LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Test Variables in the Divergent Production Study ..... .58

Table 2. Intercorrelation of Divergent Production Tests ..... .60

Table 3. Oblique Factor Analysis of Divergent Production Tests: Schematic Summarization ..... .61

Table 4. Summary of Test Variables in the New Factors Study ..... .65

Table 5. Intercorrelation of Tests in the New Factors Study ..... .69

Table 6. Varimax Solution for New Factors: 6 Factors ..... .70

Table 7. Orthogonal Procrustes Factor Solution for New Factors: 11 Factors ..... .71

Scan to pdf

Ekstrom et al 1979. pdf

COGNITIVE FACTORS : THEIR IDENTIFICATION AND REPLICATION

RUTH B. EKSTROM, JOHN W. FRENCH, and HARRY H. HARMAN
Educational Testing Service

INTRODUCTION

This monograph summarizes a study designed to provide a reference basis for researchers who study measurable areas of human performance or attempt to conceptualize and develop a theory and structure of abilities. Specifically, this study was directed toward the identification of tests that can serve as markers for well established cognitive factors.

Following background material discussed in Chapter I, the monograph is composed of four parts: Chapter I, background and overview; Chapter 11, a review of analytic studies in the cognitive domain; Chapter III, a study of the development of "factor-referenced" or "marker" testa for factors related to divergent production; and Chapter IV, a study to develop "factor-referenced" or "marker" tests for several recently identified cognitive factors and to investigate the relationship of these newer factors to factors already established.

These studies culminated in the publication, in 1976, of tho *Kit of Factor-Refevewed Cognitive Tests.* The purpose of the *Kit* is to provide research workers with a means of identifying certain aptitude factors in factor-analytic studies.

The work reported in this monograph was supported by a contract from the Office of Naval Research. The Navy Personnel Training Laboratory in San Diego, California, provided assistance in the field oxperimentation.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

By the beginning of the 1950's, it was evident that factor analysis was becoming an increasingly popular tool for the study of human aptitudes. The number of empirical studies was so great that it was difficult to obtain a comprehensive picture of the field. Moreover, it was becoming increasingly difficult to compare factors from one study to another or to select, from among the many tests which had high loadings on similarly named factors, those which might best serve as factor markers.

In 1951, two events took place at Educational Testing Service which opened the way to an orderly solution to this growing confusion. These were the publication of the Psychometric Monograph, ***The Description of Aptitude and Achievement Tests in Terms of Rotated Factors*** (French, 1951), and the convening of the Conference on Factorial Studies of Aptitude ahd Personality Measures. These two events led to the publication of ***The Description of Personality Measurements in Terms of Rotated Factors*** (French, 1953) and, in 1954, of the first edition of the ***Kit of Selected Tests for Reference Aptitude and Achievement Factors.***

The 1954 Factor Kit provided three tests for each of fifteen factors: Aiming, Flexibility of Closure, Speed of Closure, Deduction, Induction, Ideational Fluency, Associative Memory, Mechanical Knowledge, Motor Speed, Number Facility, General Reasoning, Spatial Relations and Orientation, Speed of Symbol Discrimination, Visualization, and Word Fluency. It also provided six teats for the Verbal Knowledge factor. Many of these tests were copyrighted by their authors and could be used only with permission.

By the late 1950's, it became apparent that a revision of this Kit was needed. The major reason for this revision was the continued expansion of research on cognitive factors. New factors had been identified and the conceptualization of the nature of certain other factors had been modified. Additional reasons for this revision, however, were to provide tests which had a uniform format and two parallel parts and to make it possible for researchers to use the Kit tests without having to obtain the author's permission.

The second conference on Factorial Studies of Aptitude and Personality Tests was held in November 1958 with the support of the Office of Naval Research. This led to the identification

of twenty-four aptitude factors which were considered to be sufficiently established for inclusion in a revised Kit. These factors were: Flexibility of Closure, Speed of Closure, Associations1 Fluency, Ideational Fluency, Word Fluency, Induction, Length Estimation, Associative (Rote) Memory, Mechanical Knowledge, Memory Span, Number Facility, Originality, Perceptual Speed, General Reasoning, Semantic Redefinition, Syllogistic Reasoning, Spatial Orientation, Sensitivity to Problems, Spatial Scanning, Verbal Comprehension, Visualization, Figural Adaptive Flexibility, Expressional Fluency, and Semantic Spontaneous Flexibility.

The ***Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors*** was published in 1963 (French, Ekstrom, and Price). It included tests for each of the factors listed above. Most factors had three marker tests developed by Educational Testing Service with uniform format and with two parallel parts. However, for certain of tho factors identified first in Guilford's laboratory, Guilford's own tests were included or recommended. The ETS-developed tests were tried out to ensure that the items were homogeneous but no factor analysis of these tests was performed.

Thus, the 1963 Kit differed from its predecessor by including many tests which were newly adapted for the purposes of the Kit. As was indicated in the manual, "it was felt by the participants of the conference that, except for tests of some of the more esoteric factors, this could be done without running the risk of altering the factor composition of the tests." The manual goes on to say, "Of vital importance to researchers is the question of whether an adapted test should be used as a factor reference test prior to its own repeated use in factor analyses. For some simpler tests the adapted form's parallelism seems obvious. For other tests similarity of factor content seems highly likely but not obvious. Such tests need trial as reference tests in repeated factor studies, but there is justification in predicting factor content even before such trial. . . . If we find so little psychological meaning in a factor that it is impossible to develop parallel test forms for it, we probably should not consider the factor worth marking with reference tests." A subsequent study (Ekstrom, 1967) found coefficients of congruence ranging from .90 to .93 for tests of five factors in the 1954 Kit and tests of these Same factors in the 1963 Kit.

By 1970 it became apparent that it might be time to consider the preparation of yet another Kit. The work of Guilford and his students, which had led to the development of the "structure of intellect" model (1967), made it necessary to consider the status

of many newly identified factors as well as to review some re-conceptualizations of the cognitive processes underlying some well-established factors. At a conference in March 1971, the participants agreed that a third edition of the Kit should be developed and that ETS would, with the support of the Office of Naval Research, provide the tests to be included and conduct the necessary research and development work. It is this work which is the subject of this monograph.

The work was divided into four major phases: (1) a review of the analytical literature on cognitive factors, described in Chapter II, which identified the current status of the established factors included in the 1963 kit and also identified new factors which seemed sufficiently well established to be considered for the third revision of the Kit; (2) development of tests for several factors in the "divergent production" area and a factor analytic study of them, described in Chapter III; (3) development of tests for the newly identified factors and a factor analytic study of them and their relationship to several already established factors, described in Chapter IV; and (4) the revision of the tests which had been demonstrated by this research to be suitable to add to a Kit of reference tests.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF COGNITIVE: FACTORS

ABSTRACT

This chapter is based on a review of analytic studies in the cognitive domain published in the decade 1963-1973. The main purposes of the review were to consider the status of the factors included in the Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors and to consider what additional factors might be added to a revised Kit.

The first section of the review describes the current status of each of the twenty-four factors included in tho 1963 edition of the Kit. The need to reconceptualize many of the factors in light of research findings is discussed. Major recommendations include the removal of the length estimation and mechnnical knowledge factors from the revised Kit, the development of new marker tests for speed of; closure and for adaptive flexibility, the development of better scoring procedures for originality and spontaneous flexibility, and further study of the expressional fluency, semantic redefinition, and sensitivity to problems factors which have not been as clearly demonstrated as is desirable for inclusion in the Kit.

The second section of the chapter describes new factors which have appeared in the literature, Recommentlations are made to include factors of concept formation, figural fluency, integration, visual memory, and verbal closure in the new revision of the Factor Kit since each has been fairly clearly demonstrated in several studies.

