



## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### What is the WISC®-V Integrated?

#### Q. Why should I use the WISC-V Integrated?

A. If you have a concern or question about a child's WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> performance, the WISC-V Integrated can be used to broaden your understanding of his or her cognitive abilities and processes and deepen your understanding of the child's problem-solving processes and his or her unique strengths and weaknesses.

#### Q. I already own the WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup>. Is the WISC-V Integrated just an upgrade to the WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup>?

A. No, the kit is an independent purchase. The WISC-V Integrated offers unique information in the form of subtests that allow examination of the child's cognitive processes and problem solving, and provides expanded construct coverage relative to the WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup>. The WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> is not reprinted in the WISC-V Integrated (unlike the WISC-IV Integrated kit configuration, which included the WISC-IV<sup>CDN</sup>).

#### Q. What is included with the WISC-V Integrated kit?

A. The WISC-V Integrated kit includes all of the materials you need to administer the 14 WISC-V Integrated subtests. You will also need the WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> Stimulus Book I for one of the WISC-V Integrated subtests.

#### Q. How do I use my WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> kit with my WISC-V Integrated kit?

A. The WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> should be used to administer and score your subtests for the purpose of evaluating individual ability and describing the child's performance on the WISC-V subtests. However you will need to score your subtests using the WISC-V U.S. norms when using WISC-V subtests in conjunction with the Integrated subtests because the Integrated test only has U.S. norms. This is to facilitate the interpretation of score differences between the two tests using consistent normative groups. If you are choosing to hand-score, be careful to use U.S. norms for comparison and interpretation of score differences between subtests of the WISC-V and the WISC-V Integrated. If you are using Q-Global™ to score your subtests from the WISC-V Integrated, this will automatically be done for you. When your WISC-V<sup>CDN</sup> raw scores are imported into the WISC-V Integrated report, the subtests will be scored using U.S. norms.

## Test Framework and Composite Scores

### Q. Can I substitute a WISC–V Integrated subtest for a WISC–V subtest when calculating the FSIQ?

A. No. The primary purpose of the WISC–V Integrated is to identify the underlying cognitive processes that may affect a child’s performance on the WISC–V<sup>CDN</sup>. The WISC–V Integrated subtests contribute to the Multiple Choice Verbal Comprehension Index and the Visual Working Memory Index, which are ancillary index scores. Please reference Table 2.8 in the *WISC–V Administration and Scoring Manual* for allowable substitutions for deriving the WISC–V<sup>CDN</sup> FSIQ.

### Q. What does the Multiple Choice Verbal Comprehension Index measure?

A. The Multiple Choice Verbal Comprehension Index (MCVCI) is a composite derived using scores from the multiple choice adaptations of Similarities and Vocabulary, the subtests that are used to derive the WISC–V Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI). The MCVCI provides a measure of verbal comprehension that does not require any expressive responses, presenting a potentially more appropriate estimate of verbal comprehension ability for children with substantial expressive delays or with clinical conditions associated with expressive verbal difficulties, as well as for children who are deaf or hard of hearing.

### Q. What does the Visual Working Memory Index measure?

A. The Visual Working Memory Index (VWMI) is a composite derived using scores from the WISC–V Picture Span subtest and the WISC–V Integrated Spatial Span subtest. High VWMI scores indicate a well-developed visual working memory system with a strong ability to register, maintain, and manipulate visual and visual-spatial information. Low VWMI scores may indicate poor working memory for visual information or spatial locations. The comparison between the Auditory Working Memory Index and the VWMI enables the practitioner to determine if there is a modality-specific (i.e., auditory versus visual) deficit in working memory. Chapter 6 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual* describes a seven-step process for interpreting performance on Working Memory domain subtests.

