

SECOND EDITION

HANDBOOK of
**Personality
Assessment**

IRVING B. WEINER
ROGERS L. GREENE

**HANDBOOK OF
PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT**

SECOND EDITION

**HANDBOOK OF
PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT**

SECOND EDITION

Irving B. Weiner
Roger L. Greene

WILEY

Copyright © 2017 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved.

Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.

Published simultaneously in Canada.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400, fax 978-646-8600, or on the Web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, 201-748-6011, fax 201-748-6008, or online at www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Readers should be aware that Internet Web sites offered as citations and/or sources for further information may have changed or disappeared between the time this was written and when it is read.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If legal, accounting, medical, psychological or any other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

For general information on our other products and services, please contact our Customer Care Department within the U.S. at 800-956-7739, outside the U.S. at 317-572-3986, or fax 317-572-4002.

Wiley publishes in a variety of print and electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some material included with standard print versions of this book may not be included in e-books or in print-on-demand. If this book refers to media such as a CD or DVD that is not included in the version you purchased, you may download this material at <http://booksupport.wiley.com>. For more information about Wiley products, visit www.wiley.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Weiner, Irving B., author. | Greene, Roger L.

Title: Handbook of personality assessment / Irving B. Weiner, Roger L. Greene.

Description: Second edition. | Hoboken, New Jersey : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,

[2017] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016034597 (print) | LCCN 2016047573 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119258889 (cloth)

| ISBN 9781119258896 (pdf) | ISBN 9781119258902 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Personality assessment--Handbooks, manuals, etc.

Classification: LCC BF698.4 .W45 2017 (print) | LCC BF698.4 (ebook) | DDC

155.2/8--dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016034597>

Cover design by Wiley

Printed in the United States of America

SECOND EDITION

HB Printing

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Preface **xiii**

About the Authors **xv**

PART 1: BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

Chapter 1 History of Personality Assessment **3**

Early Events	3
Emergence of Personality Psychology	5
World War II and the Expansion of Clinical Psychology	5
Trends Over Time: Shrinkage and Growth	6
Concluding Comments	9
References	12

Chapter 2 The Personality Assessment Process **15**

Purposes of Personality Assessment	15
Preparing for Personality Assessments	16
Conducting Personality Assessments	21
Interpreting Personality Assessment Data	23
Reporting Personality Assessment Findings	29
References	33

Chapter 3 Psychometric Foundations of Assessment **37**

Reliability	37
Validity	41
Clinical Decision Making	43
Impediments to Accurate Decisions	53
Concluding Comments	55
References	56

Chapter 4 Ethical Considerations in Personality Assessment	59
Student Disclosure of Personal Information (7.04)	60
Bases for Assessments (9.01)	60
Use of Assessments (9.02)	60
Informed Consent in Assessments (9.03)	62
Release of Test Data (9.04)	63
Interpreting Assessment Results (9.06)	63
Assessment by Unqualified Persons (9.07)	64
Obsolete Tests and Outdated Test Results (9.08)	66
Test Scoring and Interpretation Services (9.09)	66
Explaining Assessment Results (9.10)	67
Maintaining Test Security (9.11)	68
Training Students in Personality Assessment	68
Diversity Issues	69
Concluding Comments	72
References	72

PART 2: SELF-REPORT INVENTORIES

Chapter 5 Overview	77
Nature of Self-Report Inventories	77
Item Characteristics	79
Administration and Scoring	85
Method of Scale Development	90
Validity Assessment	92
The Process of Interpretation	101
Future Directions for Assessment With Self-Report Inventories	102
Summary	103
References	103
Chapter 6 Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2	105
History	105
Administration	109
Scoring	110
Validity	111
Interpretation	116
Applications	153
Psychometric Foundations	154
Concluding Comments	156
References	156

Chapter 7	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent	161
	History	161
	Administration	165
	Scoring	165
	Validity	166
	Interpretation	170
	Applications	190
	Psychometric Foundations	192
	Concluding Comments	193
	References	193
Chapter 8	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form	197
	History	197
	Administration	200
	Scoring	200
	Validity	201
	Interpretation	207
	Applications	220
	Psychometric Foundations	223
	MMPI-Adolescent-Restructured Form (MMPI-A-RF)	224
	Concluding Comments	225
	References	227
Chapter 9	Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV	231
	History	232
	Administration	236
	Scoring	236
	Validity	238
	Interpretation	241
	Applications	253
	Psychometric Foundations	254
	Concluding Comments	254
	References	255
Chapter 10	Personality Assessment Inventory	257
	History	257
	Administration	261
	Scoring	261
	Validity	262
	Interpretation	267

Applications	281
Psychometric Foundations	282
Adolescent Version of the PAI	283
Concluding Comments	284
References	284
Chapter 11 NEO Personality Inventory-3	287
History	287
Administration	289
Scoring	289
Validity	291
Interpretation	295
Applications	303
Psychometric Foundations	304
Concluding Comments	306
References	306
PART 3: PERFORMANCE-BASED MEASURES	
Chapter 12 Rorschach Comprehensive System	311
Nature of the Rorschach Comprehensive System	311
History	312
Administration	316
Coding and Scoring	318
Interpretation: Structural Variables	325
Interpretation: Thematic Variables	339
Interpretation: Behavioral Variables	341
Interpretation: Card Pull	344
Applications	348
Psychometric Foundations	355
References	363
Chapter 13 Rorschach Performance Assessment System	369
Nature of the Rorschach Performance Assessment System	369
History	370
Administration	370
Coding and Scoring	373
Interpretation	385
Applications	386
Psychometric Foundations	387
References	389

