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. These scholars were divided into two sets of primary authors. Author pairs were developed to ensure that sets were balanced. Given that later contributions to the Special Series built on those completed earlier, the structure allowed authors to discuss and debate the evidence presented by other scholars. On the positive side, this format of sequential dialogue provides readers with a rich opportunity to learn directly from and consider the views of different scholars. On the negative side, this format has drawbacks. For example, it takes an extended period of time to complete the series. If articles are provisionally accepted and published consistently every 6-month period, as the Special Series was, the articles are published over 2-3 years after they are initially solicited. As the primary critics and advocates who had initiated the Special Series in Part 1, they had the opportunity to respond to criticisms of their meta-analysis. The charge was placed on the latter authors to debate, dispute, and question each other as well as to the articles by Hiller et al. (1999), Strieker and Gold (1999), Dawes (1999), Garb et al. (2001), and Weiner (2001). Their task was again to debate, dispute, and question the conclusions drawn in the Part 1 and Part 2 articles, to identify the Rorschach's unique strengths or limitations and identify the conditions when the test was likely or unlikely to serve useful clinical goals.

Thus, these articles were completed more than 2 years before they were provisionally accepted in late 1999 and early 2000, respectively. However, it has had a downside as well. It took much longer than anticipated to have the articles prepared, reviewed, and revised. In fact, the articles by Weiner (2001) and Garb et al. (2001) were fact, the articles by Weiner (2001) and Garb et al. (2001) were anticipated to have the articles prepared, reviewed, and revised. In this case, the Special Series had a 2-year hiatus between the publication of Parts 2 and 3. A 2-year gap between articles in a Special Series is unusual. The original plan was to have the series completed and published within the 2-year period between the initial and second Special Series. Nevertheless, the Special Series was completed in 5 parts. The total delay was attributable to other factors, such as the need to incorporate the most recent relevant literature. Nevertheless, the Special Series was completed in 5 parts. The total delay was attributable to other factors, such as the need to incorporate the most relevant literature. The last article in the Special Series was published in September 2001.

The Special Series was initiated as a structured means for evaluating the Rorschach's utility as a clinical instrument. As mentioned above, the first Special Section was published in 1999. It contained five articles for Part 1 of the Special Series. A brief review is given below (also, see Meyer, 1999). These six articles in this issue of Psychological Assessment
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The current Special Section on the Rorschach consists of five articles. The first two articles were written by authors known to have critical views of the Rorschach. The next two articles were commissioned as impartial meta-analyses by Viglione and Hilsenroth. The last article was written by the editor in chief, following the format established by the other authors.

Viglione's meta-analysis of the literature from 1977 to 1997 indicates that the Rorschach was valuable for a wide range of purposes, such as measuring personality traits and predicting behavior. However, Viglione also identified several limitations in the evidence base, particularly regarding the incremental validity of Rorschach scores.

Garb et al. provide a critical review of the Rorschach literature, focusing on the evidence for reliability, validity, and clinical utility. They argue that the Rorschach is not a reliable or valid test for assessing personality traits and that it should not be used for clinical diagnosis.

Hilli et al. provide a meta-analysis of the evidence for the Rorschach's incremental validity, finding that the test has two distinct strengths for predicting different types of criteria.

Viglione et al. present an impartial meta-analysis of the Rorschach literature, finding that the test has not been adequately studied and that more research is needed to determine its validity.

Garb et al. argue that the Rorschach is biased and should not be used for clinical diagnosis. They present evidence that the test is not reliable or valid and that it should not be used for diagnostic purposes.

In conclusion, the current Special Section on the Rorschach highlights the need for more research to determine the test's validity and reliability. The authors argue that the Rorschach is not a reliable or valid test for assessing personality traits and that it should not be used for clinical diagnosis.
considerations articulated by Hunsley and Bailey (1999) to include by-patient basis and expand the cost-benefit and clinical utility making assessment-based judgments on an idiographic, patient-

meta-analyses focused on specific predictors in relation to specific differences between the Rorschach as an instrument and the Comprehensive System as an approach for administration and scoring, its purported construct, that advocates often gloss over diffic-

Hunsley (1988) data set. Meyer and Archer believe the results supported Viglione (1999) presented to support substantial and large effect sizes. In addition, they believe there are conceptual and empirical limitations that support this attempt at construct validation.

Rorschach. They believe that many Rorschach scores do not have limits of measurement bias or construct validity. They doubt the evidence Viglione (1999) presented to support the Rorschach's strength in measuring personality traits and clinical judgment. In each section, they explore clinical utility.

criticism comes easier than craftsmanship. Yet scientific crafts-


reflections between the Rorschach as an instrument and the Com-

productive growth in our field.
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The Publications and Communications Board of the American Psychological Association announces the appointment of five new editors for 6-year terms beginning in 2003.

As of January 1, 2002, manuscripts should be directed as follows:
- For the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, submit manuscripts to Sheldon Zedeck, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-1650.
- For the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, submit manuscripts to Karen R. Harris, EdD, Department of Special Education, Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.
- For the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, submit manuscripts to Lizette Peterson, PhD, Department of Psychological Sciences, 210 McAlester Hall, University of Missouri—Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211.
- For the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, submit manuscripts to John F. Dovidio, PhD, Department of Psychology, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY 13346.
- For *Psychological Bulletin*, submit manuscripts to Harris M. Cooper, PhD, Department of Psychological Sciences, 210 McAlester Hall, University of Missouri—Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211.

Manuscript submission patterns make the precise date of completion of the 2002 volumes uncertain. Current editors, Kevin R. Murphy, PhD, Michael Pressley, PhD, Philip C. Kendall, PhD, Chester A. Insko, PhD, and Nancy Eisenberg, PhD, respectively, will receive and consider manuscripts through December 31, 2001. Should 2002 volumes be completed before that date, manuscripts will be redirected to the new editors for consideration in 2003 volumes.