### Q. What does the WISC–V Integrated add to the measurement of Fluid Reasoning?

A. The WISC–V Integrated subtests in the Fluid Reasoning domain are adaptations of two WISC–V Fluid Reasoning subtests (Figure Weights and Arithmetic), and include Figure Weights Process Approach (FWP), Arithmetic Process Approach (ARP), and Written Arithmetic (WA). Because these subtests are adaptations, they are designed to measure the same cognitive processes, but with reduced demands on processing speed, retrieval of information, working memory, and/or mental calculation ability. Subtest-level scaled scores can be derived for each subtest in the Fluid Reasoning domain (i.e., FWP, ARPa, ARPb, and WA). Critical value and base rate information for six pairwise difference comparisons in the Fluid Reasoning domain is provided in Table B.2 of the *WISC–V Integrated Administration and Scoring Manual*.

## Revision Goals and General Practice Issues

### Q. How has the test structure changed from the WISC–IV Integrated?

A. The WISC–V Integrated is organized into the five cognitive domains defined in WISC–V: Verbal Comprehension, Visual Spatial, Fluid Reasoning, Working Memory, and Processing Speed. The WISC–IV and WISC–IV Integrated subtests were organized into a four-index test framework: Verbal Comprehension Index, Perceptual Reasoning Index, Working Memory Index, and Processing Speed Index. The Perceptual Reasoning Index included subtest scores that measured visual spatial and fluid reasoning abilities. With the separation of the Perceptual Reasoning Index into the Visual Spatial and Fluid Reasoning index scores, greater interpretive clarity is possible.

Two new index scores, the Multiple Choice Verbal Comprehension Index (MCVCI) and the Visual Working Memory Index

(VWMI), are introduced in the WISC–V Integrated. Each index score is derived after administering and scoring two subtests. The MCVCI is derived from the Similarities Multiple Choice and the Vocabulary Multiple Choice scaled scores. The VWMI is derived from the WISC–V Picture Span scaled score and the WISC–V Integrated Spatial Span scaled score.

The MCVCI is useful in a number of situations. For example, if a child obtains a disproportionately low score on Vocabulary, in many situations it may be useful to know if the low performance reflects limited word knowledge or expressive language difficulties. A separate test of receptive word knowledge could be administered in this situation. However, if the receptive word knowledge test is based on different item content and the relations of the two tests are unknown, the comparison is of limited utility. With the WISC–V Integrated, the child’s performance on Vocabulary Multiple Choice and/or Picture Vocabulary Multiple Choice can be compared directly with his or her WISC–V Vocabulary subtest performance because of shared item content. For instance, if the child’s performance is higher on Picture Vocabulary Multiple Choice than Vocabulary, poor retrieval or expressive skills may be interfering with the ability to express verbal concept formation skills. Likewise, a Vocabulary Multiple Choice score that is higher than Vocabulary suggests that poor retrieval or expressive language difficulties may be interfering with the ability to express verbal concept formation and word knowledge. Such information may be especially important for children who present with school difficulties and are suspected of having language-based learning impairments.

The WISC–V Integrated VWMI facilitates expanded interpretation of working memory ability when used together with WISC–V measures of working memory. Both auditory and visual working memory subtests are included on the WISC–V Integrated because they provide somewhat different information, potentially expanding the construct coverage. The new auditory working memory subtest, Sentence Recall, is a complex span task that provides additional insight into working memory functioning as cognitive processing demands increase, complementing the WISC–V auditory working memory subtests. The visual working memory subtest, Spatial Span, is a visual-spatial measure that can be interpreted with Picture Span, a WISC–V visual working memory subtest. Together, Picture Span and Spatial Span provide increased construct coverage because they tap both visual and visual-spatial aspects of working memory. The VWMI can be contrasted with the WISC–V Working Memory Index and the WISC–V Auditory Working Memory Index, providing a more complete assessment of domain-specific working memory functioning. Taken together with the WISC–V Working Memory subtests, these diverse measures of working memory can assist with accommodation recommendations for children with working memory deficits in the auditory and/or visual realms.

