

UNIVERSITY SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND

AN INVESTIGATION OF SKEWNESS, SAMPLE SIZE, AND TEST
STANDARDISATION

A dissertation submitted by

Adina M. Piovesana B.Psych (Hons)

For the award of Doctor of Philosophy

2014

ABSTRACT

In psychological assessment, a raw score transformation is the first step in the clinical decision-making process. During this process, clinicians will transform a raw score typically using linear standardised scores and a normative sample with characteristics similar to their client. While the literature stresses the importance of using adequate normative data, little research has evaluated the effect skewness has on sample size. Currently the consensus is that a sample size of 50 is deemed adequate for normative data. However, an alarming number of studies that present normative data have much smaller sample sizes particularly when the data is stratified by age, gender, and/or education. Additionally, the use of linear transformations onto a normal distribution introduces further problems the more positively or negatively skewed the normative raw score distribution is. Skewed distributions are commonly encountered in neuropsychology and accordingly their deviation from a normal distribution should be considered during the clinical decision-making process. The primary goal of the current thesis was therefore to evaluate the psychometric issues related to the standardisation process. In particular to investigate the current understanding of sample sizes in neuropsychological samples, assess how this is influenced by different skewed distributions, and evaluate the potential errors involved in the decision-making process. Three studies were conducted. The first study explored the minimum sample size needed to produce stable measures of central tendency and variance for a range of distributions. Results indicated that the optimal sample size required was dependent on the level of skewness of the distribution and was not the often cited $N = 50$. For normally distributed data, a sample size of 70 is required in each cell in order to produce stable means and standard deviations. Negatively or positively skewed distributions required sample sizes that ranged from 30 to 80 in each cell. This study highlighted the inadequacy of currently available normative data and called for further normative research to be conducted. The second study evaluated the errors introduced when using three different linear transformations on different skewed distributions with adequate sample sizes. Seven tests with differing skewness coefficients were evaluated using the z score transformation, a t -test method developed by Crawford and Howell (1998), and a median z score transformation developed for this research. Results indicated that the traditional z score transformation produced the least errors of the three methods. However, for highly positively skewed distributions, the use of this transformation introduces considerable error in the clinical decision-making process. A regression equation was derived as a tool for clinicians to help correct adequate data for the effect of skewness. The final study evaluated whether using different linear transformations created substantial errors when using normative data that ranged in skewness and that had sample sizes less than those recommended from Study One. This study is particularly important given the common practice in neuropsychology for at least some measures to be derived from the clinical research literature utilising inadequate sample sizes. Results indicated that the error in judgement when using the preferred z score transformation is nearly doubled in positively skewed distributions. It was recommended that normative data with sample sizes less than 30 should not be used in clinical practice and guidelines were proposed for incorporating issues of sample size and skewness into their testing practices. It is hoped that clinicians will adopt the findings and subsequent recommendations of these studies in order to improve the current standards of clinical decision-making in neuropsychology.

CERTIFICATE OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses and conclusions reported in this dissertation are currently my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award except where otherwise acknowledged:

Signature of Candidate

Date

ENDORSEMENT

Signature of Supervisor

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude firstly has to go to Graeme. You have both supported and mentored me through my undergraduate degree, my registration as a psychologist, and through my never-ending Doctoral degree. You have been my inspiration and the reason why I am so passionate about neuropsychology and all things brain. Thank you for all your time and effort, and the marvellous conversations.

Hannie. You and I started on this journey nine years ago and you have been my rock, my light and everything in between. I would never have accomplished this feat without your support, the endless pots of herbal tea, and the study sessions on your floor with Bells. Thankyou to your loving parents, Gerry and Mary for the hospitality and for treating me like their own.

My parents and family. Thank you for allowing me to live at home rent-free during my PhD. Words can never explain how thankful I am of your support and love.

Lastly to Darren, you joined me on this journey towards the end but it was at the most critical stage. You pushed me when I wanted to give in and never stopped believing in me. Your endless love, praise and support will stay with me forever. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
CERTIFICATE OF DISSERTATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF FORMULAE.....	xv
<hr/>	
CHAPTER ONE	
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Neuropsychological Assessments.....	2
1.3 Summary of Thesis.....	3
<hr/>	
CHAPTER TWO	
<u>BASIC PSYCHOMETRIC CONCEPTS</u>	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Basic Psychometric Concepts.....	4
2.2.1 Percentile Rank.....	4
2.2.1.1 Different Percentile Definitions.....	6
2.2.2 Standardised Scores.....	13
2.2.3 The Normal Distribution.....	13
2.2.4 Linear Standardised Scores.....	15
2.2.5 Skewed Distributions.....	16
2.2.6 Normalised Standard Scores.....	18
2.2.6.1 Normalised Standard Scores for the Trail Making Test.....	20
2.3 Conclusions.....	24
<hr/>	
CHAPTER THREE	
<u>NORMATIVE DATA AND SAMPLE SIZES</u>	26
3.1 Normative Samples.....	26
3.1.2 Representativeness of the Normative Sample with the Individual.....	27
3.2 The Optimal Sample Size.....	28
3.2.1 Neuropsychology and Sample Size.....	29
3.2.2 Meta-norming.....	30
3.2.3 Co-norming in “Fixed” Batteries.....	31
3.3 Finding the Optimal N – Study One.....	31
3.3.1 Cross Validation.....	52
3.4 Summary.....	59
<hr/>	
CHAPTER FOUR	
<u>ASSESSING ABNORMALITY</u>	61
4.1 Levels of Abnormality.....	61
4.2 Abnormality at the Individual Test Level.....	61
4.2.1 Solutions for Determining Abnormality at the Individual Test Level.....	61
4.3 Abnormality Between Two Tests and Solutions.....	63
4.4 Summary.....	64
<hr/>	
CHAPTER FIVE	
<u>SKEWED DISTRIBUTION AND CLINICAL DECISION MAKING</u>	65
5.1 Interpretation Issues When Standardising on Skewed Distributions.....	65
5.2 Study Two – The Errors When Standardising On Skewed Distributions.....	65

