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## Client Information

| Client name: | Sample Client |
| ---: | :--- |
| Client ID: | RAIT |
| Test date: | $06 / 23 / 2014$ |
| Date of birth: | $04 / 05 / 2004$ |
| Age: | 10 yrs 2 mo |
| Gender: | Male |
| Education: | $5^{\text {th }}$ grade |

This report is intended for use by qualified professionals only and is not to be shared with the examinee or any other unqualified persons.

| Name: | Sample Client |
| ---: | :--- |
| Gender: | Male |
| Ethnicity: | (not specified) |
| Grade/education: | $5^{\text {th }}$ grade |
| ID\#: | RAIT |
| Examiner: | Dr Anderson |


|  |  |  | Year |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Day |  |  |
| Date tested | 2014 | 06 | 23 |
| Date of birth | 2004 | 04 | 05 |
| Age | 10 | 02 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## RAIT Score Summary

|  |  | Subtest age-adjusted $T$ score |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subtest raw score | Crystallized <br> Intelligence Index (CII) | Fluid Intelligence Index (FII) | Total Intelligence Index (TII) | Quantitative <br> Intelligence Index (QlI) | Total Battery Intelligence Index (TBII) |
| General Knowledge (GK) | 11 | 52 |  | 52 |  | 52 |
| Nonverbal Analogies (NVA) | 27 |  | 53 | 53 |  | 53 |
| Sequences (SEQ) | 25 |  | 57 | 57 |  | 57 |
| Quantitative Knowledge (QK) | 14 |  |  |  | 50 | 50 |
| Quantitative Reasoning (QR) | 18 |  |  |  | 54 | 54 |
| Odd Word Out (OWO) | 11 | 43 |  | 43 |  | 43 |
| Word Opposites (WO) | 12 | 45 |  | 45 |  | 45 |
| Sum of | T scores | 140 | 110 | 250 | 104 | 354 |
| Index standa | ard score | 94 | 108 | 100 | 103 | 101 |
| Confidence inte | rval 90\% | 88-100 | 101-113 | 95-105 | 97-109 | 97-105 |
| Percen | ntile rank | 34.5 | 70.3 | 50.0 | 57.9 | 52.7 |



## Interpretive Caveats

The test scores, descriptions of performance, and other interpretive information provided in this computer report are predicated on the following assumptions. First, it is assumed that the various subtests were administered and scored correctly in adherence with the general and specific administration and scoring guidelines provided in chapter 2 of the RAIT Professional Manual (Reynolds, 2014). Second, it is assumed that the examinee was determined to be eligible for testing by the examiner according to the guidelines for testing eligibility provided in chapter 2 of the RAIT Professional Manual and the examiner was qualified appropriately to administer and score the RAIT.

This report is intended for use by individuals appropriately qualified and credentialed to interpret the RAIT under the laws and regulations of their local jurisdiction and meeting the guidelines for use of the RAIT as stated in the Professional Manual (see chapter 2 ).

## Overview of the Report

Sample Client took the RAIT. The RAIT is an individually administered measure of intellectual functioning normed for individuals between the ages of 10 and 75 years. The RAIT contains several individual tests of intellectual problem solving and reasoning ability that are combined to form a Crystalized Intelligence Index (CII), a Fluid Intelligence Index (FII), and a Quantitative Intelligence Index (QII). The subtests that compose the CII assess crystallized intelligence, or verbal reasoning ability, along with the ability to access and apply prior learning when solving language-related tasks. The FII is composed of subtests that assess fluid intelligence, or nonverbal reasoning and spatial ability. The QII contains subtests designed to assess quantitative reasoning and problem solving. A Total Battery Intelligence Index (TBII) can be calculated from the combined CII, FII, and QII indices. The TBII is recommended by the author as the most comprehensive and reliable assessment of overall intelligence. However, not all will agree that quantitative reasoning and problem solving should be included in the estimation of general intelligence. In such cases, the TII is the most appropriate estimate of general intelligence (g). The TII is obtained by combining the CII and the FII. The TII measures the two most important aspects of general intelligence according to recent theories and research findings: reasoning or fluid abilities and verbal or crystallized abilities. Each of the index scores is expressed as an age-corrected standard score that is scaled to a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 . These scores are approximately normally distributed and can be converted to a variety of other metrics if desired.

