

Abstracts from the final Special Section in the Special Series on the  
Utility of the Rorschach for Clinical Assessment  
*Psychological Assessment*, December 2001, Volume 13, Number 4  
all abstracts copyright 81999 by the American Psychological Association.

Introduction to the final Special Section in the Special Series on the utility of the Rorschach for clinical assessment.

Gregory J. Meyer

*Psychological Assessment*. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 419-422

A Special Series was organized to clarify the merits of the Rorschach for clinical assessment. Except for a neutral meta-analytic review, articles were solicited from scholars known to have opposing views on the Rorschach. The authors participated in a structured, sequential, evidence-based dialogue that focused on strengths and limitations when using the Rorschach for applied purposes. The debate has taken place over 4 iterations, with later articles building on and reacting to those generated earlier. The first 5 articles in the Special Series were published earlier (G. J. Meyer, 1999), and the final 6 articles are published in this issue of *Psychological Assessment*. This article provides a brief overview of the full Special Series and an introduction to the 6 articles contained in this Special Section. The Special Series provides clinicians, researchers, educators, and students with a thorough review of the evidence and logic that are critical for understanding the Rorschach's strengths and limitations in clinical assessment.

Advancing the science of psychological assessment: The Rorschach Inkblot Method as exemplar.  
Irving B. Weiner

*Psychological Assessment*. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 423-432

This article comments on a series of 5 articles, concerning the utility of the Rorschach Inkblot Method (RTM; R. M. Dawes, see record 1999-11130-006; J. Hiller et al, see record 1999-11130-005; J. Hunsley and J. M. Bailey, see record 1999-11130-004; G. Stricker and J. R. Gold, see record 1999-11130-002; and D. J. Vigilone, see record 1999-11130-003). Two of the articles provide extensive empirical evidence that the RIM has been standardized, normed, made reliable, and validated in ways that exemplify sound scientific principles for developing an assessment instrument. A 3rd article reports a meta-analysis, indicating that the RIM and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory have almost identical validity effect sizes, both large enough to warrant confidence in using these measures. The other 2 articles adduce sketchy data and incomplete literature reviews as a basis for questioning the psychometric soundness of Rorschach assessment. Unwarranted skepticism should not be given credence as an adequate platform from which to challenge abundant evidence that the RIM works very well for its intended purposes.

Toward a resolution of the Rorschach controversy.

Howard N. Garb; James M. Wood; M. Teresa Nezworski; William M. Grove; William J. Stejskal  
*Psychological Assessment*. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 423-448

Comments are made about the articles comprising the first round of the Special Series on the Rorschach. G. Stricker and J. R. Gold (see record 1999-11130-002) and D. J. Vigilone (see record 1999-11130-003) praised the Rorschach, but they consistently failed to cite negative

findings. R. M. Dawes (see record 1999-11130-006) obtained results that provide modest support for the Rorschach, but one of his data sets is flawed. J. B. Hiller et al (see record 1999-11130-005) reported the results of a meta-analysis, but, among other problems, their coders were not blind to the results of all the studies. J. Hunsley and J. M. Bailey (see record 1999-11130-004) made a strong case for concluding that there is no scientific basis for using the Rorschach. Recommendations are made for resolving the Rorschach controversy.

Meta-analytic methods, the Rorschach, and the MMPI.

Robert Rosenthal; Jordan B. Hiller; Robert F. Bornstein; David T. R. Berry; Sherrie Brunell-Neuleib

Psychological Assessment. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 449-451

In response to concerns described by H. N. Garb et al (see record 2001-05665-003), the authors present the weighted and unweighted means and medians of the effect sizes obtained by J. B. Hiller et al (see record 1999-11130-005). These indices of central tendency are presented separately for MMPI and Rorschach effect sizes, both for all the studies in the meta-analysis and for a 10% trimmed sample designed to obtain more robust estimates of central tendency. The variability of these 4 indices is noticeably greater for the MMPI than for the Rorschach. Meta-analysts must compute, compare, and evaluate a variety of indices of central tendency, and they must examine the effects of moderator variables. The authors also comment briefly on the use of phi versus kappa, combining correlated effect sizes and possible hindsight biases.

The Rorschach: Facts, fictions, and future.

Donald J. Viglione; Mark J. Hilsenroth

Psychological Assessment. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 452-471

A large body of empirical evidence supports the reliability, validity, and utility of the Rorschach. This same evidence reveals that the recent criticisms of the Rorschach are largely without merit. This article systematically addresses several significant Rorschach components: interrater and temporal consistency reliability, normative data and diversity, methodological issues, specific applications in the evaluation of thought disorder and suicide, meta-analyses, incremental validity, clinician judgment, patterns of use, and clinical utility. Strengths and weaknesses of the test are addressed, and research recommendations are made. This information should give the reader both an appreciation for the substantial, but often overlooked, research basis for the Rorschach and an appreciation of the challenges that lie ahead.

Whither the Rorschach? An analysis of the evidence.

John Hunsley; J. Michael Bailey

Psychological Assessment. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 472-485 In the previous Special Section, the authors presented empirical evidence and logical analysis that were sufficient to demonstrate that the widespread use of the Rorschach in clinical, legal, forensic, and occupational settings is unwarranted on both scientific and ethical grounds (J. Hunsley and J. M. Bailey, see record 1999-11130-004). To expand on their analysis and to respond to issues raised in the previous and current Special Sections, they begin their article by examining a number of conceptual issues that are at the heart of the disagreements about the Rorschach. The focus is then shifted to the central issue of clinical utility, with an emphasis on why current research is insufficient to demonstrate

the utility of the Rorschach. Next, the psychometric issues raised by I. B. Weiner (see record 2001-05665-002) are addressed and an alternative perspective on the psychometric viability of the Rorschach is provided. Finally, the authors conclude with some suggestions for future directions that must be taken in research to address the substantive concerns raised by Rorschach critics.

The hard science of Rorschach research: What do we know and where do we go?

Gregory J. Meyer; Robert P. Archer

Psychological Assessment. 2001 Dec Vol 13(4) 486-502

As the final article in the Special Series on "The Utility of the Rorschach for Clinical Assessment," the authors provide an overview of this instrument's current status. They begin with a thorough review of global and focused meta-analyses, including an expanded analysis of K. C. H. Parker et al's (see record 1989-14153-001) data set, and conclude that Rorschach, MMPI, and IQ scales each produce roughly similar effect size magnitudes, although all tests have greater validity for some purposes than for others. Because this evidentiary foundation justifies addressing other issues, the authors build on contributions to the Special Series to identify 11 salient theoretical and empirical gaps in the Rorschach knowledge base and make recommendations for addressing these challenges to further the evolution of the Rorschach and document its strengths and inherent limitations.