Chapter 14	Thematic Apperception Test	391
	Nature of the Thematic Apperception Test	391
	History	393
	Administration	396
	Coding	399
	Interpretation: Card Pull	401
	Interpretation: Story Meaning	417
	Applications	422
	Psychometric Foundations	425
	References	427
Chapter 15	Figure-Drawing Methods	433
	Nature and History of Figure-Drawing Methods	433
	Administration and Scoring	436
	Interpretation	439
	Applications	447
	Psychometric Foundations	450
	References	455
Chapter 16	Sentence Completion Methods	459
	Nature of Sentence Completion Methods	460
	History	461
	Administration	464
	Scoring	465
	Interpretation	466
	Applications	471
	Psychometric Foundations	474
	References	475
 PART 4: APPENDICES: COMPUTER-GENERATED INTERPRETIVE REPORTS		
Appendix A	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2	481
Appendix B	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent	537
Appendix C	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form	581
Appendix D	Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV	619
Appendix E	Personality Assessment Inventory	631

Appendix F	NEO Personality Inventory-3	673
Appendix G	Rorschach Comprehensive System	697
Appendix H	Rorschach Performance Assessment System	711
Subject Index		733
Author Index		741

*In memory of W. Grant Dahlstrom,
John E. Exner Jr., Theodore Millon, and
Jerry S. Wiggins*

Preface

Personality assessment consists of procedures for identifying what people are like and how they are likely to think, feel, and act. By illuminating the nature of people and their disposition to conduct themselves in certain ways, personality assessment plays important roles in psychological science and practice. Measures of personality characteristics help researchers examine individual differences in response style, unravel the origins of distinctive behavior patterns, and map developmental paths to diverse types of adaptation to life. Personality assessment helps practitioners discern an individual's frame of mind and behavioral tendencies. They can then use this information to reach relevant conclusions and make useful recommendations in a broad range of clinical, health care, forensic, educational, and organizational applications.

The personality characteristics that define the nature and dispositions of an individual can be assessed in several ways: (a) by conducting a diagnostic interview with the person; (b) by obtaining information about the person from historical records and from the reports of collateral persons who know the person well; (c) by observing the person's behavior; and (d) by administering to the person a battery of standardized personality assessment instruments.

The *Handbook of Personality Assessment* focuses on the last of these strategies: the assessment of personality functioning with standardized psychological tests. The chapters elaborate the clinical utility of personality assessment instruments in diagnostic evaluation and treatment planning, and they address as well the relevance of psychological test findings to decisions made in the courtroom and the workplace.

The text is addressed primarily to two groups of readers: graduate students who are learning about personality assessment methods and issues, and professional psychologists interested in refreshing and updating their familiarity with these methods and issues, or perhaps in becoming acquainted with measures other than the ones they customarily use. To these ends, the chapters in this *Handbook* provide basic instruction in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the most widely used multidimensional personality assessment instruments, and they also review and comment on contemporary clinical and research literature concerning the scientific status and practical applications of these measures.

Part 1 of the *Handbook* comprises chapters on four general considerations in personality assessment: its history, procedures, psychometric foundations, and ethical requirements. Chapter 1 (on history) relates the scientific and professional development of personality assessment as a field of study and practice, with attention to trends over time and issues of terminology. Chapter 2 (on the assessment process) discusses the purposes of personality assessment and issues connected with collecting and using assessment information, including management of the referral process; selection of a test battery; integration of assessment data from multiple sources; and use of computer programs in test administration, scoring, and interpretation. Chapter 3 (on psychometric foundations) reviews procedures for determining the reliability and validity of assessment methods and delineates broad issues in clinical decision making, including adequate allowance for bias and base rates. Chapter 4 (on ethical considerations) discusses each of the 11 standards in the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* of the American Psychological Association that have particular relevance to the personality assessment process.

Part 2 of the *Handbook* presents information about self-report personality inventories. Chapter 5 provides an overview of self-report inventories and the ways in which they resemble or differ from each other, including their item characteristics, their method of scale development, and their manner of determining test validity. The remaining

chapters in Part 2 provide in-depth coverage of the most widely used and frequently studied personality assessment instruments of this kind. Chapter 6 addresses the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2);¹ Chapter 7, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent (MMPI-A); Chapter 8, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF); Chapter 9, the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV (MCMI-IV); Chapter 10, the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI); and Chapter 11, the NEO Personality Inventory-3 (NEO-PI-3). These six chapters are organized according to a template consisting of each instrument's history, administration, scoring, validity assessment, interpretation, applications, and psychometric foundations.

Part 3 of the *Handbook* presents information about what have traditionally been called “projective” measures but, for reasons discussed in Chapter 1, can more appropriately be categorized as performance-based measures. Five chapters provide in-depth coverage of the most widely used performance-based methods of personality assessment. Chapter 12 addresses the Rorschach Comprehensive System (RCS); Chapter 13, the Rorschach Performance Assessment System (R-PAS); Chapter 14, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT); Chapter 15, figure drawing methods, including the Draw-A-Person (DAP), House-Tree-Person (HTP), and Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) tests; and Chapter 16, sentence completion methods, focusing on the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (RISB) and the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT). The template for these five chapters consists of the nature, history, administration, scoring, interpretation, applications, and psychometric foundations of each of these measures.

Part 4 of the *Handbook* consists of sample interpretive reports generated by computer programs for the MMPI-2, MMPI-A, MMPI-2-RF, MCMI-IV, PAI, NEO-PI-3, RCS, and R-PAS. These sample reports, which include profiles of the test scores on which the interpretive statements are based, illustrate the breadth and depth of the information that can be obtained from personality assessment instruments. The conclusions and recommendations suggested in these reports illustrate as well their potential for helping examiners provide useful diagnostic consultations. However, readers should attend to the limitations as well as the advantages of computer-based test interpretations, as discussed in Chapter 2 and included in the caveats that accompany most computer-generated test reports.