#### Q. What theory or models influenced the development of the WISC–V Integrated?

A: The process approach to test performance interpretation was the primary model that influenced the development of the WISC–V Integrated. A primary assumption of the process-oriented approach to assessment is that cognitive tests are multi-factorial and that any one, or combination of, factor(s) may contribute to an individual’s performance on a task. For example, one child may struggle with a measure of expressive vocabulary because he or she lacks semantic knowledge, whereas another child may encounter problems on the same measure because he or she is unable to express or describe semantic knowledge. These two children may achieve a similar low score, but the underlying reasons for their performances are different. A process-oriented evaluation of these low scores attempts to identify the cognitive subprocesses contributing to the score (e.g., lack of word knowledge, difficulty with memory retrieval, and/or problems with verbal expression). To identify the cognitive subprocesses, tasks that break down the processes involved in a subtest may be utilized to help identify the specific weaknesses. For example, the vocabulary words may be presented in a format that reduces reliance on memory retrieval and need for verbal expression (e.g., multiple-choice or pictorial format).

In addition, neurodevelopmental research, contemporary working memory models and research, and issues of clinical utility were important factors in the development of the WISC–V Integrated.

**Q. Is the WISC–V Integrated quicker to administer than the WISC–IV Integrated?**

A. During WISC–V Integrated development, substantial efforts were made to achieve the shortest testing time possible, yet offer greater construct coverage. In addition to shortening subtest instructions, the number of administered items is held to a minimum by reducing the overall number of items and modifying discontinue rules. The discontinue rules for all retained subtests were substantially reduced. For example, the discontinue rule for Similarities Multiple Choice, which was 5 consecutive scores of 0 on the WISC–IV Integrated, is reduced to 3 consecutive scores of 0 on the WISC–V Integrated. For retained tasks, the overall number of items was reduced relative to the WISC–IV Integrated, and administration time was reduced an average of one minute per subtest. The greatest time savings is on Arithmetic Process Approach, which most examinees complete in approximately six less minutes on the WISC–V Integrated, relative to the WISC–IV Integrated version of the subtest. This dramatic reduction in administration time is possible because only the items that are not awarded full credit on Arithmetic are readministered. On the WISC–IV Integrated, all Arithmetic items were readministered.

**Q. Is there information in the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual* about the proportions of children with various clinical conditions that were included in the normative sample? Are norms available that do not include children from these special groups?**

A. As shown in Table 3.4 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual*, representative proportions of children from the special group studies were included in the normative sample. In addition to children with various clinical conditions, children with intellectual giftedness also were included to represent children with extremely high scores. The proportions of children from special group studies are low and reflect their presence in the U.S. population. The same principle applies in the Canadian population, which has similarly low proportions of children from special groups in the general Canadian population (see page 25 of the *WISC–V Canadian Manual* for more details). For instance, 5% of children in the U.S. are diagnosed with ADHD and 4.7% of children in the normative sample were diagnosed with ADHD. It is unlikely that the inclusion of very small proportions of children with disabilities in the normative sample will result in more children scoring within the normal range such that separate norms excluding children from special groups would be necessary.

**Q. How long do professionals have to transition from using the WISC–IV Integrated to using the WISC–V Integrated?**

A. Publications such as the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* provide guidance about the use of obsolete tests. Most practitioners make the move to the new edition within 8–12 months of the release. Consider your own practice situation and how critical the evaluations you conduct are when making the decision. For example, in cases where the older edition is used and an independent educational evaluation is requested, a school system or clinician may be at a greater risk of having results called into question.

**Q. Does the WISC–V Integrated support use of a pattern of strengths and weaknesses approach to learning disability evaluation? What are the scoring requirements?**

A. Yes. The WISC–V Integrated index scores (i.e., the Multiple Choice Verbal Comprehension Index and the Visual Working Memory Index) may be used with the WIAT<sup>®</sup>–III and/or the KTEA<sup>™</sup>–3 to conduct these evaluations. Using the WISC–V U.S. standard scores in tandem with the WISC–V Integrated index scores provides a more comprehensive selection of standard scores for these purposes. The pattern of strengths and weaknesses (PSW) analysis is calculated using the Q-global<sup>™</sup> web-based scoring and reporting platform; tables for calculating PSW by hand are not included in either the *WISC–V Technical and Interpretive Manual* or the *WISC–V Canadian Manual*. The data are too complex to be provide in a paper format; the scoring must be used for this purpose. The Q-global scoring reports can be used to help evaluate a specific learning disability, using this approach. The scoring for the WISC–V Integrated on Q-global is planned for release in the fourth quarter of 2015.

