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ABSTRACT


Two of the most widely used personality assessment methods are the Rorschach (Exner, 1993) and the MMPI/MMPI-2 (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943; 1989). Both methods have demonstrated validity for particular purposes (Meyer & Archer, 2001). However, despite measuring supposedly related constructs, efforts to find a systematic relation between the two types of assessment methods have failed (Archer & Krishnamurty, 1993a). The aim of the present project was to better understand this lack of systematic inter-method relation.

Four hypothesis driven correlation studies were undertaken, based on two samples of 83 and 489 psychiatric patients, respectively, living in Stockholm. All studies included the Rorschach method and one or two self report scales. Inter-method relations were investigated using different self report scales and test variables. The first study replicated the findings of Meyer (1997), demonstrating the effects of first factor related test interaction styles. The second study used a novel form of self report, constructed to achieve maximum conceptual overlap with the suggested meaning of Rorschach Comprehensive System variables. The third study used a different, established self report, the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno & Villasenor, 1988), to investigate inter-method relations, measuring interpersonal functioning. The forth study investigated the relation between Rorschach content scales (Urist, 1977; Graves & Thomas, 1981), seizing aspects of the patient’s ideation, expressed in verbal responses, and conceptually similar indices in the IIP.

In conclusion, the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the self report instruments included in the present thesis do not seem to measure related constructs in heterogeneous samples. Levels of conceptual overlap do not by itself, seem to moderate inter-method relations. It is suggested that the Rorschach and the IIP are systematically related when test variables reflect more similar psychological functioning. In the discussion the method specific nature of individual test scores is noted, with reference to Cronbach and Rajaratnam’s concept of generalizability to further understand the results. Implications for clinical assessment are suggested. Potential incremental validity is also noted.


**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAT</td>
<td>Thematic Apperception Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIP</td>
<td>Inventory of Interpersonal Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPCS</td>
<td>Self Assessment of Personality derived from the Comprehensive System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Mutuality of Autonomy Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIS</td>
<td>Rorschach Interaction Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 BACKGROUND

During my training in personality assessment I was intrigued by what supposedly could be gleaned from various test scores and indices. However, the non-directly observable nature of the concepts addressed by these measures was also obvious, making questions about validity complex. I learned from clinical experience that patients would typically be honestly interested in what an assessor had to say when providing test feedback. However, as a student I also found that many novel and presumably useful assessment findings appeared to have limited, concrete implications for the problems that brought patients to treatment and ultimately, to the assessment. There are many steps between test assessment and therapeutic change, much of which is beyond the control of the traditional assessor and assessment, but it is difficult to disregard the issue of treatment utility. I needed to know more about how the assessment information and the testee’s own understanding and experience would best fit together. This is at the same time both a therapeutic and a psychometric issue. From all of this grew a particular interest in test validity and inter-method relations.

According to Hjelle and Ziegler (1985) contemporary psychometrics can be traced back to the ideas of the German philosopher and scientist, Gustav Fechner. Fechner is credited with introducing the idea that there might be an observable and measurable relationship between an external stimulus and an internal sensation. Subsequently, more elaborate theoretical models of this presumed linkage between intra-psychic phenomena and the physical world offered scientists interested in individual differences the possibility to test concepts of personality empirically. Because personality concepts are theoretical phenomena that cannot be observed directly, they should not be handled as physical entities and our knowledge about them will always be inferential in nature. When the postulated implications of a personality concept cannot likely, by means of empirical investigations, be attributed to other causes, the validating procedure is good enough for practical purposes.