* * *

We acknowledge the valuable suggestions of several distinguished colleagues in personality assessment who advised us in the preparation of the first edition of this *Handbook*: Marvin Acklin, Robert Archer, James Butcher, James Choca, Paul Costa, Leonard Handler, Gregory Meyer, Leslie Morey, David Nichols, Paul Retzlaff, Barry Ritzler, David Streiner, Donald Viglione, and Jed Yalof. For this second edition, we express special appreciation to Gregory Meyer for his recommendations and permission to reproduce information from the Rorschach Performance Assessment System scoring program. We also thank the American Psychological Association, the Caldwell Report, Pearson Assessments, Psychological Assessment Resources, and the University of Minnesota Press for permission to reprint some of their copyrighted materials.

Irving B. Weiner
Roger L. Greene

¹“MMPI-2,” “Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2,” “MMPI-A,” “Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent,” “Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-RF,” and “The Minnesota Report” are trademarks of the University of Minnesota.

About the Authors

Irving B. Weiner, PhD, is a retired professor of psychiatry and behavioral neuroscience at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. He received his doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Michigan, and his positions since that time have included professor of psychiatry and pediatrics and head of the Division of Psychology at the University of Rochester Medical Center; professor and chair of the Department of Psychology at Case Western Reserve University; and vice president and chief academic officer at the University of Denver and at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Dr. Weiner is a fellow of the American Psychological Association and of the Association for Psychological Science and a diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology in clinical and forensic psychology. He is a past president of APA Divisions 5 (Quantitative and Qualitative Methods) and 12 (Society of Clinical Psychology), of the Society for Personality Assessment, and of the International Rorschach Society. He has received a Distinguished Contribution Award from the Society of Clinical Psychology and from the Society for Personality Assessment. His writings include numerous articles and chapters and the following books:

Psychodiagnosis in Schizophrenia, 1966; republished ed., 1997
Psychological Disturbance in Adolescence, 1970; 2nd ed., 1992
Rorschach Handbook of Clinical and Research Applications, 1971
Child Development, 1972
Clinical Methods in Psychology, 1975; 2nd ed., 1983
Principles of Psychotherapy, 1975; 2nd ed., 1998; 3rd ed., 2009
Development of the Child, 1978
Child and Adolescent Psychopathology, 1982
Rorschach Assessment of Children and Adolescents, 1982; 2nd ed., 1995
Adolescence: A Developmental Transition, 1985; 2nd ed., 1995
Handbook of Forensic Psychology (Ed.), 1987; 2nd ed., 1999; 3rd ed., 2006; 4th ed., 2014
Principles of Rorschach Interpretation, 1998; 2nd ed., 2003
Handbook of Psychology (12 vols.) (Editor-in-Chief), 2003; 2nd ed., 2013
Adult Psychopathology Case Studies (Ed.), 2004
The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology, (4 vols.) (Ed.); 4th ed., 2010
Rorschach Assessment of Adolescents, 2016

Roger L. Greene, PhD, is a distinguished emeritus professor at Pacific Graduate School of Psychology in Palo Alto, California, where he served as director of clinical training for 12 years. Dr. Greene has worked in a variety of clinical settings and with different types of patients in his clinical career. His particular area of interest clinically is the assessment and treatment of alcohol and drug abuse. He has written a number of texts and articles on the use of the MMPI-2. His most recent book, *The MMPI2/MMPI-2-RF: An Interpretive Manual* (3rd ed.) was published in 2011. His books on the MMPI/MMPI-2 have been among the standard references for over two decades. He is a fellow of Division 12 of APA and the Society for Personality Assessment. He has served on the board of trustees and as an associate editor

of the *Journal of Personality Assessment* for the Society of Personality Assessment. He received the Bruno Klopfer Distinguished Contribution Award from the Society for Personality Assessment in 2010. His writings include numerous articles and chapters and the following books:

The MMPI: An Interpretive Manual, 1980

The MMPI: Use with Specific Populations (Ed.), 1988

The MMPI-2/MMPI: An Interpretive Manual, 1991

Emerging Issues and Methods in Personality Assessment (Co-Ed.), 1997

MMPI-2 Adult Interpretive System (with R. Brown, Jr.) [Computer software], 1998

The MMPI-2: An Interpretive Manual, 2000

MMPI2 Adult Interpretive System Version 3.0 (with R. Brown, Jr.) [Computer software], 2006

MMPI2 Adult Interpretive System Version 4.0 (with R. Brown, Jr.) [Computer software], 2010

The MMPI-2/MMPI-2-RF: An Interpretive Manual, 2011

Using the MMPI-2 in Forensic Assessment (with James N. Butcher, Giselle A. Hass, and Linda D. Nelson), 2015

**HANDBOOK OF
PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT**

SECOND EDITION

Part 1

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

HISTORY OF PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Personality assessment, as studied and practiced today, has evolved from long-standing recognition that people differ from each other in how they think, feel, and act and are generally disposed to behave in particular ways. Awareness of individual differences among people is almost as old as civilization itself, and the great literature of the world, from the Greek tragedies to modern fiction, contains vivid descriptions of men and women with distinctive personality characteristics. (Was there ever a meaner person than Dickens's Scrooge, or a more decent person after he underwent a change of heart?) Literary depictions of distinctive personality patterns predated by far the emergence of psychology as a recognized field of study, and attention to individual differences was brought early into the beginnings of formal psychological science and practice.

