
Abstract

We examine five criticisms of Tellegen et al. (in press) about our study demonstrating the redundant relationships of the RC scales with extant MMPI-2 scales. We discuss differences in univariate versus multivariate comparisons of the RC scales and our “proxy” scales using their data. We show that: 1) both the RC and extant “proxy” scales identified in our analyses account for most of the variance in the clinical scales; 2) the proxy scales are redundant with the RC scales; 3) the proxy scales matched the six RC scales in accounting for variance in the clinical scales exactly in three cases, differed by < .02 in two cases, and reached a maximum of .11 in one case; 4) the item overlap between RC1 and HEA is not at issue, but rather their correlation with Scale 1; and 5) the weak evidence for the construct validity of the RC scales using their selective reporting on the incremental validity of RC4 as illustrative.