseling	–0.81*** (0.15)	0.45	0.33, 0.60
School	–0.31 (0.23)	0.73	0.47, 1.15
Other	–0.52*** (0.15)	0.59	0.44, 0.80

Note. Sex: men = 1, women = 0; First time taking: 1 = yes, 0 = no; PhD vs. PsyD: PhD = 1, PsyD = 0; Internship accredited: 1 = yes, 0 = no or not known; Program: reference group clinical programs. CI = confidence interval; *SE* = standard error.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Fifth, individuals who graduated from smaller programs (as defined by the number of students who took the EPPP during the timeframe of this study) were more likely to pass the EPPP. However, this was a relatively small effect, as for every one standard deviation change in program size (i.e., 20 students) there was 1% increased odds of not passing the EPPP. Sixth, students from clinical programs were 55% more likely to pass the EPPP as compared to students from counseling psychology programs and 41% more likely to pass the EPPP when compared with students in other programs, respectively (but individuals from clinical psychology programs were not more likely to pass as compared with individuals from school psychology programs). Seventh, students who graduated more recently were also more likely to pass the EPPP (25% increased likelihood). In this multivariate analysis, individuals' sex was no longer a significant predictor of pass rates.

Individual Program Analysis

The multivariate analysis did reveal that there were certain programs whose students had relatively poorer pass rates on the EPPP. Computation of the pass-rate data on those programs, using 60% pass rate as the cut-off level, revealed the following: There were 37 programs (8% of all accredited or designated programs) with the lowest average pass rates, 53.2%, for their students. In contrast, programs at the 50th percentile or above had an average pass rate of 92.3%. These bottom 37 programs accounted for 647 of the 1,379 EPPP failures (46.9%). In addition, 15 programs with pass rates below 60% (13 PsyD, two PhD) accounted for 535 of the 1,379 EPPP failures (38.8%), while accounting for 1,074 of the total number of candidates taking the examination (16.5%). Of these 15 programs, all accredited separately, four were from one educational institution and three from one other educational institution. These seven programs (1.5% of the 466 accredited or designated programs) accounted for 236 of the total failures (17.1%) and 524 of the total candidates taking the examination during this time period (8%). Of the remaining 22 programs with pass rates below 60%, 18 were PhD programs, 17 of which were in traditional university settings. As an aggregate, these 149 students across these 18 programs had a 49.7% pass rate.

Discussion

These data have several implications for the field of psychology. First, it is clear, given all of the variables that impact academic performance, that a high percentage of candidates for licensure pass the EPPP the first time they take it. We hope the information provided in this study lays to rest the belief that the majority of candidates fail and that EPPP pass rates are consistently low. This information should be comforting to the majority of candidates. In addition, candidates preparing for the EPPP should know that regardless of the form of the EPPP they take, they have an equal chance of passing the test.

Two questions in the EPPP demographic questionnaire relate to preparation for the examination, an issue of considerable importance to students. It seems that there is a weak relationship between the specific methods used and pass rates (although

[1] The results were consistent when we omitted the 13 EdD Programs.

this was a tentative analysis due to the interdependence of the data), and an apparently stronger, though curvilinear, relationship between the number of hours spent studying and pass rates. Current data indicate that it would be highly advisable for most candidates to spend around 200 hours studying for the exam in order to maximize the likelihood of passing, but that how one studies might best depend on the personal preferences of the candidate. It is possible that there is a relationship between method of studying and amount of time spent studying, but further research would be needed to determine that. It seems intuitive that there is a saturation level for study. It does not seem intuitive that more study results in lower pass rates, however, unless those who study the most do so because they worry that their training does not adequately prepare them for the exam, or their style of test taking has generally not been associated with successful outcomes. It is also possible that test anxiety may drive the amount of time spent studying, with that study time being less efficient or unable to overcome the negative effects of the anxiety, or that the lower-ability students who fail the test repeatedly respond to the question by providing the cumulative time they spend studying across all of the times they took the exam. Unfortunately, the data available for this study do not provide clear guidance regarding these speculations and further study is warranted.

There is a statistically significant relationship between the time that has passed since graduate school and pass rates on the EPPP, as those who take the examination closer to graduation pass at higher rates than those who take the EPPP after some time has passed. The EPPP is an examination of the breadth and depth of knowledge of the field of psychology, and it is a logical outcome that taking the EPPP closer to having completed academic coursework during doctoral training (both academic and formal internship) will yield higher scores on the EPPP. To those candidates taking the examination at some distance from their graduation, these data reinforce the assertion that becoming reacquainted with recent literature in the field would be beneficial.