## Embedded Effort ${ }^{1}$

## TBII Effort

## TII Effort

## CII Effort

## FII Effort

## QII Effort

TBII includes items from all seven subtests: General Knowledge, Nonverbal Analogies, Sequences, Quantitative Knowledge, Quantitative Reasoning, Odd Word Out, and Word Opposites. The Embedded Effort Index (EEI) for the TBII was in the satisfactory range for test interpretation. This conclusion is advisory only and based on age-adjusted base rates of effort assessment in the standardization sample.

TII includes items from five subtests: General Knowledge, Nonverbal Analogies, Sequences, Odd Word Out, and Word Opposites. The EEI for the TII was in the satisfactory range for test interpretation. This conclusion is advisory only and based on age-adjusted base rates of effort assessment in the standardization sample.

CII includes items from three subtests: General Knowledge, Odd Word Out, and Word Opposites. The EEI for the CII was in the satisfactory range for test interpretation. This conclusion is advisory only and based on age-adjusted base rates of effort assessment in the standardization sample.

The FII includes items from two subtests: Nonverbal Analogies and Sequences. The EEI for the FII was in the satisfactory range for test interpretation. This conclusion is advisory only and based on age-adjusted base rates of effort assessment in the standardization sample.

QII includes items from two subtests: Quantitative Knowledge and Quantitative Reasoning. The EEI for the QII was in the satisfactory range for test interpretation. This conclusion is advisory only and based on age-adjusted base rates of effort assessment in the standardization sample.

[^0]
## Index Interpretations

## TBII Interpretation

## TII Interpretation

CII Interpretation

## FII Interpretation

On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a Total Battery Intelligence Index or TBII of 101. On the RAIT, this level of performance falls within the range of scores designated as average and exceeds the performance of $52.7 \%$ of individuals at Sample Client's age. The chances are $90 \%$ that Sample Client's true TBII falls within the range of scores from 97 to 105.

On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a Total Intelligence Index or TII of 100. On the RAIT, this level of performance falls within the range of scores designated as average and exceeds the performance of $50.0 \%$ of individuals at Sample Client's age. The chances are $90 \%$ that Sample Client's true TII falls within the range of scores from 95 to 105.

On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a Crystallized Intelligence Index or CII of 94 . On the RAIT, this level of performance falls within the range of scores designated as average and exceeds the performance of $34.5 \%$ of individuals at Sample Client's age. The chances are $90 \%$ that Sample Client's true CII falls within the range of scores from 88 to 100.

On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a Fluid Intelligence Index or FII of 108. On the RAIT, this level of performance falls within the range of scores designated as average and exceeds the performance of $70.3 \%$ of individuals at Sample Client's age. The chances are $90 \%$ that Sample Client's true FII falls within the range of scores from 101 to 113.

On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a Quantitative Intelligence Index or QII of 103. On the RAIT, this level of performance falls within the range of scores designated as average and exceeds the performance of $57.9 \%$ of individuals at Sample Client's age. The chances are $90 \%$ that Sample Client's true QII falls within the range of scores from 97 to 109.

## Discrepancy Interpretation

## CII-FII

Discrepancy Interpretation

TII-QII Discrepancy Interpretation

Although Sample Client's TII is a good estimate of his general intelligence, a statistically significant discrepancy exists between Sample Client's FII of 108 and CII of 94, demonstrating generally higher levels of nonverbal intelligence or spatial abilities. Although this discrepancy represents a real difference in Sample Client's abilities in these two general intellectual domains, the actual frequency of occurrence of a difference of this magnitude is relatively common, occurring in $20 \%$ of the general population. Therefore, this difference may or may not be indicative of the presence of a psychopathological condition, depending on the results of other clinical assessment information.

Sample Client's overall level of performance on the QII is consistent with his level of performance on the TII, indicating that his quantitative skills are developed in a manner consistent with his overall general intellectual ability.

When compared Sample Client's measured level of crystallized intelligence as reflected in Sample Client's CII, it can be seen that his QII significantly exceeds his CII. This result indicates a level of quantitative skill that is generally higher than Sample Client's verbal reasoning skills. Although the size of the observed difference is reliable and indicates a real difference in these two cognitive domains, a difference of this magnitude is relatively common, occurring in $>25 \%$ of the general population. Therefore, this difference may or may not be indicative of the presence of a psychopathological condition, depending on the results of other clinical assessment information.