5.2.1 Implications and Recommendation From Study Three.....	75
5.3 Study Three – Errors When Standardising on Skewed Distributions with Small Sample Sizes.....	77
5.4 Summary.....	90
<hr/>	
CHAPTER SIX	
GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	91
6.1 Overview.....	91
6.2 General Discussion and Conclusion of Results.....	91
6.2.1 Summary, Recommendations and Implications of Study One.....	91
6.2.2 Summary and Recommendations of Study Two.....	93
6.2.3 Summary and Recommendation of Study Three.....	93
6.3 General Recommendations.....	94
6.4 Limitations and Future Directions	99
6.5 Conclusion.....	99
<hr/>	
REFERENCES.....	100
APPENDIX A.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Applying Three Different Definitions of a Percentile Rank to the Raw Scores.....	5
Table 2.2. Qualitative Classifications used in Neuropsychology.....	6
Table 2.3. Descriptive Statistics on Four Normative Samples.....	7
Table 2.4. Percentile Ranks for Three Different Definitions for the Judgement of Line Orientation Test.....	9
Table 2.5. Percentile Ranks for Three Different Definitions for the Conceptual Level Analogy Test.....	10
Table 2.6. Percentile Ranks for Three Different Definitions for the National Adult Reading Test.....	11
Table 2.7. Percentile Ranks for Three Different Definitions for the Boston Naming Test.....	12
Table 2.8. Number of Cases in Each Stratified Category.....	20
Table 2.9. Descriptive statistics for mean completion time of TMT A and B for the Four groups.....	21
Table 2.10. Percentile Rank Ranges Corresponding to Standard Scores.....	22
Table 2.11. Mapped TMT A Raw Scores to Scaled Scores.....	22
Table 2.12. Mapped TMT B Raw Scores to Standard Scores.....	23
Table 3.1. Sample Sizes and Databases for Seven Neuropsychological Tests.....	32
Table 3.2. Descriptive Statistics for the Seven Tests.....	34
Table 3.3. Tests of Normality for the Seven Tests.....	35
Table 3.4. Descriptive Statistics for TMT B as a Function of Sample Size	41
Table 3.5. Descriptive Statistics for TMT A as a Function of Sample Size.....	41
Table 3.6. Descriptive Statistics for COWAT as a Function of Sample Size	41
Table 3.7. Descriptive Statistics for WAIS-III Symbol Search as a Function of Sample Size.....	41
Table 3.8. Descriptive Statistics for WTAR as a Function of Sample Size.....	41
Table 3.9. Descriptive Statistics for Rey 15 Item as a Function of Sample Size....	42
Table 3.10. Descriptive Statistics for HVOT as a Function of Sample Size.....	42
Table 3.11. 90% Confidence Intervals for Population Means and Standard Deviations.....	43
Table 3.12. Sample Sizes needed for Stable Means and Standard Deviations for Seven Tests.....	51
Table 3.13. Descriptive Statistics for WAIS-III Information and Digit Symbol – Symbol Copy.....	53
Table 3.14. Tests of Normality for WAIS-III Information and Digit Symbol – Symbol Copy.....	54
Table 3.15. Descriptive Statistics for WAIS-III Information and Digit Symbol – Symbol Copy as a Function of Sample Size.....	56
Table 3.16. 90% Confidence Intervals for Population Means and Standard Deviations.....	57
Table 5.1. Medians and Median Standard Deviations for Seven Neuropsychological Tests.....	66
Table 5.2. COWAT – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	67
Table 5.3. HVOT – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	68
Table 5.4. TMT A – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	69
Table 5.5. TMT B – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	70
Table 5.6. Rey 15 Item – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	71
Table 5.7. WAIS-III Symbol Search – Comparisons of Three Standardisation	