It should be noted that some jurisdictions allow candidates to take the EPPP upon completion of degree, while other jurisdictions allow candidates to take the EPPP only upon completion of all supervised experience hours. This administrative decision could have an impact on the pass rates of the candidates in those jurisdictions. Further research into the timing of taking the EPPP will be useful to answer this question. However, data from this study, as well as the defined purpose of the EPPP, support jurisdictional regulations that allow candidates to take the EPPP upon graduation.

While the overall pass rate is quite good, the pass rate is particularly high among those candidates with PhD degrees who graduated from APA or CPA accredited academic and internship programs. This data set provides support for the utility of higher levels of review and quality assurance, which in turn may provide better training for students.

The question of relationship of degree (especially PhD vs. PsyD) to depth and breadth of knowledge of the field of psychology is a hot issue in the training field. Our data suggest that PhD candidates, especially those from accredited programs, do perform better on the EPPP than PsyD candidates. However, it is important to note that a high percentage of candidates from many PsyD programs also pass the first time they take it. We also found that a disproportionate percentage of those candidates who fail the EPPP come from a limited number of predominantly PsyD programs. Thus, the variability among programs may result in a small number of programs, in particular a subset of PsyD programs, unfairly clouding the reputation of all PsyD programs. In addition, there are some traditional PhD programs that have relatively low pass rates. A reasonable conclusion seems to be that there are variables other than degree that are more important in determining pass rates on the EPPP.

Program size has a statistically significant albeit weak relationship to pass rate. Because programs vary along many dimensions and the students from some large programs have high pass rates on the EPPP, other educational variables are more predictive of pass rates than program size.

Both the degree and the specialty program are related to pass rates, but it has been proposed that education should be considered in the context of other variables, such as general intellectual abilities of students rather than the specific training they receive. That is, it may be that high quality training programs are able to attract more competent students to begin with, so the EPPP pass rates may be as much or more a function of the general ability level of the students from those programs as it is a function of the training they received (cf., Yu et al., 1997; Templer & Tomeo, 1998). This is an issue of some importance that further research might be able to answer. If student selection versus student training is truly a key determinant for any given program's or student's success, then this information may have important implications for the future of professional psychology training programs. There are practical and ethical implications of accepting for admission students who have limited capability of developing competence as practicing psychologists.

Lastly, in our analysis of accredited programs, a small number of programs accounted for 35% of all EPPP failures. Parent (personal communication, August 11, 2011).) found 24 accredited programs contributed over 30% of the unmatched applicants for predoctoral internship. There is a considerable degree of overlap between our poorer performing programs and those of Parent. Of Parent's 24 relatively poorly performing programs, nine are in our list of 15 programs that account for 38.8% of candidates for licensure who do not pass the EPPP and an additional three are in our list of 37 programs that account for 46.9% of the candidates who do not pass the EPPP.

There are also a number of academic programs whose students are relatively unsuccessful with the EPPP, but who are more successful in finding internships. It would be of interest to know whether the internships those students attended were APA/CPA accredited, were APPIC members, or neither. In other words, these students from poorer performing programs may have attended internship programs that had not been held up to the scrutiny of the profession, which would raise particular concerns about the quality of their overall training. Further research should explore the impact of these sequence-of-training issues on the licensure process.

What is clear is that a small number of accredited programs have disproportionately poor outcomes, which may hinder their students from entering the profession. This creates a significant challenge for psychology, not only in terms of protection of the public, but for the integrity of the profession. We do not know whether the lower passing rates on the EPPP are due to the quality of the educational instruction in those graduate programs or internships,

to the quality of the students accepted, or to some other variable. Whichever is the case, however, we believe that the programs are ultimately responsible for the outcome of their students, whether the reasons for lower pass rates on the EPPP are due to inadequate quality of instruction or inadequate quality of admission decisions.

We believe that there are important ethical considerations for our profession in these data. Programs have an ethical obligation to provide some level of assurance that students who spend years of their lives and tens to hundreds of thousands of their dollars be able to pursue the profession for which they are being trained. We believe there is an ethical imperative for faculty to ensure that the students under their guidance can be licensed in due course, as that is the ultimate goal of most psychology trainees and the reason they attend graduate school. And, we believe that the kinds of outcomes demonstrated by our data should have important implications for decisions that are made both by students who pursue graduate training and by accrediting agencies that oversee the quality of training in educational institutions.

The decision not to provide names of the 15 programs that account for nearly 39% of all candidates who fail the EPPP is an intentional one, primarily because the programs whose students have a higher probability of failing (using the 60% pass rate as a criterion) change, depending on the time period of the analysis. In addition, the more important message, as compared with the specific programs in this study, is that some programs are doing a relatively poorer job of preparing students to pass the EPPP and internship directors, regulators, and prospective students should track such programs over time. The specific pass rates for academic programs as a rolling 5-year average are located on the ASPPB website at *http://www.asppb.net/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3487*. A periodic review of the pass rate by program data on this website can provide interested observers one important outcome measure of quality of training of all accredited programs.