The advent of formal psychological science is customarily dated to the establishment of Wundt's laboratory in Leipzig in 1879 (see Fuchs & Evans, 2013). In 1883, James McKeen Cattell began working for Wundt as a graduate assistant and asked permission to do a doctoral dissertation on individual differences in reaction time. Being a nomothetic scientist interested in psychological processes, Wundt tended to look at differences among people as bothersome error variance, but he nevertheless acceded to Cattell's request. This was the beginning of a distinguished career for Cattell, in which he pioneered mental testing, generated widespread scientific interest in measuring individual differences with psychological tests, and became regarded as the father of assessment psychology (see Weiner, 2013).

Formal practical applications of psychological assessment also began over 100 years ago, when Alfred Binet was asked in 1904 to help develop a method for identifying intellectually limited children in the Paris public schools who were in need of special attention. In collaboration with Theodore Simon, Binet drew on prior research he had done on the nature of intelligence to construct the Binet-Simon scales, which in their expanded English version later became the well-known Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale.

The early assessments of mental functions in the tradition of Cattell and Binet had relatively little to do with determining how people are likely to think, feel, and act. It was not until the second decade of the 20th century that events ushered in formal psychological testing to address individual differences in psychological adjustment and personality style. Later on, in the 1930s and 1940s, personality assessment received considerable impetus from the emergence of personality as a discrete field of study in psychology, the expanded needs for mental health services to the military during World War II, and the post-World War II formal doctoral training and Veterans Administration programs in clinical psychology.

Following a heyday as the major focus of clinical psychology that extended to the late 1960s, personality assessment passed through an era of both shrinkage and growth that continues to the present time. This introductory chapter reviews these historical developments and concludes with some observations on the implications of idiographic and nomothetic perspectives in personality assessment and on alternative terminology for categorizing different types of personality assessment measures.

EARLY EVENTS

A seminal event in the history of applied personality assessment was the 1917 entry of the United States into World War I and the concerns it generated about the susceptibility of frontline soldiers to traumatic stress reactions (known then as "shell shock"). For help in identifying psychologically fragile draftees, the War Department turned to Robert Woodworth, a prominent experimental psychologist who had studied with Cattell. In response, Woodworth started

working on a checklist of probable symptoms of psychological disturbance, to be answered yes or no (e.g., “Are you happy most of the time?”). The intent was to use this checklist as a screening device to deselect emotionally unstable draftees.

As matters turned out, the war ended before Woodworth finished constructing his measure, and it was never used for its original purpose. Following the war, however, Woodworth wrote about his checklist in a 1919 journal article and then published the list as the Personal Data Sheet (Woodworth, 1919, 1920). The Personal Data Sheet found civilian use as a measure of adjustment, and it was the first formal self-report personality assessment questionnaire to become generally available. Woodworth’s measure was limited in scope, providing only a single score for overall level of adjustment and no other information about personality characteristics. His Personal Data Sheet nevertheless served as a model for later generations of similar but more complex checklists.

The first noteworthy advance over Woodworth’s unidimensional measure was a multidimensional self-report personality inventory published by Robert Bernreuter in 1931. The Bernreuter Personality Inventory comprised scales for several different personality characteristics, including neurotic tendencies, ascendance-submission, and introversion-extroversion. Highly respected and widely used in its day, Bernreuter’s measure was the forerunner of many currently prominent multidimensional personality inventories, including the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent (MMPI-A), the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI), the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI), and the NEO-Personality Inventory (NEO-PI). The individual histories of these self-report inventories are discussed in Chapters 6 through 11.

A second significant event in the early history of formalized personality assessment was also contemporaneous with World War I, but unrelated to it. Hermann Rorschach, a Swiss psychiatrist working in a mental hospital, became interested in using reports of what patients saw in inkblots as indicators of their mental state and personal dispositions. Rorschach’s experimental testing of several hundred nonpatients and patients with various disorders resulted in the 1921 publication of *Psychodiagnostics* (Rorschach, 1921/1942). In this book, Rorschach presented guidelines for administering, scoring, and interpreting responses to a set of 10 inkblots that has subsequently become known as the Rorschach Inkblot Method (RIM). Chapter 11 elaborates Rorschach’s personal history and the subsequent embellishment of his method by Rorschach practitioners who followed in his wake.

Although much more complex than Woodworth’s checklist, Rorschach’s inkblots were similarly intended more as a tool for identifying disorder than for describing personality. Rorschach’s *Psychodiagnostics* is subtitled *A Diagnostic Test Based on Perception*, and he explicitly stated about his measure, “It is to be understood that the test is primarily an aid to clinical diagnosis” (Rorschach, 1921/1942, p. 121). Nevertheless, Rorschach did posit numerous relationships between certain inkblot findings and particular personality characteristics, and later generations of Rorschach clinicians and scholars developed his method into a rich source of information about how people are likely to perceive events, experience emotion, manage stress, and relate to other people (see Chapter 12).

Rorschach’s approach to assessing people differed markedly from the methods used by Woodworth and by other developers of self-report inventories for measuring personality. The self-report method asks people to describe themselves (e.g., “I am a very sociable person” answered as true or false) and then infers fairly directly from this response some personality characteristic or behavioral tendency (e.g., being an outgoing person who enjoys being around other people, or a reclusive person who is more comfortable when alone than when in the company of others). Rorschach instead asked people to report what inkblots might be and then, from the manner in which they performed this task, inferred certain behavioral dispositions (e.g., taking their manner of responding to the color in the blots as a clue to whether they were likely to be reserved or excitable in expressing emotions).

Based on Rorschach’s approach, other personality assessment measures were developed in which the critical data similarly comprised not what people said about themselves but how they performed on various tasks. In addition to the Rorschach Comprehensive System (RCS) discussed in Chapter 12, an alternate inkblot method, the Rorschach Performance Assessment System (R-PAS), is presented in Chapter 13. Along with these two inkblot methods, three similar techniques methods became commonly used: (a) asking people to make up stories about pictures, as exemplified by the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) discussed in Chapter 14; (b) having people draw figures and tell stories about what they have drawn, as is done with the Draw-A-Person, House-Tree-Person, and Kinetic Family Drawing tests described in Chapter 15; and (c) asking people to extend words or phrases into complete sentences, as illustrated by the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (RISB) and the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) presented in Chapter 16.