Introduction

This chapter describes one aspect of a study intended to provide a reference basis for the identification of tests that can serve as markers for well-established factors. The results of such research should go a long way in providing a structure for the cognitive domain of human abilities and a beginning for a comparable structure for the temperament domain of personality. Such theoretical structures are founded on empirical evidence and are amenable to continued challenge and verification. Researchers would be expected to use the resulting Factor Kits by selecting a small number of tests as markers for testing conjectures about factors in their studies.

To help set general guidelines for procedures to be used in the study, a conference was convened which included twenty prominent persons in the area of factor analysis and human assessment. Three guidelines that emerged are as follows: (1) A factor will be considered as "established" and markers for it will be included in the Kit if it is possible to identify it in at least three analyses performed in at least two different laboratories. (2) At least three tests will be provided as markers for each established cognitive factor; at least four measures will be provided as markers for an

established noncognitive factor, two for each of the opposite poles. **(3)** Newly developed tests and other measures for both the cognitive and noncognitive domains will be field tested in order to determine some of their basic statistical properties and to check their factorial content.

This chapter, based on Ekstrom **(1973),** is aimed at the identification *of* "established" factors in the cognitive domain from a search of the literature. Such factors serve as the basis for the development of marker tests in the study. The literature search for the establishment of noncognitive factors is in **a** parallel report (French, **1973).** Psychomotor factors are not included. Analyses sestricted to second-order and often higher order factor analyses are generally omitted.

Earlier work (French, Ekstrom, & Price, **1963)** concluded that twenty-four cognitive factors had been sufficiently well established to be included in the Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors. This review will consider the status of these factors **as** well as considering what additional factors might be added to **a** revised Kit.

As in earlier studies, the criterion for deciding that **a** factor is "established" is that it is reported in at least three separate studies and that these studies be done by at least two different researchers or laboratories. Thus, no one researcher's factors are considered established unless they have been replicated by others.

The matching of factors across studies is dependent, not only upon the researcher's interpretation, but also upon the reviewer's analysis of the tests or tasks which **load** on these factors. The search here is for ,the psychological meaning of the factors, not **a** mere matching of semantic terms used to name the factors. It **has** been necessary to omit **a** number of studies from this review because either too few or too many factors were extracted, because of inadequate rotations, or because there were too few tests to allow adequate factor determination.

The number of factor analytic studies attempting to isolate new factors has diminished substantially since the period of the last review **(1952-1963). A** major source of research into new cognitive factors has been the laboratory of **J. P.** Guilford. Additionally, the Structure of Intellect model developed by Guilford appears to have been the stimulus for alternative models developed by other researchers (Cattell, Guttman, Royce, etc.) as well **as** extensive testing of the SI model. There has also been some reanalysis **of** Guilford's work (Harris, Eindhoven, etc.). The other research emphases during this period have included the confirmation of the already established factors in other cultures, the determination of the degree to which factors are affected by culture and environment, and the relationship of established factors to different kinds and stages of learning.

Status of Established Factors

This section reviews the literature pertaining to each of the twenty-four factors included in the **1963** Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors. This review covers the period **1963** through **1972.**

Flexibility of Closure

The **1963** Kit manual defined this factor **as** "the ability to keep one or more definite configurations in mind so as to make identification in spite of perceptual distraction." Since that time, there have been several studies which suggest that this definition be revised. It now appears that the subject usually keeps only a single configuration in mind at one time when making the perceptual search; moreover the nature of the perceptual distraction is always some other design in which the given configuration is embedded. Royce **(1973)** defines flexibility of closure as "ability to 'hold in mind' a particular visual percept (configuration) and find it embedded in distracting material." There is now some question as to whether or not Guilford's Convergent Production **of** Figural Transformations (NFT) is the same **as** flexibility of closure. The best markers for NFT according to Guilford and Hoepfner **(1971)** are the Penetration of Camouflage Test, where the subject **does** not know the configuration for which he is searching; Hidden Figures, **a** five-option embedded figures test similar to Cf-1; and Internally Consistent Figures, which requires subjects to transform a representation from two-dimensional to three-dimensional in order to detect inconsistencies. There is **a** great need for further research on the flexibility of closure €actor in order to increase our understanding of this ability. Wardell **(1973) has** suggested that flexibility of closure and figural adaptive flexibility may be the same.

The markers for flexibility of closure in the **1963** Kit were: **(1)** Hidden Figures, which requires the subject to decide which one **of** five figures is embedded in **a** more complex design, (2) Hidden Patterns, which requires the subject to decide whether or not a sample figure is embedded **in** a more complex design,

and (3) Copying, which requires the subject to copy a simple figure onto a matrix of dots.

The Hidden Figures Test has proven to be less clearly related to the two better established types of flexibility of closure testa, Hidden Patterns (Cf-2) and Copying Tests (Cf-8) than is desirable. (See, for example, Ekstrom, 1967 or Kropp and Stoker, Note 7.) It is hypothesized that this is because of the multiple-choice nature of the Hidden Figures Test which requires the subject to decide which one of five stimuli is embedded in a complex pattern. While this multiple-choice version has been shown to be useful in the selection of individuals for jobs such as military photo interpreter (Johnson, Note 6), it is planned to revise this test so that a single stimulus figure is searched for in each item.

Another major question for further research is the relationship of flexibility of closure to the cognitive style of field-independence or field articulation as described in the work of Witkin and others. As was mentioned above, Royce (1973) considers flexibility of closure one of six factors which combine into a second-order visualization factor which then combines with two other second-order factors, scanning and reflection-impulsivity, into the field articulation factor. Hettema (1968) has suggested that field-dependence may be a separate factor lying conceptually between flexibility of closure and speed of closure. Witkin et al (1971) have stated that "some of the well-known dimensions earlier identified in studies following a factor-analytic approach are very likely the same as, or at least very similar to the field-dependence-independence dimension — for example, the adaptive flexibility dimension of Guilford and his associates and the flexibility-of-closure dimension of Thurstone." Cattell (1971) calls this factor restructuring closure and thinks that it is an aptitude component of the personality trait,,critical practicality. Kropp and Stoker (Note 7) have found flexibility of closure to be a significant predictor of the cognitive processes described by Bloom (1956) as knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

Several researchers (Nasca, 1965; Kropp and Stoker, Note 7; Ekstrom, 1967; Adcock and Martin, 1971) have used the Hidden Figures and Hidden Patterns Tests and obtained factors interpreted as flexibility of closure. Frederiksen (1965) used all three marker tests to obtain this factor. El-Abd (1970) and Reed (1966) used the Hidden Patterns and Copying Test and found a flexibility of closure factor. Other studies which obtained flexibility of closure

factors are Carver et al (Note 2), Hettema (1968) and Messick and French (1975).

However, in at least two studies (Holmberg, 1967; Ohnmacht et al, 1970) the two closure factors, Cf and Cs, are combined.

Speed of Closure

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to unify an apparently disparate perceptual field into a single percept." Royce (1973) has defined it as "ability to 'take in' a perceptual field as a whole, to 'fill in' unseen portions with likely material and thus to coalesce somewhat disparate parts into a visual percept." Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) have raised two questions about the nature of this factor: (1) how much emphasis should be placed on acts of closure which require the subject to fill in gaps in objects in order to interpret them as unitary wholes, and (2) whether closure against distractions is a necessary part of this factor.

As was mentioned above in the discussion of flexibility of closure, there has been some evidence that these two factors tend to combine. As was suggested in the 1963 Kit manual, a major distinction between these factors may be whether or not the subject; knows the configuration for which he is searching. A second problem is to determine whether there is a significant difference between the process of disembedding and of location of a figure amid perceptual distractions.

