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Purpose:
• Individually-administered, norm-referenced measure of general- and discrete cognitive abilities for individuals ages 6 through 17-11 years.

Provides:
• 10 subtests combine in various configurations to yield 16 composite scores, including General Mental Ability Composite, Optimal Composite (set of 4 highest subtest scores for an individual), specific Domain Composites (Verbal, Nonverbal, Attention-Enhanced, Attention-Reduced, Motor-Enhanced, Motor-Reduced, Total), and various Theoretical Composites representing aspects of different contemporary cognitive theoretical models (Fluid Intelligence, Crystallized intelligence, Associative Level, Cognitive Level, Simultaneous Processing, Successive Processing, Verbal Scale, Performance Scale, and Total).

Standardization Issues:
• Norming included 1,350 individuals comprised of two cohorts separated in time by 7 years. The standardization (norm) sample’s demographics match US Census in terms of geographic area, gender, race, urban/rural residence, parental education and disability.

Reliability and Validity Issues:
• Average coefficients for internal-consistency, test-retest, and interrater-agreement reliabilities are reported by the authors and fall within acceptable. Content validity evidence is described in the manual for each test in the form of comparison to previous DTLA versions and to other aptitude/intelligence tests. The author presents factor-analytic results in support of the various Composites.

Additional Points:
• Other than the elimination of the Pictures Fragments and replacing black-and-white artwork with color stimuli, the test’s “structure” and content remains unsubstantially changed from the previous version.
• The real utility of the Optimal Composite in formal assessment is unclear and will consist of different subtests for different examinees and may lead to inflated estimates of “ability.” This composite should not be used for LD discrepancy-identification purposes.
• The fact that 2 of the Composites are comprised of identical subtests with 2 other Composites, that several of the Composites differ from others only by one subtest, and the lack of Composite intercorrelation data, call into question some of the actual interpretive distinctions.
• Concerns were presented with the techniques chosen in individual item analysis for technical quality and bias, and the manual's section addressing item analysis indicates that several of the subtests contain items which fall short of typically-accepted levels of quality.