Conclusions

Based on the findings from the review of this data set, we believe the following conclusions are appropriate:

1. Applicants for graduate training choose doctoral programs for a variety of reasons, including program goals, faculty mentors, reputation, areas of study, and geography, to name a few. Based on our findings, we recommend that these applicants also include EPPP pass rate of the programs' students as a factor in their choosing a graduate program. Such data will provide them with more important information regarding ultimate licensure, one consequential measure of training success, than type of degree or specialty area of study.

2. Although we recognize that there is a significant internship supply and demand imbalance, as the number of applicants far exceeds the number of training slots available, decreasing the options available to students, based on our results it would behoove students to seek and complete an accredited internship. Our data support the notion that an internship provides valuable training in addition to the accrual of supervised professional experience, as accreditation of the internship contributes to pass rates over and above the contribution of the educational program. However, further study will be helpful to understand better the utility of an internship and performance on the EPPP.

3. It is self-evident that students should study before taking the EPPP. Our research provides guidance about the amount of study that is useful to pass the EPPP. It appears that for many candidates, it is not necessarily helpful to study more than 200 hours, but studying up to that level will likely be helpful. A tentative conclusion is that time spent studying appears to be more important than the method of study. Thus, formal EPPP study programs may not be essential for the majority of students who come from accredited programs.

4. It is advantageous to take the EPPP as soon after graduation as possible. We encourage licensing jurisdictions to develop licensing regulations that allow candidates to take the EPPP at graduation.

5. In analyzing the programs with the students who had the lowest average pass rates on the EPPP, we chose as a cut-off a 60% pass rate. That is a largely arbitrary cut-off point, chosen because a relatively small number of programs fell below that point (37 out of 466), with a strikingly disproportionate percentage of the total failures on the examination (47%). Additional discussion in the field of what an acceptable pass rate for an accredited program might be seems warranted.

6. Based on these data, it appears that additional conversations, perhaps difficult conversations, examining graduate level training in psychology will be beneficial to the profession and the students we train. It would be useful for the profession and for training associations to develop a suitable response to specific programs that appear to do a relatively poor job of preparing their students for entry into the profession of psychology. Specifically, we believe that pass rate on the EPPP should be one important variable influencing whether a graduate program receives APA or CPA accreditation.

We hope this report makes the process of preparing for and taking the examination clearer and less intimidating. In addition, our data have also highlighted a number of issues in psychology education and training that warrant further attention. These data can provide some clarity and direction for discussions about the sequence of education and training leading to licensure as a psychologist.

References

Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards. (2010). *Analysis of the practice of psychologists in the United States and Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.asppb.net/files/ASPPB_PA_July_2010.pdf

Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards. (2011). *ASPPB information for candidates – 2011,* Retrieved from http://www.asppb.net/files/public/IFC.pdf

DeMers, S. T. (2009). Understanding the purpose, strengths, and limitations of the EPPP: A response to Sharpless and Barber. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 348–353. doi:10.1037/a0015750

Greenberg, S., & Jesuitus, L. (2003). *Study of the practice of licensed psychologists in the United States and Canada.* Montgomery, AL: The Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards.

Nelson, P. D., Belar, C. D., Grus, C. L., & Zlotlow, S. (2008). Quality assessment in higher education through accreditation. In J. E. Hall & E. M. Altmaier (Eds.), *Global promise: Quality assurance and accountability in professional psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rehm, L., & Lipkins, R. (2006). The examination for professional practice in psychology. In T. Vaughn (Ed.), *Psychology licensure and certifica-*

tion: What students need to know. Washington, DC: APA. doi:10.1037/11477-004

Schaffer, J., DeMers, S., & Rodolfa, E. (2010). Licensing and credentialing. In J. C. Norcross, G. R. VandenBos, & D. K. Freedheim (Eds.). *History of psychotherapy: Continuity and change* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sharpless, B. A., & Barber, J. P. (2009). The examination for professional practice in psychology (EPPP) in the era of evidence-based practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 333–340. doi:10.1037/a0013983

Templer, D. I., & Tomeo, M. E. (1998). Examination for professional practice in psychology: Clerical errors corrected but inferences unchanged. *Psychological Science, 9,* 83–84. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00048

Yu, L. M., Rinaldi, S. A., Templer, D. I., Colbert, L., Siscoe, K., & van Patten, K. (1997). EPPP score as a function of clinical psychology graduate program. *Psychological Science, 8,* 347–350.

Received October 15, 2009
Revision received November 14, 2011
Accepted November 15, 2011 ■