Frederiksen (1966) has shown that speed of closure is positively identified with the ability to recognize ambiguous visual stimuli due to the inference effects which are required for early identification of out-of-focus pictures. Hoffman et al (1968) found a task requiring the identification of close-up pictures to load on speed of closure. Wardell (1973) suggests that speed of closure may be related to extensiveness of scanning.

Cattell (1971) considers that speed of closure is an aptitude component of the personality factor, restraint-timidity. Adcoclc and Martin (1971) have posited the existence of separate divergent and convergent forms of this factor. Both Adcock and Martin and Messick and French (1975) suggest that there may be both w-mantic and perceptual speed of closure factors.

Frederiksen (1965) used Gestalt Completion (Cs-1) and Concealed Words (Cs-2) and found a speed of closure factor. However, he questions the status of this factor "as a separate, unitary cognitive ability." He suggests that "tests for speed of closure

may potentially involve the same interference effects which are observed in experiments in perceptual recognition."

The **1963** Kit included Gestalt Completion and Concealed Words as the reference tests for this factor. The former requires the subject to name the object or action which is being portrayed in black blotches which form an incomplete representation, The latter requires the subject to identify **a** word which has been partly erased.

There was some hesitancy about the inclusion of Concealed Words as **a** marker €or this factor since there was some evidence that it might better represent the then inadequately researched verbal closure factor.

While fairly clear speed of closure factors involving both reference tests have been found by some (Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Ekstrom, 1967; El-Abd, 1970), evidence since the publication of the **1963** Kit has more often shown that Gestalt Completion and Concealed Words have failed to combine into **a** single speed of closure factor. Messick and French **(1975),** Haynes **(1970),** Adcock and Webberley **(1071)** and Adcock and Martin **(1971),** and Harris and Harris **(1971) all** found these two tests to load on separate factors. Gestalt Completion loaded with Word Patterns and Circle Reasoning Tests in Haynes' study onto **a** factor which he describes as "the ability to organize incomplete stimuli into meaningful categories." Messick and French **(1975)** found Gestalt Completion to combine with Guilford's Hidden Picture Test on a factor they interpret as "speed of perceptual closure.'' Harris and Harris found their Gestalt Completion Test combining with a Spatial Relations Test which also requires "visualization of missing portions of figures." The Harrises found Concealed Words to load with Omelet and Spelling Tests on **a** factor which they interpreted as word fluency. Haynes described the factor on which Concealed Words loaded **as** "the ability to group symbolic material into class structure." Adccck and Webberley identified the factor on which Concealed Words loaded as "Word Gestalt Completion."

It is obvious that these two tests are not reliable markers for the same factor. More work needs to be done to determine if there are separate speed of perceptual closure and speed of semantic closure factors and to see how these and other tests relate to the factors.

The work by Frederiksen and by Guilford has suggested that identification of objects photographed at very close range and/or out-of-focus might be new marker tasks for speed of perceptual

closure. Guilford has also used **a** speed of closure test called Hidden Print, which requires the subject to identify **a** letter hidden in **a** field **of** dots. **A** similar test was tried out for the **1963** Kit and was found wanting, perhaps (it now **seems)** because of the inadequacy of the other marker tests. A more detailed discussion of verbal closure will be found in the section on newly established factors.

Associational Fluency

The definition of this factor in the **1963** Kit was "the ability to produce words from **a** restricted area of meaning."

Pawlik **(1966)** has pointed out that this factor is not "simple fluency of word production" but requires "quality rather than fluency of word production." This would suggest that **a** task requiring the selection of the "best" synonym might load on an associational fluency factor: Royce **(1973)** defines associational fluency as "facility in producing English words having somewhat similar meanings." There appears to be no evidence to suggest that this factor is confined to the English language. It would be interesting to determine whether the ability to produce **an** appropriate word when translating a well-known foreign language would involve associational fluency.

The four fluency factors—associational fluency, expressional fluency, ideational fluency, and word Iluency—are, of course, closely related. Royce **(1973)** hypothesizes that they combine into one second-order factor.

The fluency factors are also closely related to flexibility and originality factors. There have been **a** number of discussions (such as Cropley, **1966; Fee, 1968;** Murphy, **1973; &** Ward, **1967)** of the role fluency, flexibility,'and originality play in various "creativity" tests, such as those of Torrance or Wallach and Kogan.

Cattell **(1971)** states that all of the fluency factors are related to such temperament factors' **as** exuberance.' He also points **out** the relationship between fluency and memory **factors,** since "ease of retrieval" plays **a** significant role in fluency.'

Taylor et al **(1967)** have found associational fluency related to ability'to perform such activities as instructing others, conducting conferences and interviews, and writing reports.

Factor-analytic studies of the word association process provide some further insight into the nature of associational fluency. **Nunnally** and Hodges **(1965)** found separate factors for associations of antonyms, synonyms, and "spatial relations" (objects frequently

seen together); additional hypothesized factors of active functions and passive functions were not found, however.

The tests recommended in 1963 as markers for associational fluency were: (1) Controlled Associations, which requires the subject to write as many synonyms as possible for each stimulus word; (2) Associational Fluency, which also requires producing as many synonyms as possible, and (3) Associations IV, which requires the production of a word associated with two given words but which has a different meaning. Guilford now feels that Associations IV is a better marker for the originality factor than for associational fluency.

Controlled Association and Associations IV have been used in three factor analytic studies (Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Reed, 1966; Ohnmacht et al, 1970). Only the last named study yielded a clear associational fluency factor. However, lack of enough markers to determine all the expected factors was a problem in each of these studies. In many cases the associational fluency tests tended to load with vocabulary.

Other studies (Bereiter, 1960; Christensen & Guilford, 1963; Guilford, Fulgosi, and Hoepfner, 1970; Hoepfner & Guilford, 1965) have used Controlled Association or similar tests and Simile Insertions, a test which requires the production of a variety of adjectives to complete descriptive phrases, to mark associational fluency. Bereiter did not obtain an associational fluency factor but found that, for his sample of girls, Controlled Associations loaded on a factor which included Object Naming, Form Completion, and Brick Uses and which he interpreted as a personality factor arising from "differences in looseness or rigor with which Ss interpret the given restrictions." The Guilford studies found a clear associational fluency factor. In two of the Guilford studies, a test called Inventive Opposites, which requires producing two antonyms for a given word, also occurred on this factor.

Taylor et al (1967) also obtained an associational fluency factor which included Suffixes and First and Last Letter Tests.

Getzels and Jackson's Word Association Test has also been used in factor analyses (Cave, 1970; Haag & David, 1969). Unfortunately, neither study included enough other tests of associational fluency to allow this factor to emerge.

Expressional Fluency

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to think rapidly of appropriate wording for ideas." It requires producing connected discourse in contrast to the production of isolated words required in associational fluency and word fluency. Expressional fluency differs from ideational fluency in requiring rephrasing of ideas already given instead of the production of new ideas.

Royce (1973) defines expressional fluency as "facility in finding an appropriate word or set of words to make a proper English expression." Pawlik describes expressional fluency as lhe ability to "supply; proper verbal expressions for ideas already stated or to find a suitable expression which would fit a given semantic frame of reference" and suggests that it is related to Cattell's temperament factor "Surgency vs. Desurgency." Pawlilc considers the Naming factor which has been found in studies by Carroll (1941) and by Guilford to be a sub-factor of expressional fluency. Taylor et al (1967), found expressional fluency to be related lo editing ability. Their Naming Facility factor appears to be a subfactor of expressional fluency.

Guilford and Hoepfner, (1971) state that the production of short sentences of about 4 words in length, with the initial letter of each word specified, is the optimal method of measuring expressional fluency. The Expressional Fluency Test (Fe-1) in the 1963 Kit meets these requirements exactly. The other two tests suggested as markers for this factor were Simile Interpretations (Fe-2), which require the subject to complete a sentence in as many ways as possible, and Word Arrangements, (Fe-3), which requires the subject to write as many sentences as possible, each containing four specified words. These tests suggest the need for some revision of the factor definition since none of the markers require an appropriate wording for a given idea.