FII-QII
Discrepancy Interpretation

Sample Client's overall level of performance on the QII is consistent with his level of performance on the FII, indicating that his quantitative skills are developed in a manner consistent with his fluid, or nonverbal, abilities.

CII-QII Discrepancy Interpretation

## RAIT Index Discrepancy Table

| Index Comparisons |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indexes | Standard <br> score | Standard <br> score | Difference | Statistical <br> significance | Base rate |
| CII - FII | 94 | 108 | 14 | 0.01 | $20 \%$ |
| CII - QII | 94 | 103 | 9 | 0.10 | $>25 \%$ |
| QII - FII | 103 | 108 | 5 | ns | $>25 \%$ |
| TII - QII | 100 | 103 | 3 | ns | $>25 \%$ |

## Subtest Interpretations

## Crystallized Subtests

## General Knowledge

Odd Word Out

Word Opposites

The General Knowledge subtest measures common cultural knowledge in combination with reasoning and classification skills by asking the examinee to classify persons of historical notoriety into discrete conceptual categories. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 52 on General Knowledge.

Odd Word Out measures verbal reasoning skills in combination with basic vocabulary demands by presenting words, all but one of which have a common conceptual link, and then asking the examinee to determine which word does not belong with the others presented. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 43 on Odd Word Out.

The Word Opposites subtest measures verbal reasoning skills in combination with basic vocabulary demands by asking the examinee to discern which word from a short list is most nearly the opposite in meaning to the target word. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 45 on Word Opposites.

## Fluid Subtests

Nonverbal Analogies

Sequences

Quantitative
Knowledge

Quantitative Reasoning

Nonverbal Analogies measures nonverbal reasoning and logic and tends to invoke deductive over inductive thought by asking the examinee to determine which picture or symbol best completes an incomplete pictorial analogy. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 53 on Nonverbal Analogies.

Sequences measures nonverbal reasoning, sequencing, and deductive skills by asking the examinee to ascertain which picture or symbol best completes a series of pictures or drawings. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 57 on Sequences.

## Quantitative Subtests

Quantitative Knowledge measures the ability to apply prior mathematical knowledge to computational and word problems. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 50 on Quantitative Knowledge.

Quantitative Reasoning measures the ability to reason using numerical stimuli when the arithmetic knowledge required to derive a solution is minimized. On testing with the RAIT, Sample Client earned a $T$ score of 54 on Quantitative Reasoning.

RAIT Item Response Table

| GK |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | B | 25. | - |
| 2. | B | 26. | - |
| 3. | F | 27. | - |
| 4. | B | 28. | - |
| 5. | E | 29. | - |
| 6. | B | 30. | - |
| 7. | E | 31. | - |
| 8. | A | 32. | - |
| 9. | A | 33. | - |
| 10. | F | 34. | - |
| 11. | C | 35. | - |
| 12. | B | 36. | - |
| 13. | E | 37. | - |
| 14. | E | 38. | - |
| 15. | - | 39. | - |
| 16. | A | 40. | - |
| 17. | - | 41. | - |
| 18. | - | 42. | - |
| 19. | - | 43. | - |
| 20. | A | 44. | - |
| 21. | - | 45. | - |
| 22. | - | 46. | - |
| 23. | - | 47. | - |
| 24. | - |  |  |


| NVA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | D | 27. | A |
| 2. | C | 28. | B |
| 3. | C | 29. | - |
| 4. | B | 30. | - |
| 5. | A | 31. | - |
| 6. | B | 32. | D |
| 7. | C | 33. | D |
| 8. | C | 34. | D |
| 9. | D | 35. | - |
| 10. | B | 36. | - |
| 11. | A | 37. | - |
| 12. | A | 38. | - |
| 13. | E | 39. | - |
| 14. | E | 40. | - |
| 15. | A | 41. | - |
| 16. | E | 42. | - |
| 17. | B | 43. | - |
| 18. | B | 44. | - |
| 19. | A | 45. | - |
| 20. | D | 46. | - |
| 21. | C | 47. | - |
| 22. | D | 48. | - |
| 23. | A | 49. | - |
| 24. | C | 50. | - |
| 25. | C | 51. | B |
| 26. | C | 52. | - |