When considering broad personality concepts, an array of behavioral correlates are typically expected, based on the underlying theoretical formulation. For example, according to psychoanalytic theory, the concept of a hysterical personality is expected to be evident in specific memory functioning, in particular forms of cognitions, in characteristic emotional reactions and so forth (Shapiro, 1965). Some behavioral correlates of personality concepts can be translated into operational definitions. This presupposes an acceptance of a set of operations as an adequate definition of whatever is to be measured. When this is possible, measurement validity can be established in relation to a definite criterion. Examples of criterion-related validity are predictive validity and concurrent validity. With evidence of criterion-related validity there is typically less focus on the rationale for expecting a test variable to measure what it purport to measure. For example, it may not be completely clear how some of the individual response items of the MMPI/MMPI-2 relate to clinical conditions measured by the empirically derived clinical scales. Such items are nevertheless included when they add to the predictive or discriminant validity of the scales.
The term construct is used in personality assessment when an operational definition of what is being measured is not possible or practical (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). If a scale with demonstrated criterion-related validity is to be used for other purposes it would be necessary to demonstrate criterion validity for every such purpose. However, if it is feasible to infer that a scale measures some underlying personality construct, and if there is evidence of construct validity, the scale may be used for any purpose that target the construct. Construct validity is suggested when the scale converges with other, independent measures, expected to tap the same or related constructs. A lack of construct validity does not repudiate evidence of criterion-related validity. However, relations between a scale and external criteria may alter our understanding of the construct measured by the scale.

Personality assessment not only relies on theories of personality, but also presupposes a general test theory and a theory governing the specific procedures used by particular methods of assessment. An example of the latter would be the projective hypothesis that underlies the use of the TAT (Murray, 1943; Bellack, 1993).

Although beyond the scope of the present thesis, it must be noted that issues of validity become more complex in clinical assessment practice. Conclusions based on assessment findings hardly ever rely on singular findings. Instead, they are based on multiple sources of information and combined evidence. Grove and Meehl (1996) call this the clinical method, as opposed to the mechanical method, relying on formal, algorithmic, objective procedures. In reviewing the literature, they conclude that the mechanical method is consistently more effective for discriminative and predictive purposes.

Two of the most widely used personality assessment methods are the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI/MMPI-2) and the Rorschach (Lubin & Larsen, 1984; Piotrowski & Keller, 1989). Both the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach Comprehensive System, which presently is the most widely accepted Rorschach procedure for scoring and interpretation, rely on normative data (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943; 1989; Exner, 1993). Meyer and Archer (2001) reviewed and expanded on meta-analytic studies including these two assessment instruments, and concluded that they both offer reliable and valid information for their intended purposes. Meyer and Archer further observe that both the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach, are associated with validity criteria at a level comparable to the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale. Archer & Krishnamurthy (1993a; 1993b) reviewed studies reporting inter-relationships between the MMPI and the Rorschach. They found limited or minimal evidence of relationships between the two methods. Although the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach were not primarily developed for the same purpose, they are both personality assessment methods, including indices with similar names that can be expected to tap related personality functioning. The findings of Archer and Krishnamurthy were therefore challenging.

When considering test validity, the issue is not whether an assessment method is valid or not valid. A method of assessment is a way of collecting and handling data that may be more or less productive for a particular purpose. Validity can only be assessed for individual test scores in relation to specific purposes. Some test variables have more
validity support than others. When considering the observed pattern of limited or minimal inter-method convergence among indices with varying levels of validity support, the lack of a systematic relation between indices with similar names in the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach cannot simply be dismissed on the basis of limited validity of the indices in either, or both methods of assessment. Undoubtedly, unrelated indices do not, per definition, measure the same construct. Test variables seize specific, circumscribed behaviors. These behaviors are presumed to be correlates of a particular construct or concept. The issue brought up by the lack of inter-method convergence may be conceptualized as a question of generalizability (Cronbach & Rajaratnam, 1963); to what extent can we generalize the observed test score?

Meyer (1993) found Rorschach response frequency (R) to be significantly associated with practically every other Rorschach variable. He further found R to be a moderator of the relation between the Rorschach and the MMPI. The fact that R was related to almost every variable, each purporting to measure distinct concepts, indicated that R seized some shared Rorschach characteristic. Trait variability was expected to moderate the relation but did not. This suggests that method specific factors was moderating inter-relations between the two methods. Method specific factors, of course, are directly related to generalizability. Meyer (1997) subsequently pursued this issue further using first factor related response styles. The first principal component factor of a test can be described as a single point in a data matrix that best describes the total variability in the data set. Similar to R, it can be interpreted as a measure of method specific factors since it capitalizes on shared variance among individual indices, devised to measure independent concepts. Meyer considered the first factors as an expression of test interaction style, or response style. His finding that first factors from different self-report scales are highly correlated, while the first factors in self report and the Rorschach are not correlated, fits with this conceptualization. Meyer found systematic and predictable relations between the Rorschach and the MMPI-2 when test respondents were aligned according to response style.