All three of these tests were used in studies by Bereiler (1960), by Christensen and Guilford (1963), and by Mullins (1967). In the Bereiter study, Simile Interpretations failed to load as heavily as expected on a factor with the other two expressional fluency tests. Simile Insertions and Object Naming Tests loaded on the factor with Expressional Fluency and Word Arrangemen 1. In the Guilford study; a clear expressional fluency factor was obtained. Mullins also obtained a fairly clear expressional fluency factor, but Simile Interpretations had nearly as high a loading on another factor which included inductive and deductive reasoning teats.

Hoepfner and Guilford (1965) and Brown et al (1966) both found the factor with Expressional Fluency and Simile Interpretations, but the loadings were not completely clear. Taylor et al

(1967) found an expressional fluency factor marked chiefly by the Letter-Star Test.

Kropp and Stoker (Note **7)** and Reed **(1966)** used Simile Interpretations and Word Arrangements. Neilher obtained **a** clear expressional fluency factor, perhaps due to an insufficient number of marker tests for the factor.

In view of these studies, the expressional fluency factor appears to have little support. Certainly Simile Interpretations should not be used **as a** marker for this ability.

ideational Fluency

This factor was defined in the **1963** Kit as "the facility to call up ideas wherein quantity and not quality of idea is emphasized." However, the definition was focused on the semantic aspect of this factor. There is *a* major question as to whether or not there is **a** separate figural ideational fluency factor or if the two factors are essentially comparable except for the content of the input and/or response.

Royce **(1973)** defines ideational fluency **as** "ability to quickly produce ideas and exemplars of an idea about **a** stated condition or object." Pawlik **(1966)** describes ideational fluency as "the ability which provides for rapid production of ideas fitting a given specification." Taylor et al **(1967)** have suggested that individuals with very high or low ideational fluency may be less effective in transmitting information than those with middle range scores on this factor.

The tests included in the **1963** Kit as markers for ideational fluency were Topics (Fi-1), which requires the subject to write as many ideas as possible on **a** given subject, Theme (Fi-2), which asks the subject to write as much as possible about **a** topic, and Things Category (Fi-3), which asks the subject to list as many items as possible that are alike in some way. Cattell **(1971) also** suggests Topics **as** a marker test for this factor. Other ideational fluency tests which he recommends are Riddles, Plot Titles, and Uses. Guilford,,and Hoepfner **(1971)** found Consequences, Ideational Fluency,' Plot Titles, and Utility Test to be good markers for this factor. With both authors the scoring of these tests focuses on total production of responses, not on the number of unusual responses (probably an indication of originality) nor changes in response categories (an indicator of flexibility).

All three ideational fluency markers from the **1963** Kit were used by Kropp and Stoker (Note **7),** Locke **(1963),** and Reed

(1966). Only Locke obtained **a** clear ideational fluency factor. He found that Consequences, Categories, Pertinent Questions, and three sections from the AC Test of Creative Ability also loaded on this factor. Reed, however, found that the three ideational fluency tests did not combine on **a** single factor. Topics and Theme combined with Word Arrangement (Fe-3) and the Utility Test (scored for flexibility) while Thing Categories appeared on another factor also with the Utility Test. Kropp and Stoker (Note 7) used Topics and Things Category. The ideational fluency and expressional fluency factors combined at each grade level of the Kropp and Stoker study; the Apparatus Test (Sep-1) and Plot Titles **(0-1)** also loaded consistently on this factor.

In studies from Guilford's laboratory (Christensen & Guilford, **1963;** Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Brown, Guilford & Hoepfner, **1966;** Hendricks et **al, 1969;** and Guilford, Fulgosi, & Hoepfner, 1970), Thing Listing **(also** called Ideational Fluency), Brick Uses, Plot Titles, and Consequences were important markers for the ideational fluency factor. In the **1963** study the Brick Uses Test produced a doublet on which both its flexibility and Eluency score loaded. The **1969** study included idea production factors in the behavior areas as well as ideational fluency. In the **1970 study,** tests of Agent-Action Relations, Class-Member Relations, and Whole-Part Relations, load 'on ideational fluency as well as the **two** marker tests. However, the Ideational Fluency Test loaded as strongly on the associations1 fluency factor **as** on its own.

Taylor et al **(1967)** found ideational fluency factors using tests such as Plot Titles, Brick Uses, Topics, Similes, and Consequences. Messick and French **(1975)** used Thing Categories, Brick Uses, Unusual Uses, and Object Naming and obtained **a** clear ideational fluency factor. May and Metcalf **(1965)** used a number of "Uses" and "Improvement" type tests adapted from materials by Guilford and by Torrance. They found two ideational fluency factors, one specific *to* fluency scores on uses tests and one specific to improvement scores on both fluency and flexibility tests. Similar factors have been found by McKenna **(1968)** using **a** test similar to Theme and by Adcock and Martin **(1971)** and Adcock and Webberley **(1971)** using **a** test calling for verbally stated ideas about ambiguously shaped ink blots.

An ideational fluency factor has also been found in two studies with six-year-old children (McCartin & Meyers, **1966;** Orpet & Meycrs, **1966).** The Uses Test, the Monroe Language Classification Test, and an Action-Agent task loaded on this factor in both stu-

dies. The Monroe Test asks the child to name all the objects he can think of in a given category. The Action-Agent task asks the child to name as many examples as possible of agents which perform an action, such as sleeping, cutting, etc.

There appears to be a good deal of confusion still surrounding this factor. Because of the nature of the tasks used, it is often confused with flexibility. To some degree these must be considered correlated abilities since the more ideas the subject generates in his response the more opportunities occur for spontaneous flexibility. The confusion with other fluency factors has been explained by Guilford to be related to the degree of restrictiveness in the stimulus material. He suggests that the more restrictive the stimulus, the greater the loading on associational fluency instead of ideational fluency. Guilford also suggests that failure to specify an initial letter on word listing tasks could shift the factor loading toward ideational fluency and away from word fluency.

As was mentioned earlier in this discussion, there have been attempts to find one or more factors of figural fluency (Bereiter, **1960;** Gershon et al, **1963;** Guilford and Hoepfner, **1966).** There is limited information about the nature of a figural ideational fluency factor but the evidence strongly suggests such an ability or group of abilities. Tests such as Guilford's Sketches or Decorations, which require adding lines or elaborations to basic shapes or objects, may be markers for figural ideational fluency. This factor will be further discussed in the section on new factors.

Word Fluency

This was the first of the fluency factors to be identified. It was defined in the **1963** Kit as "facility in producing isolated words that contain one or more structural, essentially phonetic, restrictions, without reference to the meaning of the words." Royce **(1973)** defines it as "facility in producing words in accordance with structural restrictions but without regard to meaning.'' It is similarly described by Pawlik **(1966)** who states, "this factor accounts for the ability to rapidly produce words fulfilling specific symbolic or structural requirements."

Taylor et al **(1967)** found that word fluency was more predictive of communications skills than the other fluency factors.

The tests recommended in the **1963** Kit as markers for this factor were the Word Endings Test (Fw-1), which asks the subject to write as many words as possible ending with certain letters, the Word Beginnings Test **(Fw-2),** which asks the subject to write

as many words as possible beginning with certain letters, and the Word Beginnings and Endings (Fw-3), which imposes restriction regarding both the' beginning and ending of 'the words to be produced. Guilford and Hoepfner **(1971)** suggest that tests of word fluency should be limited to the specification of only one letter if contamination from verbal comprehension is to be avoided. They also suggest that shorter time limits for each item and more different items would offset any advantage obtained from a large vocabulary. When more than two letters are specified, the task approaches verbal closure rather than word fluency.

