According to Piedmont, et al. (2000), how are validity scales intended to work? That is, how are we supposed to use these measures? According to the evidence in these two articles, do validity scales live up to this expectation?

According to Piedmont, et al (2000), “…*validity scales* intended to assess the accuracy of self-reports”. For this article, I interpreted them as meaning how does it really get at what the participants meant. The authors were extremely focused on trying to reduce social desirability and other factors that would make the response on a scale not be accurately representing the true score. This includes factors such as social desirability and careless responding. This, is what the intentions of the validity scales, according to Piedmont, et al. (2000).

According to this article and the two studies within it, not really, these validity scales do *not* seem to live up to this expectation. At best, it seems like using a combination of techniques to assess these validity scales is a multi-method approach - But even then we can’t be 100% positive. Using a validity scale in combination with a interrater agreement may serve as a better method, but there is still some vagueness associated with that method. At best, there may be agreement between the raters and validity measures.