The present work focuses on inter-method relations between the Rorschach and self report methods of assessment. The work was implemented in order better to understand the lack of relation between Rorschach and self report scales, expected to measure related constructs. The effort begins with a study replicating Meyer’s (1997) novel approach using first factor related response styles. It continues with a study purporting to clarify the extent to which conceptual overlap moderates the relation between the Rorschach and self report. In a third study a different, empirically validated self report method is used, more specifically the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno & Villasenor, 1988). In the last paper, inter-method relations are again studied between the Rorschach and the IIP, but this time using two Rorschach content scales, selected for their relative similarity with the IIP, measuring interpersonal functioning as reflected in the ideational content of the test responses.
2 METHODS

All four papers in the present thesis are hypothesis driven correlation studies, including psychiatric in- and outpatients, living in the region of Stockholm, Sweden. One study also includes undergraduate psychology students. Study I and II are based on a consecutive sample of eighty-three in- and outpatients with varying diagnoses, outpatients with affective disorders being in majority, and referred for psychological assessment as part of their psychiatric treatment. Study III and IV are based on a sample of 489 psychiatric patients from three different community health care areas, considered for publicly financed psychotherapy, and tested as part of the evaluation procedure, assessing therapy suitability. Patients in the sample were subsequently tested again three to six months after treatment termination and at a two year follow-up. Study III relies on all available Rorschach and self report data before therapy, while study IV consists of a stratified sub-sample of sixty patients with test data from both before treatment and at termination.

The research focuses on two types of personality assessment methods. The Rorschach according to the Comprehensive System (Exner, 1993) or, in one study, analyzed by response content (Urist, 1977; Graves & Thomas, 1981), and three different self report scales; the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2) (Hathaway & McKinley, 1989), the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) (Horowitz et al. 1988), and the Self Assessment of Personality derived from the Comprehensive System (SAPCS) (Lindgren, Carlsson & Lundbäck, 2007). The purpose of all studies was to investigate the inter-relations between the two types of assessment methods. This was performed by means of particular statistical procedures, by varying the type of self report scale used, and also by employing different types of scales; structural test indices that seize frequencies of specific, concrete behaviour and content variables that summon more qualitative aspects of the test responses.

Study I included the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the MMPI-2, translated into Swedish, measuring broad aspects of personality functioning, by aggregating individual test variables. Rorschach inter-judge reliability was assessed. Inter-method relations were studied in all patients and in sub-groups defined by first principal component related test interaction style criteria.

Study II used the Rorschach Comprehensive System, the MMPI-2 and fifty-one newly constructed self-descriptions derived from the interpretive guidelines for the Comprehensive System (SAPCS). The Rorschach and MMPI-2 test data were the same as in study I. To investigate the measurement qualities of the SAPCS, independent raters’ ability to correct classification of the SAPCS items was assessed. Test-retest reliability of SAPCS statements and the ability of the SAPCS items to measure adaptive capacity and vulnerability were investigated in twenty-three and one hundred undergraduate psychology students, respectively. Concurrent validity of SAPCS items and the MMPI-2 was also assessed. The inter-method relation analysis used only test variables with an acceptable level of reliability and validity.
Study III included the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. Rorschach inter-judge reliability was assessed. Broad measures of interpersonal functioning were used, in the form of both individual and aggregated test variables. Inter-method relations were analyzed in all patients as well as sub-grouped according to first factor-related test interaction style criteria.

Study IV, used Rorschach content scales, analyzed according to the Rorschach Interaction Scale and the Mutuality of Autonomy Scale, together with the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. Reliability of Rorschach scoring was determined. The sample was stratified so that thirty patients had been treated with directive forms of therapy and thirty patients had received non-directive forms of therapeutic treatment. Broad test variables were used in the analysis of inter-method relations, including all sixty patients, assessed before and after therapy.
3 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

3.1 STUDY I.

Study I came about after a review of the literature that failed to find a stable relationship between the two most extensively researched personality methods, the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach, measuring presumably related constructs (Archer & Krishnamurty, 1993a; 1993b). In an effort to make further sense of this challenging finding, Meyer (1997) found that the first principal component factors of the MMPI and the Rorschach, interpreted as indicators of test interaction styles, were strong moderators of inter-method relations. The test interaction styles identified were open or engaged, and constricted. Meyer was able to show that when test interaction style was similar cross methods, test results from the two methods converged. With disparate test interaction styles cross methods, test results were negatively correlated.