EMERGENCE OF PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY

Personality assessment received its next important impetus from the emergence in the 1930s of personality psychology as a discrete field of study. Prior to this time, as recounted by Barenbaum and Winter (2013; see also Winter & Barenbaum, 2008), numerous articles and books referring to “personality” had been published. However, just as the early methods of personality assessment stressed disorder and diagnosis rather than personality description, the early personality literature was more concerned with deviant traits and abnormal conditions than with the nature of people.

The psychoanalytic theory of personality formulated by Sigmund Freud (1916–1917/1963) and his followers during the first third of the 20th century was a significant exception (see Bornstein, Denckla, & Chung, 2013; Westen, Gabbard, & Ortigo, 2008). These psychoanalytic perspectives gained considerable popularity outside the academic community and greatly influenced psychological treatment methods, but they had little impact on what university faculty of the day believed or taught their students. When pre-1930 academic psychologists thought about personality processes, moreover, they tended to view them as subtopics within abnormal, social, or educational psychology, rather than as a separate field of study in their own right.

Personality psychology emerged from this restricted focus and subfield status with the contributions of two major figures in the history of psychology whose work emphasized the individual uniqueness of people. Gordon Allport (1937) and Henry Murray (1938) asserted in landmark books that people should be studied and understood not as an assemblage of unrelated traits, each to be examined separately, but instead with holistic attention to all the interactive facets of their unique life experiences that make people the distinctive individuals they are (see Hall, Lindzey, & Campbell, 1998, chaps. 6, 7). The Allport and Murray texts, together with a text by Stagner (1937), were the first three books devoted to broadly conceived personality theory, and the impact of these volumes was largely responsible for turning personality into a major field of psychology with its own literature, courses of study, and research programs.

Murray’s contribution to energizing personality psychology held special significance for personality assessment, by virtue of his developing the TAT as his favored measure for exploring the individual experiences and perspectives of people (see Chapter 14). Progress in personality psychology also created new opportunities for using personality assessment measures in research studies. With increasing awareness of the possible contribution of personality factors to variations in whatever phenomena they were studying, investigators after the 1930s became more likely to include measures of personality characteristics among their procedures.

WORLD WAR II AND THE EXPANSION OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Just as in World War I, the participation of the United States in World War II, beginning in December 1941, created an urgent need for psychological services. The Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which was the predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), asked Murray to help them select people who could function effectively in secret missions overseas. Murray brought his background in personality assessment to bear in creating and overseeing a selection process for this purpose. More than 5,000 candidates passed through Murray’s evaluation program, which was staffed by approximately 50 professional persons, mostly psychologists, and encompassed just under 100 different psychological tests and behavioral measures. Following declassification of their work after the war, the OSS staff published a detailed description of its methods and reviewed how the selection program had contributed to the war effort (Office of Strategic Services Assessment Staff, 1948; see also Handler, 2001).

On a much larger scale than the OSS selection program, psychologists were brought into the armed forces during World War II to assist in providing diagnostic and treatment services for military personnel. These services included administration of personality assessment instruments in widespread screening of inductees for possible mental or emotional disorder, much as had been planned but never fully implemented during World War I. In contrast, before World War II ended, “Hardly a male adult of military potentiality within the United States escaped psychological testing” (Reisman, 1974, p. 271).

As World War II progressed, mounting psychological casualties required assigning an increasing number of psychologists to military hospitals. Continuing need for veterans’ mental and other health services following the war led the Veterans Administration (VA) to create a vast hospital system in which large numbers of staff positions for psychologists became available. Faced with a shortage of psychologists to fill these positions, the VA established a

clinical psychology training program that provided paid supervised clerkships for graduate students. As an additional response to pressing needs for trained psychologists, the US Public Health Service developed a training grant program of financial support for clinical doctoral students and their university departments.

With a beckoning job market, paid training positions, and available financial aid for entering an interesting and challenging profession, a tidal wave of students sought admission to graduate training programs in clinical psychology in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Some universities had been awarding occasional doctorates in clinical psychology for many years, but few of them prior to 1946 had any prescribed educational program for becoming a doctoral-level clinical psychologist. In 1944, recognizing the need for a structured curriculum and a set of educational requirements for the professional preparation of clinicians, the American Psychological Association (APA) appointed David Shakow to chair a committee charged with addressing the matter. Shakow's committee and a later APA Committee on Training in Clinical Psychology that he also chaired formulated guidelines for a multiyear doctoral program of course work, clinical experience, and scholarly engagement. Commonly referred to as the Shakow Report and published in 1947, these guidelines have continued to shape graduate education requirements in clinical psychology since that time (American Psychological Association, 1947; Shakow, 1965).

Evolving as a profession with eager students, ample financial support, a structured curriculum, and a good job market, clinical psychology expanded rapidly in the post–World War II era, and personality assessment flourished along with it. Although clinical students also received training in psychotherapy, the identity of clinical psychology in those days was vested largely in psychological assessment. Assessment formed the core of training in clinical psychology, and most doctoral programs included substantial course requirements in psychological testing. Diagnostic consultation was what clinical psychologists did for the most part, and their services were sought primarily as consultants who alone among mental health professionals could bring data from standardized tests to bear in facilitating differential diagnosis and treatment planning. These and other aspects of the emergence of clinical psychology as a profession are elaborated by Reisman (1974) and Routh (1994, 2013).