Two studies (Bereiter, **1960** and Dunham et al, **1969)** have used Word Fluency, a test which requires the subject to write as many words as possible, and Suffixes, a test similar to Word Endings, as markers for the word fluency factor. A clear factor was obtained by Dunham and by Bereiter for his sample of girls but not for his sample of boys. In the latter case, the two tests split with Word Fluency loading on a factor with associational and expressional fluency tests while Suffixes formed a separate specific factor. The Suffixes Test has also Been used in other studies (Christensen & Guilford, **1963;** El-Abd, **1970).** In both cases clear word fluency factors were found. In the Christensen and Guilford study, Word Listing and Rhymes Tests also loaded on this factor; in El-Abd's study, a First Letters Test similar to Word Beginnings also loaded on word fluency, Taylor et al **(1967)** obtained a factor which may be word fluency marked by First and Last Letters; Abstracting, and Letter-Star Tests.

Harris and Harris **(1971)** have interpreted as word fluency a factor including Spelling, Concealed Words, Disenvoweled Words, and Omelet Tests. This appears to be more nearly a verbal closure factor.

Induction

As was discussed in the **1963** Kit manual, this may well be a second-order factor with several sub-factors such as figure classification and concept formation. The definition of induction in the **1963** Kit was "associated abilities involved in the findings of general concepts that will fit sets of data, the forming and trying out of hypotheses."

Royce **(1973)** has defined induction as "ability in forming and testing hypotheses directed at finding a principle of relationship among elements and applying the principle to identifying an element fitting the relationship.:' He hypothesizes that induc-

tion, deduction, syllogistic reasoning, and spontaneous flexibility combine into a second-order reasoning factor. Wardell (1973) suggests that inductive reasoning is largely synthesizing, unifying, or constructing a largely unstructured array, while deduction involves analyzing, abstracting, or composing essential features from a largely structured array.

Pawlik (1966) is uncertain as to whether or not induction and reasoning are separate factors. This position seems difficult to justify since a number of studies have been reported in which both Induction and General Reasoning factors appear. Pawlik defines the induction factor as "reasoning from the specific to the general, in the sense of discovering a rule or principle in a given material and subsequently applying it correctly." Cattell (1971) also assumes that induction and general reasoning do not represent separate factors, although he thinks that induction could possibly be a figural reasoning factor. He points out the "relation-perception" lists in a classification task include: (1) looking for differences, (2) looking for similarities, and ($) comparing similarities and differences.

Guilford considers induction in the area of cognition in his schema "because of its discovering properties." He states that there are sixteen kinds of inductive ability represented in his structure of intellect model. Dye and Very (1968) suggest separate inductive reasoning and symbolic-inductive reasoning factors in addition to deductive reasoning, verbal reasoning, arithmetic reasoning, and general reasoning. In young children, higher error scores and faster response times on inductive reasoning tests have been found to be associated with impulsivity (Kagan et al, 1966).

The tests used in the 1963 Kit as markers for induction are Letter Sets (I-1), which requires the subject to find the rule which relates four groups of letters to each other and then mark a fifth group which does not fit the rule; Locations (I-2), which requires the subject to determine the rule for the location of a mark in each of four rows of dashes and spaces and then to choose the correct location for a mark in the fifth row; and Figure Classification (I-3), which presents the subject with two or three groups of figures each of which are alike according to some rule and then asks him to assign test figures to the correct group.

Several studies (Bunderson, 1967; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Manley, 1965; Mullins, 1967; Reed, 1966; and Singer & Roby, 1967) have utilized all three of these induction marker tests. Only the Bunderson study showed a clear induction factor. The induction

factor was found in the Kropp and Stoker subjects at grades 10, 11, and 12 but not at grade 9. In the other four studies, the results were less clear. The induction and syllogistic reasoning tests combined on a single factor in Reed's study; however, this factor was separate from a general reasoning factor. Both Manley and Singer and Roby found that the Letter Sets and Locations Tests loaded on the same factor while Figure Classification loaded on another factor, but Mullins found that Locations and Figure Classification loaded on the same factor, one that also included Syllogistic Reasoning, while Letter Sets had significant loadings on three different factors. Two other studies (Dunham & Bunderson, 1969; Lemke, Klausmeir, & Harris, 1967), which used only two of the marker tests, do not clearly distinguish induction from the other reasoning factors. Dunham and Bunderson found that Letter Sets and Locations combined into a single induction factor but that two tests developed in Guilford's laboratory, Logical Reasoning (Rs-2) and Ship Destination (R-3), also appeared on this factor. Lemke et al found that Letter Sets failed to load on a factor with Locations but appeared on a separate factor while Locations appeared on a factor which included Ship Destination (R-3), Necessary Arithmetic Operations (R-4), and Nonsense Syllogisms (Rs-1).

Induction factors have been found by several other researchers (Dye & Very, 1968; Dunham et al, 1969; Follman et al, 1969; Harris & Harris, 1971; and Very & Iacono, 1970) using other tests. The Harrises point out that their induction factor is limited to tests which do not employ semantic content. "Instead, when they are used, numbers and letters are used as symbols and words are used as forms rather than semantic units." Dye and Very (1968) have found a separate factor for symbolic reasoning as separate from other reasoning factors but this factor appeared only for male subjects. They comment that the induction factor becomes clearer with age and also is more differentiated in males than females. Both Dye and Very (1968) and Very and Iacono (1970) used tests from the Very Developmental Battery of Intellectual Abilities.

Dunham et al (1969), like several other studies by Guilford and his associates, found at least two distinct factors, cognition of figural classes, and cognition of symbolic classes, that appear to be related to induction. Tests of Figure Classification and Figure Class Inclusion were the major variables on the figural classes factor while Number Classification, Number Group Naming, and

Letter Classification Tests Jiad significant loadings on the symbolic classes factor. These authors discuss the possible relevance of these factors to concept learning tasks. The question of **a** separate concept attainment *or* concept formation factor will be discussed in a later section. The existence of two comparable common factors involving classification, in addition to an induction factor, in the Harris **(1971)** study supports the existence of multiple first-order factors in this domain.

It seems likely that the induction factor is relatively easy to break down into two or more separate factors. Redefinition needs to be done and particular attention focused on the non-semantic quality of the tests which seem to be the best markers for induction. Further research also needs to be done to clarify the nature of the induction sub-factors as well as to determine the relationships among these factors and other reasoning factors.

Length Estimation

This factor, which was included in the **1963** Kit, has been criticized because of its narrowness and failure to fit into most models of cognitive abilities. It is recommended that it be dropped from the next edition of the Kit.

Mechanical Knowledge

This is another relatively narrow factor and is the only factor in the **1963** Kit which is more nearly an achievement factor than an aptitude factor. For these reasons it is recommended that this factor be dropped from the Kit revision.

Associative Memory

This was one of two memory factors included in the **1963** Kit. Associative, or rote, memory was defined as "the ability to remember bits of unrelated material."

Royce **(1973)** defines this factor as "upon presentation of one part of previously associated but otherwise unrelated material, ability to recall another part." Pawlik **(1966)** points out that this factor may relate "to memory for non-meaningful material only" and, if so, that a corresponding factor for meaningful memory should exist.

On the other hand, Cattell **(1971)** states that meaningful memory is only **a** projection of intelligence into memorizing performance. "Our assumption is that rote memory represents **a** basic capacity to commit to memory and retain, which operates regardless of meaningfulness and complexity **of** material. Later researcli should probably separate the general effectiveness **of** committing to memory from the general retentivity, but at present they are probably confounded here." This factor is one of those basic to Cattell's Ability Dimension Analysis Chart.