Methods.....	72
Table 5.8. WTAR – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods.....	73
Table 5.9. Summary of the Differences Between the Actual and Obtained Percentile Ranks.....	74
Table 5.10. Clinical Interpretation using 5 th Percentile Cut-off for z score Transformations.....	74
Table 5.11. Corrections Required to Reflect 5 th Percentile Cut-off as a Function of Skewness.....	76
Table 5.12. Descriptive Statistics of Seven Neuropsychological Tests with N = 20.....	77
Table 5.13. Corresponding Raw Scores for Different Percentiles in the Underlying Distribution (N = 20).....	78
Table 5.14. COWAT – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	80
Table 5.15. HVOT – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	81
Table 5.16. TMT A – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	82
Table 5.17. TMT B – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	83
Table 5.18. Rey 15 Item – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	84
Table 5.19. WAIS-III Digit Symbol – Copy - Comparisons of Three S Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	85
Table 5.20. WTAR – Comparisons of Three Standardisation Methods with N = 20.....	86
Table 5.21. Summary of Differences Between Obtained and Actual Percentiles..	87
Table 5.22. Clinical Interpretation using 5 th Percentile Cut-off for z score Transformations using Different Sample Sizes	87
Table 6.1. General Rules for z score Transformations as a Function of Skewness.....	93
Table 6.2. Optimal Sample Size and Estimated Judgement Errors for Differing Skewness Levels.....	94
Table 6.3. Skewness Statistics for 45 Neuropsychological Tests and Calculated z score Equivalents Based on the 5 th Percentile Cut-off Score – Presented in Order of Skewness.....	96
Table 6.4. Minimal Level of Consideration by a Clinician.....	98

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. The normal distribution.....	14
Figure 2.2. Positively skewed distribution.....	16
Figure 2.3. Negatively skewed distribution.....	17
Figure 2.4. Percentile Conversion Table.....	19
Figure 3.1. Histogram of TMT B distribution.....	36
Figure 3.2. Histogram of TMT A distribution.....	37
Figure 3.3. Histogram of COWAT distribution.....	37
Figure 3.4. Histogram of WAIS-III Symbol Search distribution.....	38
Figure 3.5. Histogram of WTAR distribution.....	38
Figure 3.6. Histogram of Rey 15 Item Test distribution.....	39
Figure 3.7. Histogram of HVOT distribution.....	39
Figure 3.8. TMT B sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	44
Figure 3.9. TMT B sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals...	44
Figure 3.10. TMT A sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	45
Figure 3.11. TMT A sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals.....	45
Figure 3.12. COWAT sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	46
Figure 3.13. COWAT sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals.....	46
Figure 3.14. WAIS-III Symbol Search sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	47
Figure 3.15. WAIS-III Symbol Search sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals.....	47
Figure 3.16. WTAR sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	48
Figure 3.17. WTAR sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals.....	48
Figure 3.18. Rey 15 Item sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	49
Figure 3.19. Rey 15 Item sample standard deviations with 90% confidence Intervals.....	49
Figure 3.20. HVOT sample means with 90% confidence intervals.....	50
Figure 3.21. HVOT sample standard deviations with 90% confidence intervals..	50
Figure 3.22. Stable means and standard deviations as a function of skewness....	51
Figure 3.23. Histogram of WAIS-III Information distribution.....	54
Figure 3.24. Histogram of WAIS-III Digit Symbol – Symbol Copy distribution.....	55
Figure 3.25. WAIS-III Information sample means with 90% Confidence Intervals.....	57
Figure 3.26. WAIS-III Information sample standard deviations with 90% Confidence Intervals.....	58
Figure 3.27. WAIS-III Digit Symbol –Copy sample means with 90% Confidence Intervals.....	58
Figure 3.28. WAIS-III Digit Symbol –Copy sample standard deviations with 90 % Confidence Intervals.....	59
Figure 5.1. The difference between actual and obtained %ile as a function of Skewness.....	75
Figure 5.2. The difference between actual and obtained %ile as a function of skewness and sample size.....	89

LIST OF FORMULAE

Formula 1. Percentile Rank Definition A.....	5
Formula 2. Percentile Rank Definition B.....	5
Formula 3. Percentile Rank Definition C.....	5
Formula 4. Normal Distribution Theoretical Equation.....	13
Formula 5. z score Formula.....	15
Formula 6. T-score Formula.....	15
Formula 7. Linear Score Transformation Equation.....	15
Formula 8. Skewed Distribution Equation.....	16
Formula 9. Standard Error of Mean.....	43
Formula 10. 90% Confidence Interval of Mean.....	43
Formula 11. Optimal Sample Size Formula.....	51
Formula 12. <i>t</i> -test Approach Formula.....	62
Formula 13. Prediction Interval Method Formula.....	62
Formula 14. Payne and Jones (1957) Formula.....	63
Formula 15. Payne and Jones (1957) Formula – Standardised.....	63
Formula 16. Modified <i>t</i> -test Formula.....	63
Formula 17. Medium z score Transformation.....	66
Formula 18. Medium Standard Deviation.....	66
Formula 19. Obtained Percentile Corresponding to 5 th Percentile.....	76