TRENDS OVER TIME: SHRINKAGE AND GROWTH

The heyday of personality assessment as a central focus of clinical psychology extended from the post–World War II era to the late 1960s. The approximately 50 years since that time are usually regarded, with good reason, as an era of shrinkage in the field. Ironically, the post-1970 years have also been a time of considerable growth in both scientific and professional aspects of personality assessment.

Years of Shrinkage

During the 1950s, when education in clinical psychology emphasized personality assessment, and training programs usually included two or three required courses in testing, most graduate students were being trained in psychotherapy as well. In time, interest in conducting psychotherapy began to supplant diagnostic testing as a preferred career activity among clinical psychologists, and this development was hastened during the 1960s by the passage of certification and licensing laws that identified psychotherapy as a legitimate professional function of psychologists, independent of medical supervision (see Cautin, Freedheim, & DeLeon, 2013).

The 1960s was also a time when psychologists played leadership roles in advancing a wide variety of treatment modalities, including group and family therapy, behavioral methods, and community mental health approaches. With so much else for them to learn and do, clinical psychologists began to decrease the amount of time they devoted to mastering and practicing personality assessment. This shift in focus was spurred in part by the personal experience of many clinicians that newer roles offered more prestige, autonomy, and satisfaction than providing test results to be used by others in planning and providing treatment services.

Concurrently with these changes in the profession, the radical behavioral perspectives on psychology in the 1960s brought personality assessment under heavy scholarly attack. Leading social learning theorists like Mischel (1968/1996) and Peterson (1968) asserted in influential books that traditional personality assessment serves no useful purpose. There is no such thing as personality, according to these authors, and what people do is determined by the situations in which they find themselves, not by any abiding dispositions to behave in certain ways. Hence, they said,

clinicians should stop trying to infer personality characteristics from test responses and concentrate instead on constructing test situations that provide representative samples of whatever behaviors are to be predicted.

From a much different theoretical perspective, humanistic psychologists around this time began to question the morality of using personality assessment instruments to classify people. These early humanistic perspectives on assessment derived mainly from the writings of Maslow (1962) and Rogers (1961), who contended that people can be understood only by learning how they experience themselves, and not by any external observations of what they say and do. From this humanistic perspective, moreover, classifying people according to personality traits or behavioral characteristics they share with other people was not only a waste of time but also a dehumanizing procedure that strips people of their individual dignity and wrongfully presumes the right of one person to pass judgment on another.

Behaviorism and humanism challenged the pursuit of personality assessment in the 1960s not only directly but also indirectly by derogating the entire field of personality psychology. As described by Carlson (1975), the negative perspectives that emerged from these sources contributed to a dark age for personality psychology, such that personality as an area of inquiry “virtually disappeared during the 1960s,” largely due to “the burgeoning technology of behavior modification, and the celebrations of humanistic ideology” (p. 393).

This period of generally decreased interest in personality as an explanatory concept, combined with the expanded roles available to clinical psychologists and the behaviorist and humanistic labeling of personality assessment as irrelevant or improper, led many academic faculties to question the value of teaching assessment skills. As a consequence, the utility of personality assessment was often neglected in doctoral programs, along with the unique significance of assessment in the professional identity of clinical psychologists. Frequently typifying this neglect were reduced course offerings in personality assessment, minimal requirements for assessment competency, and limited opportunities or encouragement for students to become involved in assessment-related research (see Butcher, 2006; Childs & Eyde, 2002; Exner & Erdberg, 2002; Weiner, 2013).

As the 20th century drew to a close, personality assessment was attacked from a third direction—this time not for being behaviorally irrelevant or humanistically improper but for being unnecessary and financially uneconomical. This line of attack emanated mainly from health care managers who alleged that the cost of personality assessment outweighs its benefits in planning and implementing appropriate interventions. These allegations were used as a basis for limiting or disallowing financial reimbursement for personality assessments, an action that caused assessment psychologists considerable concern about losing income and having either to curtail their practice or find referral sources outside the health care industry (see Acklin, 1996; Stout, 1997).

Years of Growth

Fortunately for the field of personality assessment, the aforementioned challenges to its relevance, propriety, and utility did not prove fatal. The behavioral emphasis exclusively on environmental contingencies ran out of steam in time, as did disavowal of persistent personality characteristics and limiting explanations of behavior to situational factors. Thoughtful theorists commented on the shallowness of denying that people are disposed to think, feel, and act in certain ways (see Epstein, 1979; Millon, 1984), and research findings documented broad consistencies in individual differences and the longitudinal stability of many personality characteristics (see Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000).

In the face of these developments, many prominent proponents of radical situationism, including Mischel, eventually modified their position in favor of an interactive perspective that allowed for “dispositional constructs” to influence the likelihood that a particular action will be evoked by particular external circumstances (e.g., Mischel, 1973; see also Wright & Mischel, 1987). Mischel continued to allow a place for personality assessment in determining why people behave as they do, by acknowledging the stable individual differences among people and “the psychological invariance that distinctively characterizes an individual and that underlies the variations in the thoughts, feelings, and actions that occur across contexts and over time” (Mischel, 2004, p. 1).

This reversal in the earlier behaviorist view that traditional personality assessment serves no useful purpose was accompanied by a corresponding shift in the focus of behavioral assessment. Instead of being limited to situational observations of representative samples of behavior, recommended procedures for behavioral assessment began to include interviews and self-report inventories as well. Moreover, specialists in behavioral assessment turned some of their attention from environmental contingencies to aspects of cognitive style and the kinds of feelings, fantasies,

expectations, and beliefs that people bring with them into situations (e.g., Ciminero, Calhoun, & Adams, 1977; Kendall & Hollon, 1981).

