

# Unit assignment

[Experience](#), [Human Nature](#)



Then, the paper will go into further detail about problems and, dilemmas, that accompanied the old traditional classification. As a consequence of this state of affairs, the psychological community all agreed upon one matter. In short, it's a fact of necessity, that the old terms, " projective" and " objective must be parted with. " Finally, substitute terms are needed to be designated as suitable the new placements, and, the community is all in agreement to simply refer to assessment tasks by their specific name. Unit 8 Assignment Historical use of the Terms Objective and Projective

More than 10 years ago, psychologists have been labeling personality tests by dividing them into two separate types either the objective method or the projective method. Many people have seen them in documents, in the same exact way. Those two words continue to be seen in textbooks, in all types of articles, in graduate programs, and, generally all over the place. Historically, many psychologists have become used to utilizing these terms without fully realizing that they do not begin to define, the psychological personality assessment tests that, they are purported to identify. The terms " objective" ND " projective" are not only scientifically inaccurate, but problematic from a professional standpoint as well" (Bernstein, 2007, p. 202). Because, science is trying to keep up with today's times they are trying to eliminate those two terms, objective and projective from the lexicon. " In the interests Of advancing the science of personality assessment, we believe it is time to end this historical practice and retire these terms from our formal lexicon and general discourse describing the methods of personality assessment" (Meyer & Kurt, 2006, p. 223). The old descriptions do not accurately describe a human rationality.

Historically, the methods that were used for describing personality assessment tests have always been divided into two separate parts. The one section has been objective and the other section has always been projective. These words are ambiguous because they have several possible meanings and they are difficult to comprehend, distinguish or classify a certain type personality in these tests. It's like painting a picture with two different colors and trying to classify it, with only two colors. The results of this show that the terms are so unclear, and they have multiple meanings.

Unfortunately, the terms objective and projective carry multiple, often unclear, meanings, including some connotations that are very misleading when applied to personality assessment instruments and methods" (Meyer & Kurt, 2006, p. 223). It is essential not to utilize these words as umbrella words because they do not cover everything they are purported to. " The old and familiar terminology of objective and projective personality tests has misleading connotations that will not serve the field well as we seek to have a more differentiated understanding of assessment methods" (Meyer & Kurt, 2006, p. 24). Some other reasonable alternatives need to be agreed upon and utilized. These unsuitable words cannot be continued because they are misleading in terminology. " The unsuitable and primitive nature of the term projective is revealed when trying to arrive. It is an umbrella label to characterize tasks as diverse as drawing one's family, telling stories in response to pictures, and stating what an ink blot looks like" (Meyer & Kurt, 2006, p. 224).

Problems with Traditional Classification There cannot continue to be a broad-based paintbrush that is applied and entities to label all psychometric personality assessment tests. " Tests that are not so categorized will tend to be viewed less positively, regardless of psychometric data, because they are, after all, not objective" (Meyer & Kurt, 2006, p. 223). Because of the past, there is too much negativity surrounding the term, projective. The terminology both, " objective" and " projective" are not necessarily what they seem. The term " objective" is a smokescreen for measures that can be just as subjective as anything else and the term " projective" is derived from untenable theoretical concepts that have anointed to create confusion in the field for a long time" (Chilliness, 2007, p. 197). Some other substantial problem is when the effects of a test cannot be duplicated by the same test more than one time. " If assessment psychologists did not derive overarching frameworks and terminologies for classifying psychological tests, those who use, study, or critique these tests would do it anyway.

In this respect, it is better that an organizing framework be made explicit (and the logic underlying the framework spelled out in detail) than that multiple contrasting framework and labels emerge in isolation among different segments of the psychological community" (Bernstein, 2007, p. 205). The volume of the dilemmas above have all been a culmination of psychologists and psychiatrists in this community and their opinions about the problems with traditional classification.