These were highly interesting findings because they put a focus on the method of assessment as a context for its’ own measurement, and also because they suggested a way to seize method specific variance that could improve the reliability of existing measures. Meyer’s approach was novel and had only been tested in his own sample. Study I was therefore implemented with the purpose to independently replicate Meyer’s 1997 findings. Seventy-eight psychiatric patients consecutively referred for test assessment as part of a clinical procedure completed the Rorschach and the MMPI-2, translated into Swedish. Subsequent analysis revealed inter-method relations similar to Meyer’s (1997) with practically no correlation evident between the MMPI–2 and the Rorschach, measuring similar constructs, in all patients. Patients with similar test-interaction styles demonstrated positive inter-method correlations between both conceptually related, and conceptually not directly related, test indices. The same scales were negatively correlated in patients with discordant test-interaction styles, and this difference between test-interaction style groups was significant. The results from study I suggested that Meyer’s findings were applicable also in a Swedish sample of psychiatric patients. That is, first-factor related test interaction style moderates convergence. However, the results further suggested that test interaction style moderates convergence between both conceptually related, and conceptually not directly related, measures of distress or psychopathology. In other words, a lack of clear discriminant validity of the first factor related scores was evident.

3.2 STUDY II

The MMPI and the Rorschach were originally developed under different circumstances and were not intended for the same specific purposes. It could be argued that many of the variables used in the published inter-method research have an insufficient degree of conceptual overlap. This cannot fully explain the systematic lack of a stable relation between the two methods, but conceptual overlap is, of course, a prerequisite for expecting different methods to agree. Unfortunately, at the time of conducting study II, no established self report measure of personality offered sufficient conceptual overlap with the Rorschach to allow this issue to be investigated further. We therefore set out to construct such a measure ourselves.
Fifty-one self-descriptions were constructed by the authors in co-operation with three senior fellow psychologists, with the objective to achieve maximum overlap with the interpretive guidelines suggested for Rorschach Comprehensive System variables, while simultaneously fitting with how patients could be expected to describe themselves in self-ratings. Eighty psychiatric patients with different clinical diagnoses completed the Rorschach, the MMPI-2 and also rated these 51 written personality descriptions derived from the Comprehensive System (SAPCS). To access test-retest stability of the SAPCS items, a group of twenty-three undergraduate psychology students also responded to the items on two separate occasions. To clarify the extent to which the SAPCS items were close to the meaning of the Rorschach Comprehensive System variables, ten independent judges’ ability to correct classification of the items was accessed. Concurrent validity of SAPCS items was accessed by means of item inter-correlation with the MMPI-2. As a possible indicator of construct validity, the SAPCS’ items sensitivity and specificity, measuring psychological adaptive capacity and vulnerability/pathology was accessed by comparing responses by the eighty psychiatric patients with one hundred undergraduate psychology students.

The strategy in study II was to retain only those SAPCS and Rorschach items that achieved sufficient levels of reliability and validity. This rendered sixteen variable pairings for the main analysis. Patients’ SAPCS ratings were expected to significantly converge with corresponding Rorschach Comprehensive System measures. However, including all variable pairings, the mean correlation suggests that SAPCS statements overlapping with CS interpretive statements, do not measure the same constructs as the Comprehensive System variables to which the interpretive statements are referring. Standard validity scales in the MMPI-2 and first factor-related test interaction style did not moderate the relation between Comprehensive System indices and the Comprehensive System-near self descriptions.

### 3.3 STUDY III

A search of the literature suggested that there is limited research on the relation between the Rorschach and other self report instruments. In study III, relations between the self reported Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) (Horowitz et al, 1988) and variables in the interpersonal cluster of the Rorschach Comprehensive System were investigated in a sample of 225 Swedish psychiatric patients awaiting publicly funded psychotherapy. The results suggest that the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the IIP do not measure related concepts.