| SEQ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | E | 23. | E |
| 2. | A | 24. | E |
| 3. | A | 25. | D |
| 4. | E | 26. | A |
| 5. | C | 27. | A |
| 6. | E | 28. | - |
| 7. | B | 29. | - |
| 8. | C | 30. | - |
| 9. | C | 31. | A |
| 10. | B | 32. | A |
| 11. | B | 33. | - |
| 12. | C | 34. | - |
| 13. | D | 35. | - |
| 14. | B | 36. | - |
| 15. | D | 37. | - |
| 16. | B | 38. | - |
| 17. | A | 39. | - |
| 18. | D | 40. | - |
| 19. | D | 41. | - |
| 20. | C | 42. | - |
| 21. | E | 43. | - |
| 22. | C |  |  |


| QK |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | C | 20. | D |
| 2. | B | 21. | D |
| 3. | D | 22. | - |
| 4. | D | 23. | - |
| 5. | D | 24. | - |
| 6. | C | 25. | - |
| 7. | C | 26. | - |
| 8. | B | 27. | - |
| 9. | B | 28. | - |
| 10. | D | 29. | - |
| 11. | C | 30. | - |
| 12. | C | 31. | - |
| 13. | B | 32. | - |
| 14. | E | 33. | - |
| 15. | A | 34. | - |
| 16. | E | 35. | - |
| 17. | E | 36. | - |
| 18. | - | 37. | - |
| 19. | - | 38. | - |
|  |  |  |  |

## RAIT Item Response Table

| QR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | C | 20. | - |
| 2. | C | 21. | - |
| 3. | C | 22. | - |
| 4. | C | 23. | A |
| 5. | D | 24. | B |
| 6. | C | 25. | A |
| 7. | B | 26. | - |
| 8. | E | 27. | - |
| 9. | D | 28. | - |
| 10. | C | 29. | - |
| 11. | C | 30. | - |
| 12. | D | 31. | - |
| 13. | C | 32. | - |
| 14. | D | 33. | - |
| 15. | A | 34. | - |
| 16. | B | 35. | - |
| 17. | C | 36. | - |
| 18. | A | 37. | - |
| 19. | A |  |  |


| OWO |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | B | 21. | - |
| 2. | B | 22. | - |
| 3. | B | 23. | - |
| 4. | B | 24. | - |
| 5. | A | 25. | - |
| 6. | C | 26. | - |
| 7. | B | 27. | - |
| 8. | B | 28. | - |
| 9. | C | 29. | - |
| 10. | A | 30. | - |
| 11. | C | 31. | - |
| 12. | - | 32. | - |
| 13. | - | 33. | - |
| 14. | E | 34. | - |
| 15. | E | 35. | - |
| 16. | E | 36. | - |
| 17. | - | 37. | - |
| 18. | - | 38. | - |
| 19. | - | 39. | - |
| 20. | - | 40. | - |


| WO |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Resp | Item | Resp |
| 1. | A | 21. | - |
| 2. | E | 22. | - |
| 3. | C | 23. | - |
| 4. | B | 24. | - |
| 5. | A | 25. | - |
| 6. | C | 26. | - |
| 7. | D | 27. | - |
| 8. | A | 28. | - |
| 9. | B | 29. | - |
| 10. | A | 30. | - |
| 11. | A | 31. | - |
| 12. | D | 32. | - |
| 13. | A | 33. | - |
| 14. | A | 34. | - |
| 15. | A | 35. | - |
| 16. | - | 36. | - |
| 17. | B | 37. | - |
| 18. | B | 38. | - |
| 19. | - | 39. | - |
| 20. | - | 40. | - |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Embedded Effort Index provides an empirical assessment of effort and supplements data derived from the examiner's observations. The EEI is derived from a Switching Index where each examinee receives a point each time he or she changes his or her response (e.g., selecting response option 1 on Item 5 and response option 2 on Item $6=1$ point, selecting response option 1 on Item 5 and response option 1 on Item 6 $=0$ points). Infrequent switching index scores paired with low scores on a RAIT index create the EEI index and offer one indication of less-than-adequate effort on the given RAIT Index.