Guilford and Hoepfner **(1971)** state that tests with other than paired associates formats, such as a numerical operations test and a digit-symbol test, appear on the same factor and suggest that this is because "implications rather than relations are probably emphasized" in **such** learning. It may simply be that the numerical content of these tasks is sufficient to make them load with tests which require the pairing of numbers with other material:

Lumsden **(1965)** obtained separate factors for unrelated rote memory and related rote memory.

The tests used in the 1963 Kit as markers for the Associative (Rote) Memory factor "were the Picture-Number Test **(Ma-1),** which requires the subject to learn pairs of pictures and numbers and then write the appropriate number when presented with the picture, the Object-Number Test (Ma-2), which pairs words and numbers in a similar manner, and the First and Last Names Test **(Ma-3),** which presents full names and later asks the subject to recall the first name when the last name is presented.

All three of these tests have been used together in several studies (Bunderson, **1967;** Duncanson, 1966; Mullins, **1967;** Traub, **1970).** In each case a clear associative memory factor was obtained although Duncanson found that First and Last Names also had some slight variance on memory span and on **a** different factor which was specific to some of his verbal memory tasks. The Duncanson study suggests that different memory strategies may be employed with verbal and non-verbal (numerical and figural) material. It is uncertain whether this verbal memory is the same as the meaningful memory factor which has been found by others. The fact that Duncanson paired nonsense syllables with real words may suggest that the verbal rather than meaningful element is important, or it may mean that there are different memory processes used for abstract and for concrete imagery.

Several other studies (Dunham & Bunderson, **1969;** Flores and **Evans,** 1972; Kropp & Stoker, Note **7;** Lemke et al, 1967; and Manley, **1965)** employed two **of** these three marker tests. Again, **each** study showed a clear associative memory factor. Van-

denberg (1967) found a ,memory factor marked by Word-Number Memory, Number-Number Memory, and Figure Recognition.

Tenopyr **(1966)** conducted an extensive study of symbolic memory abilities. Although she obtained all **six** of the structure of intellect symbolic memory factors hypothesized by Guilford, there was a need for redefinition of several of these factors. She suggests that paired-associates tasks define Guilford's memory for symbolic implications factor but disagrees with Guilford that numerical operations tests also belong on this factor. However, Hoepfner et al **(1970)** obtained **a** factor which included both **a** number-letter association test and **a** numerical operations test. Tenopyr also suggests that list-learning tasks define the memory for symbolic units factor and that tests involving meaningful relationships define memory for symbolic relations.

Adcock and Webberley **(1971)** also found a factor which seems to be associative memory. Holtz **(1971)** has **a** factor based on learning radio codes and on memory €or pitch; this may be an associative memory factor since it requires the association of symbols with other stimuli.

Considerably more work needs to be done to clarify the nature of this factor. However, the marker tests in the **1963** Kit should continue to be adequate.

Span Memory

This factor was defined in the **1963** Kit as "the ability to recall perfectly for immediate reproduction a series of items after only one presentation of the series." Royce describes it as the "capacity in number of distinct elements that can be maintained within the span of immediate awareness."

It has been suggested that span capacity and long term memory storage may be independent abilities (Jensen, **1964;** Adams, **1967;** Ryan & Whimbey, **1968;** Ellis, **1968).** However, it is difficult to define just what differences might exist between these two kinds of memory. Two kinds of processes have been distinguished in long term memory: **(1)** reproductive processes, which are concerned with retrieving stored facts, and (2) reconstructive processes, which involve the generation of material based on stored rules. Ryan and Whimbey attempted to determine whether the type of test used would explain the lack of correlation between the span and long-term memory systems. In earlier studies, these authors **had** noted, "without exception, the materials used as stimuli differed, the format of presentation differed, and the possibilities

of individual differences in strategy differed from one test to another." They concluded that there is n strong relation between the two systems and that material gets into long term memory via short term memory. A similar conclusion was reached by Ellis, who has described long term memory as selecting material by attention from the environment moving it to primary memory, which is perceptually dependent, where it must be acted upon through rehearsal strategies to prevent rapid loss. Other discussions of various memory systems may **be** found in Atkinson and Shiffrin **(1968),** Kumar **(1971), or** Norman **(1970).**

Cattell's Ability Dimension Analysis Chart, as discussed earlier, places considerable emphasis on the importance of memory. Three distinct processes related to memory are considered: **(1)** the amount of committing to memory (grnmming), (2) the amount of retentive activity involved, and **(3)** the amount of retrieval activity. Cattell suggests that research should find factors which separate **(1)** and (2). He considers span memory too narrow to accept as a separate factor. Guilford and Hocpfner **(1971)** have stated that memory span factors are fairly test specific. They also describe the need for research to determine if recognition and recall memory are separate factors. The tests which were used in the **1963** Kit as markers of the memory span factor were auditory number span, digitpan-visual, and letter span-auditory. All three of these tests were used by Lumsden **(1965)** and **by** Bunderson **(1967).** Both obtained a clear span memory factor. Bunderson also obtained **a** second factor involving memory span on tests **of** Binary Digit Span and Three Letter Span which he had hypothesized would measure **a** chunking memory factor. The chunking process is used to group material into bits which can effectively increase the capacity of immediate memory.

Other studies using some, but not all, of the Kit marker tests include Dunham and Bunderson **(1969),** Lemke et al **(1967),** Duncanson **(1966),** and Traub **(1970).** All except Duncanson obtained **a** clear span memory factor. In the Duncanson study, the two memory span tests loaded on a factor which also included vocabulary tests **as** well as significant loadings on most of the Stanford Achievement Test subtests and the Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Test.

A span memory factor **has** also been found by researchers using other tests (Arnold, **1967;** Games, **1962;** Orpet & Meyers, **1966;** Adcock & Webberley, **1971;** Tenopyr, **1966).** Adcock and Webberley concluded that "span memory is distinct from medium-term memory in the case of semantic material, but both load highly

on a common factor with figural material," though their data do not seem to demonstrate this clearly. The possibility of a separate memory factor for figural material will be discussed in the section on new factors.

Number Facility

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to manipulate numbers in arithmetical operations rapidly." Pawlik (1966) defines this factor as "facility in performing elementary arithmetical operations (typically under speeded conditions)" and points out that "the factor does *not* determine higher mathematical skills or complex mathematical reasoning." Royce (1973) defines number facility as "speed and accuracy in doing the basic operations of arithmetic" and thinks that this ability may combine with the perceptual speed factor to produce a second-order intellectual speed factor. Werdelin and Stjernberg (1971) have shown that the N factor is associated with easier visual perceptual tests.

As was pointed out earlier, Guilford thinks that numerical facility is a part of the memory factor, memory for symbolic implications. He bases his argument for this on two studies of the Wechsler scales (Davis, 1956; de Mille, 1962) where a numerical operations test loaded on a factor including the Digit-Symbol Test and upon two later studies (Hoepfner et al, 1979; Guilford et al, 1965) which showed a numerical operations test loading on the same factor as a number-letter association task.

In a study of simple, single-digit addition problems, Groen and Parkman (1972) discovered that two types of approaches are used. They conclude that adults usually use a memory look-up approach while children usually and adults occasionally use an incrementing counting process. This points out the need to determine the type of process or strategy a subject chooses to use in solving any test or problem. The possibility of more than one strategy being employed by subjects to solve even a simple addition problem indicates the folly of attempting to design tests without knowing the variety of approaches which may be used and also the problems resulting from analyzing the data as if the task necessitated a single approach.

