Administering GFTA-2 and PPVT-4 with Q-interactive

In adapting existing tests to the Q-interactive format, the development team carefully evaluates whether an empirical study is needed to support the equivalency of the digital and paper formats of each new instrument. The decision is based on two factors: whether there is a plausible reason why the two formats might give different results, and if there is, whether the administration or scoring features that are of concern have previously been studied and found to not jeopardize equivalency. Numerous tests of varied types have been studied since Q-interactive equivalency research began in 2012 (see the Technical Reports on HelloQ.com).

The Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test are well suited to providing equivalent raw scores in Q-interactive and paper formats. With Q-interactive, the examinee’s tablet is used to display the stimulus page. This function is inherently low-risk because there is little difference between seeing a stimulus image on a screen and seeing it on a printed page, assuming that resolution is comparable in both formats. Other tests on Q-interactive that use the tablet to display a pictorial stimulus have been studied and found to be equivalent, including CELF-5 Linguistic Concepts and Following Directions; WISC-IV Picture Completion, Matrix Reasoning, and Block Design; and NEPSY-2 Picture Puzzles.

PPVT-4 has the additional Q-interactive function of capturing the examinee’s touch response, if the examinee chooses to touch rather than say the number of their answer. This functionality also is low-risk and has been shown to maintain equivalency in studies of other tests using this format (such as CELF-5 Linguistic Concepts and Following Directions, and WISC-IV Matrix Reasoning, Picture Concepts, and Figure Weights). Also, the examiner has control over the response that is actually recorded in the Q-interactive system, so if there is any doubt about the examinee’s intended response, the examiner can ask the examinee and enter the desired response—just as he or she would do in a paper administration.

Finally, when administering GFTA-2 with Q-interactive, the examiner records an incorrect sound (omission or substitution) by touching that part of the word displayed on the examiner tablet. This is a very simple interface that does not raise a concern about equivalency. The examiner also records the nature of the error by touching on the IPA keypad or, if necessary, writing with the stylus. This information is used for qualitative analysis but not for scoring.

Therefore, based on the factors described upon, it was determined that conducting an equivalency study for either GFTA-2 or PPVT-4 was not necessary.