### 3.4 STUDY IV

In study IV we used the same self report method as in study III but this time altered the type of Rorschach scales employed. In study I, II and III, variables used were all structural in nature, meaning scores that capture frequencies of a circumscribed aspect of the test performance. In contrast, test responses can also be analyzed in terms of response content. Previous research with the Rorschach and self reported assessment in heterogeneous groups demonstrated that method specific factors are typically stronger determinants of inter-method relations than actual state or trait variability (Meyer, 1997; Meyer, Riethmiller, Brooks, Benoit & Handler, 2000; Lindgren & Carlsson,
2002). The purpose of study IV was to test the hypothesis that when scales use different methodology to measure relatively similar test response content, they will agree.

In a sample of 60 psychiatric patients undergoing psychotherapy, the Rorschach Interaction Scale, RIS (Graves & Thomas, 1981), the Mutuality of Autonomy scale, MOA (Urist, 1977) and the self reported Inventory of Interpersonal Problems, IIP (Horowitz et al, 1988) were used to investigate inter-method relations. The three scales were considered similar in that all of them use ratings of interpersonal functioning, based on respondents interpersonal ideation. As predicted, the Rorschach and the self report scales were significantly correlated, measuring occurrence of interpersonal problems. The results were found to support our hypothesis.
4 DISCUSSION

Meyer (1997) conceptualized the first principal component factors of the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach as broad indicators of test interaction styles. He corroborated this with data showing that the first factors of the different types of methods were unrelated and that the different methods correlated significantly when test respondents were aligned according to similar or disparate styles of test interaction. Implicit in these findings and in study I was the intriguing, Escher-like idea that assessment methods in themselves constitute a decisive context for their own measurement. Similar to Meyer and earlier observed by Campbell & Fiske (1959), common method variance, or method specific factors, was found in study I to be the single strongest determinant of the total variability in measurement. In other words, how we measure appears to be more decisive than what we measure for the total variability evident in measurement.

The method by which we measure needs to be further understood. In what way is the Rorschach task a unique experience and how is it similar to typical real life situations and to a self report task or other types of test procedures? Traditionally, the Rorschach has been regarded as a “projective” test while methods such as the MMPI/MMPI-2 were considered “objective”. This rests on a gross categorization that disregards crucial aspects of the methodology. The Rorschach is far from only a projective and the MMPI/MMPI-2 is certainly not only an objective method of assessment.

When aligning respondents according to the first principal component score related criteria, the Rorschach and the MMPI-2 were significantly correlated, in conceptually meaningful ways. However, correlations of similar magnitude were also evident among presumably unrelated variables. It is likely, from this finding, that the first factor score encompasses more than pure test interaction style. Future, more refined, probably more specific psychometric efforts to measure test interaction style, may offer a more useful way to separate method specific variability from the measurement of state or trait.

Archer (1996) identifies three different perspectives concerning the relationship between the Rorschach and self report. One view holds that variables from the two methods will demonstrate a systematic relation only in research studies that involve specific, well-constructed and theoretically derived predictions. A second view holds, according to Archer, that although variables from the Rorschach and the MMPI/MMPI-2 do not bear a high inter-correlation with each other, these variables may be combined to contribute significantly to the prediction of outcome variance. A third view is that although the MMPI/MMPI-2 and the Rorschach do not co-vary systematically under general conditions, meaningful relationships may be yielded under specific psychometric conditions.

Study I fits Archers description of a third approach to understanding Rorschach and self report inter-relations. The second view identified by Archer would fall under the category “clinical method” in Grove and Meehl’s (1996) model, mentioned earlier. The review and findings of Grove and Meehl suggest that, until we have a tested theory of
inter-method relations, this second approach may in fact contribute negatively to the prediction of outcome variance. The first view identified by Archer is probably the most commonly held. The argument that construct overlap is typically insufficient between indices in the Rorschach and the self report belong to this view. Considering the variety of indices used in published inter-method analyses including the Rorschach and the self report, it seems unlikely that this could explain the systematic lack of a stable relation. However, construct overlap is undisputably a pre-requisite for expecting inter-method agreement.