Keats (1965) has suggested the existence of an automatic process factor that might include numerical facility as a sub-factor. Werdelin and Stjernberg (1971) also suggest that number facility is really an "automatization" factor. Flores and Evans (1972) found an automated learning factor that includes both numerical

facility and perceptual speed, as well as a separate numerical facility factor. The tests used as markers for the numerical facility factor in the 1963 Kit were addition, division, and a test with both subtraction and multiplication problems. All of these tests are highly speeded.

Several studies (Duncanson, 1966; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Manley, 1965; Mullins, 1967; Tenopyr, 1966; and Traub, 1970) have included both rote memory tests and number facility tests, allowing an opportunity to determine whether or not these factors are the same, as Guilford has suggested. In none of these six studies did the two groups of tests load on the same factor. This evidence clearly supports the existence of the number facility factor as separate from associative memory. However, the automated learning factor of Flores and Evans (1972) includes a moderate loading for an associative memory test as well as larger loadings for numerical facility and perceptual speed.

The question of numerical facility as a sub-factor of a larger automatic process or learning speed factor has not been adequately explored. Werdelin and Stjernberg (1971) suggest that automatization involves problems in which rules nre applied to a symbol. Such an explanation would clarify the appearance of digit-symbol tasks on the number facility factor. It is also possible that the automatization factor could be defined as speed of response to over-learned material. This is partially suggested by the tendency of the numerical facility factor to combine in some studies with measures of perceptual speed (Duncanson, 1966; Strowig & Alexakos, 1969; Mukherjee, 1962; Dye & Very, 1968; Pounders, 1970; Very & Iacono, 1970; Khan, 1970; and Flores & Evans, 1972). Numerical facility factors have also been found by other researchers (El-Abd, 1970; Flores & Evans, 1972; Harris & Harris, 1971; Nasca, 1966; Osborne &,Lindsey, 1967; and Vandenberg, 1967). It is possible that this factor should be more broadly conceptualized than merely numerical facility.

Originality

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to produce remotely associated, clever, or uncommon responses."

Royce (1973) defines originality as "facility in conceptualizing phenomena in ways that in our culture are judged to be unusual and clever." Pawlik (1966) states that the originality factor "loads tests in which the subject is to invent uncommon and clever responses." He calls attention to its relation to Cattell's personality

factor U.I.T. 25, Tense Inflexidia vs. Less Imaginative Realism and to Eysenck's Psychoticism factor.

Guilford and Hoepfner **(1971)** have described originality in terms of the uniqueness or uncommon response, remoteness of association, and cleverness of response. They describe this factor as being limited to semantic tasks and suggest Plot Titles (clever), Quick Responses, Figure Concepts (uncommon), and Consequences (remote) as tests which would represent the several aspects of this factor and serve as markers.

A number of studies (Ward, **1967;** Fee, **1968;** Cropley & Maslany, **1969;** Murphy, **1973)** have re-analyzed the Wallach arid Kogan **(1965)** data; they fail to obtain separate factors for number of responses (ideational fluency) and unique responses (originality) on creativity tests.

Originality may be the same as Cattell's factor U.I. **(6),** Flexibility vs. Firmness. Cattell points out that this factor has associations with several personality factors.

Two of the tests mentioned above, Plot Titles and Consequences, were recommended as markers ***for*** the originality factor in the **1963** Kit along with a test of symbol production. The latter seems now to be **a** poor marker for the originality factor if the factor definition is, as the evidence now suggests, restricted to the semantic domain. Kropp and Stoker (Note **7)** used both Symbol Production and Plot Titles in the three analyses based on **10, 11,** and 12th grade students. In each case, the two tests failed to load on the same factor. Plot Titles tended to combine with the fluency tests. An, originality factor did appear in Hoepfner et al **(1970)** with the Consequences Test having by far the largest loading on this factor probably because of the scoring approach. Two studies in Guilford's laboratory (Brown ct al, **1966;** Hendricks et al, **1969)** obtained **a** good originality factor with Plot Titles and Consequences. Hoepfner and Guilford (1965) have what seems to be two originality factors, one with Plot Titles and one with three figural tests. The latter may be a figural fluency factor.

One problem In finding the originality factor is its relationship to ideational fluency. The more responses that are produced, the more likely is the subject to give **a** response that is clever or unusual or remotely associated. Harvey et al **(1970)** correlated scores on the Torrance Tests of Creativity and found that originality and fluency scores correlated from .50 to .62. **A** factor analysis of the Minnesota. Tests **of** Creative Thinking (Madeus, **1967)** resulted in factors of verbal and non-verbal divergent thinking, rather than separate factors of fluency, flexibility, elaboration and originality.

It seems safest to limit the definition **of** this factor to semantic originality. Whether or not it is possible to develop adequate test scoring criteria to insure replicable measures of either semantic or figural originality remains to be demonstrated.

Perceptual Speed

This factor may be, as was pointed out in the **1963** Kit manual, the centroid of several sub-factors (including Form Discrimination and Symbol Discrimination) which can be separated but are more usefully treated as a single concept for most research purposes. The **1963** definition of 'the perceptual speed factor was "speed in finding figures, making comparisons, and carrying out other very simple tasks involving visual perception." This factor probably involves iconic memory, the relatively short persistence of a visual image after the stimulus has been terminated (Neisser, **1967).**

Other definitions of perceptual speed are "speed in identifying specified, small elements of a visual pattern" (Royce, **1973)** and "fast speed in comparing visual configurations" (Pawlik, **1966).** Pawlik points out that the factor is "restricted to speed of performance on tasks emphasizing quick apprehension of a visual pattern and/or its identification among similar and therefore distracting configurations.". He also stresses that, unless the task is relatively simple, the **tests** would load on **a** closure factor. Cattell **(1971)** notes that this factor is sometimes called "Figure Identification." Some additional hypotheses about the nature of the perceptual speed factor have been presented by Werdelin and Stjernberg **(1969).** They state that "the perceptual speed factor is defined by tasks involving the visual perception of space" and that "the perceptual speed factor **is** a measure of capacity to automatize, by means of practice, the solution of perceptual problems, which have originally depended **on** tho visual perception factors." It is possible that perceptual speed is analogous to flexibility of closure (restructuring closure) except for the disembedding aspect of the closure factor. In both cases the subject must hold **a** "model figure" in mind to compare with other figural material. Whether or not it is also the perceptual counterpart of numerical facility, with both factors representing the "automatic process" developed from earlier learning, remains for further research.

A stndy by Kunnapas **(1969)** further indicates the complex

nature of the perceptual speed factor. He obtained three factors which he feels account for variability in perceptual activities included in the Identical Pictures and Identical Numbers Tests: **(1)** perceptual fluency, or the "readiness with which the subject oscillates between alternating percepts," (2) decision speed, or the "readiness with which the choice is made when the response is not completely determined by sensory input," and which may be similar to Thurstone's speed of judgment factor, and **(3)** immediate perceptual memory.

Royce **(1973)** has suggested that perceptual speed may be a sub-factor of the cognitive style factor called scanning.

The tests which were included in the **1963** Kit **as** markers of the perceptual speed factor were Finding A's, which asked the subject to check each of five words containing an **"A"** in columns of **41** words; Number Comparison Test, which asks the subject to indicate whether pairs of multi-digit numbers are the same or different; and Identical Pictures Test, which asks the subject to check which of five similar figures is identical to a given sample figure.

These three tests have been **used** together in several studies (Khan, **1970;** Duncanson, **1966;** Traub, **1970). As** was mentioned earlier, the number facility and perceptual speed factors combined in the Duncanson and Khan studies using children at grades **6, 7,** and **9** although Khan did obtain two separate factors at grade **11.** But Traub, who also used sixth grade children, obtained two distinct factors, numerical facility and symbol discrimination; he found that Identical Pictures failed to load significantly on any of his factors.

