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Purpose:
- Individually-administered test of academic achievement in areas of reading, math, written language, and oral language for ages 4-06 to 25 years. Two alternate-forms are available.

Provides:
- A Comprehensive Achievement Composite (CAC), as well as individual Composite performance estimates for Reading, Math, Written Language, and Oral Language. Each of the composites are based on performance on two individual subtests tapping basic skill and application. The oral language composite is comprised of a receptive and an expressive estimate. In addition, the KTEA-II provides six individual, diagnostic, reading tasks which are linked to early reading development (measuring phonological awareness and decoding, as well as various aspects of fluency). The test includes norm-group overlap (2,520 students) with Kaufman’s comprehensive cognitive measure (KABC-II), to provide more direct ability-achievement discrepancy analysis. The test also provides an optional system for doing “error-analysis,” which can be helpful in pinpointing specific remedial needs.

Standardization Issues:
- The test is co-normed with the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Second Edition (Comprehensive Form) at ages 4-06 to 18-11, and included 3,000 participants (3,000 in the age-norm sample, 2,400 in the grade-norm sample), matched to March of 2001 US Census Bureau statistics for gender, geographic region, educational level of examinee’s mother, ethnicity, and parental education within each ethnic group. 18-25 year old group was additionally controlled for the educational status of the examinee. Throughout, the sampling included proportional percentage of special education groups, ADHD, and Gifted students. The younger age/grade groups purposely included larger sample sizes to account for more precision in measuring the developmental nature of specific academic skill acquisition. No information appears to be provided about the inclusion of students who are limited English-proficient.
Reliability and Validity Issues:

- Technical characteristics of the test are quite good. Oral Language reliability tended to be lower than the other areas of the test (.78). Internal consistency estimates of reliability in the test yielded highest correlations with the composite scores for Reading and Math as well as for Spelling Nonsense-Word Decoding subtests (.93-.97). Alternate form (Forms A and B) reliability and test-retest reliability was somewhat lower but still acceptable. Interrater reliability estimates provided for the “more subjective” subtests (Written Expression, Oral Expression, Reading Comprehension, Listening Comprehension, and Associational Fluency) suggest scoring by different raters to be reliable. A variety of validity evidence is presented in the manual supporting the test, including correlation with measures of cognitive ability (generally .80), mean score differences for different disability categories, factor-analysis for subtests and composites, and correlations with other major achievement tests (original KTEA, WJ-III, WIAT-II, PIAT-R, and OWLS). Despite the KTEA-II’s different approach to measuring written language from those of the WIAT-II and WJ-III, mean correlations with the WIAT-II were .87 across grades, and yielded mean estimates of .84 (older students) and .92 (younger students) with the WJ-III.

Additional Points:

- No information appears to be provided about the inclusion of students who are limited English-proficient.

- The format of the Reading Comprehension and Written Expression subtests may seem somewhat more “classroom-like” in terms of typical demands than their WJ-III counterparts. The writing test includes responding to oral stimuli, pictures, incomplete sentences, editing pre-written passages, and a final essay. The Reading Comprehension includes reading passages of increasing length and complexity, and responding to literal and inferential questions about the text.

- Because of the subjectivity, the Oral Language subtests (Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression) may present somewhat lower reliability estimates, and the Oral Expression subtest seems to have a low ceiling for older students. Beyond getting general estimates in the area of oral language, a deeper clinical or diagnostic work-up may be better obtained by comprehensive evaluation by a Speech and Language clinician.

- The KTEA-II, like the WJ-III and the WIAT-II, includes measures which assess all seven areas of LD listed in the IDEA definition. The KTEA-II offers 7 subtests assessing early- and developing-reading skills, as opposed to the WJ-III’s four and the WIAT-II’s two.

- The optional Error Analysis can help to pinpoint specific areas of remediation.
• The test offers age- and grade-based (Fall and Spring) norms. Caution should be used if using grade-based norms, especially for the younger grades. For certain subtests, at grades K through 3, there are often dramatic differences between the standard scores based upon the Fall norms versus those obtained using the Spring norms. For example, on Letter & Word Recognition, a child in the first grade who is tested on January 31\textsuperscript{st} would obtain a standard score of 100 for earning 16 raw score points. That same child tested one day later, on February 1\textsuperscript{st}, would obtain a standard score of 89 for earning the same 16 raw score points (http://alpha.fdu.edu/psychology/kabc_comments.htm). For that reason (as well as the fact that in making ability-achievement comparisons, the ability scores are based on age-based norms), examiners should use age-based norms.