In study II a particular effort was made to achieve sufficient overlap between what the Rorschach and the self report purport to measure. Test respondents were required to rate themselves according to a number of different personality descriptions, carefully crafted to correspond to the interpretive guidelines for the Comprehensive System, covering multiple areas of functioning. The conclusion that these ratings did not systematically relate to corresponding Rorschach indices remains an intriguing finding. Not only were the Rorschach and the self report not measuring the same construct. They appeared to be quite systematically measuring unique phenomena. This seems to lend further support to the notion that assessment methods are in themselves decisive contexts for their own measurement. A relatively high degree of conceptual overlap between Rorschach and self report variables seems not, by itself, enough for the two types of assessment methods to agree. From a clinical point of view, the assessor and the assessed will probably be talking about different things when discussing assessment outcome addressed similarly to that in the SAPCS.

Most studies investigating the relations between the Rorschach and self report have used the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the MMPI/MMPI-2. No study of inter-method relations was found including the Rorschach and the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. This prompted study III. Study III failed to demonstrate a stable relation between the Rorschach Comprehensive System and the IIP, purporting to measure interpersonal problems. The finding supports the contention that the Rorschach Comprehensive System variables are not systematically related to self reported methods of assessment, in heterogeneous samples.

The first and third study in this thesis investigated the relation between the Rorschach and the self report by using different, well-tested and widely used self report scales. The general questions were in short: Is there a systematic relation under specific psychometric conditions and does it make a difference which particular scale is used? In study II efforts were made to achieve conceptual overlap between the two types of methods. The question could be put in the following way: Is level of conceptual overlap a moderator of the relation between the Rorschach and the self report? Study IV focused on the content of the measurement. The general question was: Is the Rorschach and the self report systematically related when indices require similar psychological functioning?

In study IV, scales from each method used ratings of interpersonal functioning, based on respondents’ interpersonal ideation. The Rorschach and the IIP were systematically related when the specific scales, included in the analysis, used similar response content
for their respective measurement. Similar response content may be assumed to reflect similar psychological functioning in test respondents.

It may be that personality assessment scale scores primarily are generalizable to personality functioning that requires psychological processes similar to that of the measurement. Test scores obtained by requiring distinctly different psychological processes in test respondents are less likely to be systematically related. Evidence of construct validity may be a consequence of the requirements set by test indices rather than actual construct overlap. Future research needs to further confirm and clarify what constitutes similarities and differences between contents of measurement and corresponding psychological functioning. In answering such questions I believe that an experiential perspective on measurement is necessary (Schachtel, 1966; Fischer, 1994). Schachtel expected colour responses in the Rorschach to be related to affects because experiencing colour is similar to experiencing affect. They require similar psychological functioning.

The lack of a systematic relation between the Rorschach and the self report appears less confusing when making a clear distinction between different types of validity evidence. Both types of methods carry evidence of criterion-related validity to support their respective use. The findings of study I, II, III and IV are primarily relevant for assessing and further understanding the construct validity of Rorschach and self report indices. Method specific characteristics have not been properly considered in previous formulations of construct validity of our measures.

The present work was introduced with questions about how to best combine credible assessment data and testees’ conceptualizations and subjective experience. From a clinical assessment point of view, test results should probably best be interpreted in two steps: First consider the available validity evidence, suggesting that a particular test score measures a specific personality concept. Second, unless the validity evidence is very similar to the functions we wish to generalize our test finding to, we must consider the degree of similarity between the content of our test scores and whatever it is the test scores are intended to help us clarify.

Similar to previous research (Archer and Krishnamurthy, 1993; Meyer, 1997), study I, II and III demonstrate a lack of systematic relations between the Rorschach and different types of self report in heterogeneous samples. Countless hours have been spent searching for a systematic relation between the Rorschach and the self report, in particular the SAPCS. The outcome of this was a systematic lack of relations. A large number of variables, purporting to measure a broad range of functioning, show independence cross methods. This suggests, as other authors have pointed out already (Archer & Krishnamurty, 1993), potential incremental validity. Establishing incremental validity is facilitated by a thorough understanding of what individual methods of assessment measure, and do not measure. Hopefully, this thesis has contributed in this area.
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