In order to obtain the PSW analysis using Q-global, you must have index scores from the WISC–V Integrated (and WISC–V U.S. standard scores, if desired) as well as KTEA–3 and/or WIAT–III results. You must manually enter the WISC–V

Integrated index scores (and the WISC–V U.S. standard scores) when creating a KTEA–3 or a WIAT–III score report to conduct the PSW analysis. If you are using the WIAT–III, be sure you select the U.S. score report so that your WIAT–III scores are calculated using U.S. norms which is necessary to maintain a consistent normative reference group when deriving comparisons with the WISC–V Integrated. The KTEA–3 can only be scored with U.S. norms so this is the default already and you do not need to generate any additional reports. Refer to Chapter 6 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual* and the *WISC–V Technical and Interpretive Manual* for more information on calculating patterns of strengths and weaknesses for a learning disability evaluation.

**Q.** I have seen children get correct answers but just after the time limit has expired. These children had the correct answers but were just somewhat slower in responding. Are these children penalized due to their slow processing speed rather than their cognitive abilities on these higher-level cognitive reasoning tasks? For any of the subtests, did the WISC–V Integrated standardization research compare the accuracy of answers versus just their time-based raw scores?

**A.** In early research phases of the project, data were collected with extended time limits. Analyses indicated the children who responded correctly after the time limit were of lower ability than children who responded within the time limit. There was little benefit to extending the time, as few children could answer correctly after the time limit expired. Data were not collected with extended time limits at standardization because that would have provided more exposure to the items, which could result in some additional procedural learning or practice that is not standard. Process observations to test the limits can be done at the end of all testing and described qualitatively in the report.

Research shows that tasks such as Figure Weights and Arithmetic may be well within the capacity of a child with neurodevelopmental difficulties, if extra time is allotted. Figure Weights Process Approach and Arithmetic Process Approach provide the opportunity to observe the effects of time on responses. Both subtests offer extended time for responses to items scored 0 points and those beyond the discontinue points.

**Q.** I found a discrepancy between two scores that is rare, but I am unsure how to interpret it. Is there somewhere I can see specifics?

**A.** After identifying critical value and base rate information for comparisons in Table B.2 of the *WISC–V Integrated Administration and Scoring Manual*, you can find the interpretive hypotheses for every discrepancy that appears on the Record Form in Chapter 6 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual*.

**Q.** Is colour blindness a factor on the WISC–V Integrated?

**A.** Colour blindness occurs in approximately 10% of the general population and more commonly, in males. We have made every effort to ensure that items on Pearson tests, including those on the WISC–V Integrated, are free of bias against these individuals. Reviews for colour blindness involve a variety of procedures. Items are reviewed by experts in colour blindness, as well as individuals with colour blindness, during early stages of test development. Acetate overlays are utilized to give the test developers a visual representation of the stimuli as it appears to individuals with the various types of colour blindness. Items are copied in greyscale to check appearance to those with monochromatic colour blindness. In addition, items are subjected to a simulation of colour blindness to check item appearance with every type of colour blindness and to ensure that the intensity and saturation of colours are not overly similar and do not suggest different responses.

## Subtests

### Q. Is teaching allowed on the sample items to ensure that children understand the expectations of the subtests?

A. Yes, many of the subtests have demonstration, sample, and teaching items built in to ensure the child understands the task. These items were added in response to the needs of thousands of children who participated in the development of the scale. Children with special needs were included among these participants.