As for humanistic concerns about neglecting individuality, this criticism of personality assessment gradually gave way to recognizing that there is nothing inherently prejudicial in conducting psychological evaluations. Accurate assessment of a person's assets and limitations does not inevitably prove damaging to that individual, nor is there any necessary obstacle to psychological examiners' paying just as much attention to how people differ from as well as resemble each other. To the contrary, great strides were made by humanistic psychologists in developing assessment procedures that enhance rather than restrict attention to the unique needs of individuals. Notable among these enhancements were new procedures for evaluating the implications of people's test responses and for molding the feedback of test findings into a therapeutic encounter for the person who has been examined (see Finn, 1996; Finn, Fischer, & Handler, 2012; Finn & Tonsager, 2002; Fischer, 1994).

Personality psychology as a field of study was rejuvenated along with personality assessment by the softening of the radical behaviorist position and the emergence of cognitive perspectives in psychology. No longer persuaded that psychological science should attend only to observable situational determinants of behavior and give no credence to inferred cross-situational characteristics of people, many researchers resumed studying individual consistencies in attitudes, motives, self-perceptions, and personality traits. As testimony to this renaissance in personality psychology, McAdams and Pals (2006) wrote, "Once an endangered scientific species, the concept of the personality *trait* now enjoys a privileged status among personality researchers and an increasingly prominent role in studies done in social, developmental, cultural, and clinical psychology" (p. 204).

With regard to the managed care allegations that personality assessment is neither useful nor economical, empirical evidence has indicated otherwise. An extensive literature documented the utility of properly conducted personality assessment in planning therapeutic interventions, monitoring their course, and enhancing their effectiveness. Moreover, follow-up findings showed that appropriate applications of personality assessments in health care are likely to have the long-term effect of decreasing costs rather than adding to them (Butcher, 1997; Finn & Kamphuis, 2006; Kubiszyn et al., 2000; Maruish, 2004; Weiner, 2004). In contemporary times, health management organizations routinely provide coverage for psychological assessments, although the rate of reimbursement is typically less than most psychologists consider adequate. At the same time, with the expansion of settings in which personality assessment is requested and valued, many assessment psychologists provide services that are fully recompensed by individual clients, agencies, or institutions (see Walfish, 2010).

In describing the reversal of fortunes for personality assessment that began during the early 1980s, some authors noted that the bloom had never gone entirely off the psychodiagnostic rose (Millon, 1984; Weiner, 1983). With the expanding roles available to clinical psychologists, and despite challenges to the relevance and propriety of personality assessment, many personality assessors continued to find professional autonomy, respect, and satisfaction in functioning as expert consultants whose specialized skills can help resolve diagnostic dilemmas and point the way to effective interventions. As these expert diagnostic consultants discovered, there are many circumstances in which determining the kind of health care intervention likely to prove beneficial is a more challenging and prestigious activity than providing the intervention.

Having survived earlier challenges, personality assessment practice and research began to grow in the 1980s. A smaller percentage of clinical psychologists than before were involved in personality assessment and were devoting less of their time to it (i.e., the shrinkage), but these percentage decreases were more than offset during the latter part of the 20th century by sharply increasing numbers of doctoral-level clinicians. Among these increased numbers of clinical psychologists, assessment remained the second most frequent service they provided in various settings, after psychotherapy, and survey respondents working in independent practice or in health care or government settings reported spending 15% to 23% of their time doing assessment (Phelps, Eisman, & Kohout, 1998). In a similar survey of 412 clinical psychologists randomly selected from the APA membership directory, 90% of the respondents reported involvement in personality assessment (Watkins, Campbell, Nieberding, & Hallmark, 1995).

In addition to growing along with the increasing numbers of clinical psychologists, personality assessment benefited from the previously noted post-1980 expansion of clinical psychology into diverse new settings that welcomed and appreciated psychological consultants. In health care, psychology's traditional focus on the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders broadened to encompass assessment of personality characteristics associated with the origins and course of physical illness, adjustment to chronic disability, tolerance for medical and surgical procedures, and

maintenance of a healthy lifestyle (see Andrasik, Goodie, & Peterson, 2015; Boyer & Paharia, 2007; Marks, 2013; Porcelli & McGrath, 2007). Psychologists also became increasingly active in forensic, educational, and organizational settings in which personality evaluations could contribute to administrative decisions.

In the forensic area, personality test indications that a criminal defendant is out of touch with reality can be relevant to the court's determination of the person's competence or sanity, and personality characteristics that suggest psychic injury or that have implications for parental effectiveness can prove relevant in personal injury and child custody litigations (see Archer & Wheeler, 2013; Craig, 2005; Heilbrun, Marczyk, DeMatteo, & Mack-Allen, 2007; Ogloff & Douglas, 2013). In educational settings, personality assessment can help cast light on the needs and concerns of students showing conduct or learning problems (Braden, 2013). In organizational settings, personnel decisions related to fitness for duty or employee selection and promotion often hinge on personality characteristics that can be measured with psychological tests (see Corey & Borum, 2013; Hough & Johnson, 2013; Klimoski & Wilkinson, 2013). Whenever personality characteristics are relevant to decisions facing courts, schools, employers, or agencies of any kind, experts in assessing personality can make a valuable and sometimes critical contribution. These practical applications of personality assessment are discussed further with respect to specific assessment instruments in Chapters 6 through 16 of this *Handbook*.

To summarize, a shrinkage in the prominence of personality assessment among the activities of clinical psychologists since the post-World War II era was accompanied by a substantial increase in the number of clinical psychologists. These increasing numbers, combined with expanded applications of personality assessment in diverse settings, generated consistent growth in the field beginning in the 1980s. As reflections of this growth, the Society for Personality Assessment (SPA) has grown and prospered, and a stable cadre of persons in both academic and practice positions identify themselves as assessment psychologists.

