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Purpose:
- Individually-administered, norm-referenced measure of visual-perceptual ability for individuals ages 4-years through Adulthood. The test’s format purposefully eliminates the need for potentially-confounding motoric-responses.

Provides:
- The test yields a total score (Perceptual Quotient and Perceptual Age scores), based on performance in five categories of visual perception: Spatial Relationship, Visual Closure, Visual Discrimination, Visual Memory, and Figure Ground domains.

Standardization Issues:
- 2,005 individuals comprised the standardization sample, of which, 1,856 of these were used to calculate the test’s norms (the remaining individuals comprised the validity samples). Detailed information regarding how the sample participants were selected may be unclear. The sample represented individuals from 34 states and was matched (or statistically “weighted” when matching was unable to be performed) to 2000 US Census data based on age, race/ethnicity, geographic region, gender, residence, and disability-status.

Reliability and Validity Issues:
- Reliability estimates are provided for internal-consistency and for test-retest. Internal consistency estimates were divided into 4-10 years, and 11+ year old groupings. 4-10 year old data yielded a mean score of .80 comprising a reported range of .69-.87 (marginal). The internal reliability data for older individuals (11+ years) was more convincing and judged adequate (mean=.89; range=.86-.90). Short-term test-retest figures were based on a very small, sample (n=28 individuals) and did suggest an average of 8.44 points gained on the second administration for the younger (4-10 years) group, suggestive of “practice-effects.” The older group (11+ years) showed a smaller “practice-effect” of 3.87 points on average, but the sample for this group included predominantly college-educated, Caucasian individuals. The manual indicates examples of content-, criterion-, and construct validity. However, the need for further investigation into the test’s validity may be appropriate because of
concerns expressed including details regarding the specific content analysis, lack of comparable instruments to perform concurrent validation, and details pertaining to the targeted subgroups studied (LD, TBI, DD) in validation work.

Additional Points:
- Optional Response Time Index/norms are available (often useful in rehabilitation settings), however, interpretability of this optional measure may be compromised by the validity evidence provided on it.
- Internal-consistency reliability estimates for the younger groups (ages 4-10 years; r=.69-.87) were lower than for the older groups (ages 11+; r=.86-.90), suggesting the test may serve more appropriately only for screening-purposes for the younger students. Further, the younger groups showed considerably higher “practice-effects” (8.44-point increase upon retesting after a mean of 34 days) than the older group (3.87-point gain for same period of retesting).
- As a test of “Visual Perception,” one needs to be cognizant of the potential for “confounding-effects” of introducing cognitive-skills to the results—particularly on the tasks such as visual short-term memory and spatial orientation, which inherently go beyond “perceptual-ability” and begin to involve other cognitive factors.