### Q. Is there a standard subtest administration order I must follow for the WISC–V Integrated?

A. There is not a standard subtest administration order for the WISC–V Integrated. Subtests are selected and administered based on a variety of clinical reasons. In some cases where a more comprehensive evaluation is required, you may decide to administer all of the subtests. However, in most cases, you will only administer those subtests that are best suited to provide additional information for clinical hypothesis testing. These decisions are dictated by knowledge of the child's functioning prior to testing, by referral questions, by observations of the child during testing, and by the child's performance on WISC–V subtests. However, if Coding Recall from the WISC–V Integrated is selected, it must be administered immediately following Coding from the WISC–V. Also, if you choose to administer Coding Recall, Figure Weights Process Approach, and/ or Arithmetic Process Approach, they should be administered in the same testing session as the WISC–V to ensure the WISC–V Integrated subtest scores are valid.

### Q. Why aren't the Yes/No responses scored in Sentence Recall?

A. The Yes/No responses are recorded so that a separate Sentence Recall Question Errors score (SRqe) can be calculated. An error score can be obtained by summing up the number of questions the child answers incorrectly during the task. The accuracy of these responses are not considered in the Sentence Recall score but can provide insight into the child's knowledge and their motivation and attention during the task. The SRqe score should be reported and interpreted if a child commits an unusually high number of errors (e.g., base rate <10%). The purpose of the Sentence Recall subtest is to increase the cognitive processing load for auditory working memory in comparison to WISC–V Digit Span and Letter–Number Sequencing. The Yes/No question is part of the cognitive processing load.

### Q. When and why should I administer Figure Weights Process Approach?

A. This new subtest measuring Fluid Reasoning is an adaptation of the WISC–V Figure Weights subtest in which the child is given additional time to respond. Within an extended time limit, the child is readministered Figure Weights items previously scored 0 points. Relative to Figure Weights, the extended time limit on Figure Weights Process Approach reduces the emphasis on speeded performance to permit investigation of the hypothesis that the child responded incorrectly due to time pressure. In other words, you can see if the child performs better on a key measure of fluid reasoning when more time is provided. This could have implications for interventions, homework, and instruction.

### Q. How might I interpret significantly different performance on Block Design (BD) vs. Block Design Multiple Choice (BDMC)?

A. Chapter 6 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual* explains how to interpret all of the key comparisons between subtests on the WISC–V Integrated and on the WISC–V.

The BD–BDMC difference comparison provides information on the potential influence of motor planning and execution demands on BD performance. A BDMC > BD scaled score difference may indicate that BD performance was limited by motor abilities or visual-motor integration rather than visual-spatial perception and discrimination. BD scaled scores may be higher than BDMC scaled scores for a number of reasons. Children with poor decision-making skills or difficulty with inhibition of selecting salient responses may be overwhelmed by the response options. In addition, the mental manipulation of visual-spatial information may be more difficult than physical manipulation or trial and error approaches to visual-spatial

problem solving. Additional support for this hypothesis may be present if WISC–V Visual Puzzles is also significantly lower than BD (the BD–Visual Puzzles pairwise difference comparison can be completed using the WISC–V and should be interpreted using WISC–V Canadian norms for this comparison). Careful observation of behaviour on both BD and BDMC will assist interpretation.

**Q. How do I use process observations?**

A. Table I.4 in the *WISC–V Integrated Administration and Scoring Manual* shows which process observations (e.g., frequency of stating, “Don’t Know”; subvocalization; self-correction) have base rates available for each subtest. If the child uses one or more of these processes much more frequently than most children, additional insight can be gained into how the child currently approaches challenging and novel tasks. For instance, subvocalization is defined as silent lip movement or perceptible self-talk. It may be used as a strategy to reduce the cognitive load of a task. Observable subvocalization may indicate a child is approaching the limits of processing capacity for a given task. Subvocalization may also indicate involvement of working memory mechanisms. The extent of the child’s success at utilizing subvocalization may provide insight into his or her problem-solving strategies and strengths. See Chapter 6 of the *WISC–V Integrated Technical and Interpretive Manual* for further explanation of how to use process observations