The growth and current vigor of assessment psychology is reflected as well in a burgeoning literature. In a review of published research articles on personality assessment measures over a 20-year period from 1974 to 1994, Butcher and Rouse (1996) found a higher annual rate of publication in the 1980s and 1990s than in the 1970s, and concluded, "Research in clinical personality assessment continues to be carried out at a high rate" (p. 103). In 1980, just one major journal was devoted to personality assessment—the *Journal of Personality Assessment (JPA)*—with occasional articles on assessment topics appearing in the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, the *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, and *Professional Psychology*. The *JPA* has since been joined by the *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* in 1984, *Psychological Assessment* in 1989, and *Assessment* in 1994; assessment-related articles also appear in *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, begun in 1994. Each of these journals has expanded in size over the past 20 years, and numerous articles from them, together with numerous texts and handbooks concerning personality assessment issues and instruments, are cited throughout the chapters of this *Handbook*.

Finally of note with respect to its status, the APA in 2010 approved recognition of personality assessment as a proficiency in professional psychology, and the SPA subsequently began developing formal procedures by which adequately trained and experienced psychologists can be credentialed as proficient in personality assessment.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In concluding this brief history of personality assessment, some comments are in order concerning two matters that are relevant to the following chapters: (a) the distinction between *idiographic* and *nomothetic* approaches to personality assessment, and (b) choosing apt terminology for categorizing personality assessment measures.

Idiographic and Nomothetic Approaches to Personality Assessment

Psychologists have approached personality assessment from two different perspectives, commonly called the *idiographic* and the *nomothetic*. Idiographic perspectives reflect Cattell's previously mentioned interest in individual differences, which laid the groundwork for the field of assessment psychology. As delineated in the recommendations of Allport and Murray for using individual case studies as a way of understanding personality, idiographic assessment emphasizes ways in which people differ from each other and is focused on identifying each person's unique constellation of personality characteristics.

In contrast, nomothetic personality assessment emphasizes ways in which people resemble each other and is focused on personality characteristics and dimensions that are common to most people. Nomothetic perspectives can also be traced back to early 20th-century research, when studies of traits and temperament were sufficiently numerous to warrant their being reviewed by Thurstone in 1916 and Allport in 1921. In short, then, nomothetic personality assessment is primarily process focused, whereas idiographic personality assessment is primarily person focused.

On the one hand, idiographic approaches to personality assessment have traditionally been more relevant to the purposes of practitioners than researchers. In clinical settings, practitioners conduct personality evaluations mainly to facilitate differential diagnosis and treatment planning for persons with psychological problems. To be effective and helpful in their work, clinical assessors must be closely attuned to the particular needs, capacities, and preferences of each person they examine. An examinee's resemblance to certain groups of people can provide useful information, as when a person being evaluated appears to be depressed. Nomothetically speaking, persons who are depressed are more likely than most people to commit suicide, which means that indications of depression are risk factors in evaluating suicide potential. Yet the vast majority of people who become depressed do not take their own lives, which means that, idiographically speaking, clinicians evaluating a depressed person's likelihood of becoming suicidal must take into account numerous aspects of his or her particular mental state and environmental circumstances, aside from indications of depression (see Nock, 2014; Yufit, 2005).

Nomothetic assessment, on the other hand, serves mainly the purposes of researchers rather than practitioners. Personality researchers assess people to learn about the normal and abnormal course of personality development, the types of genetic dispositions and life experiences that give rise to particular traits and coping styles, and what kinds of people tend to behave in certain ways. Such nomothetic research yields probabilistic statements that expand basic knowledge of personality processes. For nomothetic assessors, individual differences and deviations from the average detract from the generalizability of whatever relationships are suggested by the data and from the universality of whatever principles they appear to identify.

These differences between idiographic and nomothetic approaches to personality assessment notwithstanding, every individual's personality always consists of some features that differ from and other features that resemble the features of most people. Hence clinicians, despite their idiographic focus, must be sufficiently familiar with normative expectations to recognize whether and to what extent a person being examined is showing unique characteristics. Conversely, psychological processes cannot be fully understood without some grasp of which individuals, for what reasons, and under what circumstances are likely to deviate from normative expectation. Hence researchers despite their nomothetic focus need to go beyond viewing exceptions to the rule as error variance and seek explanations for why the behavior of certain people in certain circumstances differs substantially from normative expectations.

Terminology for Categorizing Personality Assessment Measures

Woodworth's Personal Data Sheet and the similar measures that it prompted became commonly known as "self-report inventories," which is an informative and accurate way of categorizing them. As noted, however, Rorschach's approach to assessment differed from Woodworth's and could not be considered a self-report method. Instead of relying on relatively direct inferences from what people reported about themselves, Rorschach relied on making relatively indirect inferences from what people reported inkblots might be. In an influential article published in 1939, Frank suggested that personality tests like the Rorschach, in which the stimuli and instructions are relatively unstructured, induce a person to "project upon that plastic field . . . his private world of personal meanings and feelings" (pp. 395, 402). Frank's suggestion resulted in Rorschach's test, together with picture-story, figure drawing, and sentence completion tests, becoming referred to as *projective* methods.

Over time, it became common practice to differentiate the so-called projective methods from self-report inventories by referring to the latter as *objective* methods. This distinction between objective and projective measures is misleading because it implies that, if one type of measure is objective (and hence scientific and dependable), the other type of measure must be subjective (and hence less scientific and dependable). In truth, self-report inventories are not entirely objective, nor are projective tests entirely subjective. Self-report items often involve subjectivity with respect to how persons being examined interpret them. Asked to answer yes or no to statements like "I get angry sometimes" and "I