Other studies (Adcock & Webberley, **1971;** Lemke et al, **1967;** El-Abd, **1970;** Orpet & Meyers, **1966)** have used one ox more **of** the Kit marker tests for perceptual speed. Adcock and Webberley found that the Identical Pictures test loaded on a factor which also included flexibility of closure measures. They concluded that "perceptual speed is primarily symbolic and verbal measures are just more contaminated forms which are of doubtful value." They **also** suggest that perceptual speed may be merely preferred speed, since accuracy tends to decline as speed is increased. Orpet and Meyers were unable to separate symbol discrimination from form discrimination in their sample of six-year olds; both groups of tests combined into a single perceptual speed factor.

Guilford and his co-workers use similar tests and obtain two perceptual speed factors, evaluation of figural units and evaluation

of symbolic units. Gershon et al (1963), nnd Hoepfner and Guilford **(1965),** include a figural aspect of this factor, Tenopyr et al **(1966)** includes the symbolic aspect of this factor, while Hoepfner et al **(1964)** includes both in the same analysis. Hoffman et al **(1968)** found that a Judgment **of** Size Test loaded on the same factor with Identical Figures. **They** suggest that perceptual accuracy may better describe the process measured by this factor than perceptual speed.

Several researchers (Weiner, 1964; Droege & Hawk, **1970;** Strowig & Alexakos, **1969)** have found a perceptual speed factor in the **GATB,** although in one **of** these studies (Strowig & Alexakos), the perceptual speed and numerical facility factors tended to combine. Perceptual speed factors have been found in the analysis of other well-known **tests** (Mukherjee, **1962;** Singer, 1965; Pounders, **1970).** In the test battery developed by Very, perceptual speed and number facility factors combined at **the** seventh grade (Very & Iacono, **1970)** and ninth grade levels (Dye and Very, **1968)** but were separate for subjects at grade **11** and college-level.

Other studies which have included **a** perceptual speed factor are Cardinet and **Rousson, 1967;** Harris & Harris, **1971;** Hettema, **1968;** Meyers et al, **'1964;** Messick & French, **1975;** and Vandenberg, **1967.**

The nature of this factor is less clear than was formerly thought. There is not only the problem of understanding the relationship of the perceptual **speed** and number facility factors which have been found to combine in **many** studies using subjects younger than mid-adolescence, but there is also the question **of** whether or not more than one perceptual **speed** factor exists. One possible explanation would be the major role of speed in this area. Numerical facility and the several kinds of perceptual speed may represent different aspects **of** an automatic process factor that is best measured by simple but highly speeded tasks

General Reasoning

There has been a good deal of difficulty in differentiating between this factor and other kinds of reasoning as well **as** between this factor and numerical facility. The **1963** Kit manual defines 'general reasoning as "the ability to solve a broad range of reasoning problems including those **of** a mathematical nature."

Royce defines general reasoning as "ability in organizing the relevant aspects of problems' having an algebraic quality and rea-

soning through to find solutions for them." As was mentioned earlier, both Pawlik (1966) and Cattell (1971) have expressed doubts as to whether or not General Reasoning and Induction are separate factors. Cattell assumes that these are not separate because "general reasoning is nothing more than a partial perception of fluid intelligence, gf, in the first order." While Pawlik is "inclined to regard the two factors as different" he points out the difficulties of interpretation. "It may simply represent a general convergent reasoning factor the way Thurstone conceived of it; alternately R may constitute a principal determinant of general intelligence at the first-order level." Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) consider general reasoning to be "the ability to conceive of structures." They suggest that tests which are "designed to show what information is needed or relevant" should be good markers for this factor. However, in the re-analysis of an earlier study (Guilford, Kettner, & Christensen, 1956), the Necessary Arithmetic Operations Test appeared on their memory for symbolic implications factor with their Numerical Operations Test instead of appearing on general reasoning. Guilford and Hoepfner suggest that the ability to handle complicated procedures and/or trial-and-error manipulation may also play an important role in general reasoning.

The tests recommended in the 1963 Kit as markers for general reasoning were two mathematics aptitude tests, which required subjects to select an answer to word problems requiring arithmetic and/or very simple algebra; Guilford's Ship Destination Test, which requires the subject to utilize several pieces of information to compute effective distance of a ship to port: and Necessary Arithmetic Operations, which asks the subject to determine what numerical operations are necessary to solve a problem but does not require computation.

Guilford's reanalysis raises a question about the appropriateness of the Necessary Arithmetic Operations Test as a marker for this factor. Another concern is the relationship of this factor to estimation ability and/or category width. Messick and Kogan (1965) have discussed the relationship between category width and quantitative aptitude. This cognitive style may be functioning as a moderator variable in tests of general reasoning.

One or more of the reference tests for general reasoning have been used in a number of studies (Adcock & Webberley, 1971; Bunderson, 1967; Duncanson, 1966; Dunham and Bunderson, 1969; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Lemke et al, 1967; Locke, 1963; Manley, 1965; Messick & French, 1975; Reed, 1966; Traub, 1970). Since

several of these studies also included tests of deductive or syllogistic reasoning, they provide an opportunity to test Cattell's hypothesis that these factors are essentially the same. A clear and separate general reasoning factor was found by Bunderson; Dunham and Bunderson; and Reed. However, Dunham and Bunderson found the Ship Destination Test loaded almost as heavily on another reasoning factor, which included two tests of inductive reasoning and one test of syllogistic reasoning, as it did on the general reasoning factor. Since two of the four tests on this factor were developed in Guilford's laboratory, it is possible that variance due to authorship may have played a role here. In three other studies (Manley, Lemke et al, Kropp & Stoker), however, the general reasoning factor seemed to be confounded with syllogistic reasoning. Both Kropp and Stoker and Manley found that two syllogistic reasoning tests, Logical Reasoning and Inference, tended to load on the same factor with general reasoning tests, but Lemke found that Nonsense Syllogisms, but not Logical Reasoning, appeared with the general reasoning measures. Obviously, the answer to the relationship between these two reasoning factors cannot be resolved on the basis of these data. It is interesting to note that there is more difficulty in differentiation of factors using the tests developed or suggested by Guilford's worlc than using those closer to the Thurstonian measures for these factors.

Other tests have also been used in studies which sought to differentiate among the reasoning factors. Dye and Very (1968) found an arithmetic reasoning factor which appeared to be distinct from both numerical facility and from general reasoning. Their arithmetic reasoning factor included tests which "commonly require mathematical solution of verbally-stated problems" whereas their general reasoning factor was "a relatively undifferentiated reasoning factor with a quantitative emphasis" which became somewhat more specific with college-age males than with females or with younger subjects. In the college male group this general reasoning factor involved both quantitative and verbal reasoning.

A general reasoning factor has also been found in factor analysis of other tests (Cave, 1970; Flores & Evans, 1972; Keats, 1965; Montgomery, 1968; Pounders, 1970; Smith, 1966). Guilford and his associates interpret this factor as cognition of semantic systems; the factor was found by Nihira et al, 1964; Brown et al, 1966; Dunham et al, 1966; and Hoffman et al, 1968.

The relationship between difficulty and factor loadings has been explored by Werdelin and Stjernberg (1971) and sheds some

light on the nature of the general reasoning factor. They found that the more difficult a test was made, the higher the loading on R. The tests included arithmetic problems that could be solved by logical reasoning, a non-mathematical logical reasoning test, and a number series test. It is possible that the general reasoning factor represents an upper difficulty level of another factor or group of factors and is not a separate factor.

Semantic Redefinition

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to shift the function of an object or part of an object and use it in a new way." This may be a bi-polar factor with the opposite pole being "functional fixedness." It is probably closely related to the flexibility factors.

Royce defines this factor as the "ability to imagine different functions for objects or parts of objects and thus use them in novel ways to accomplish stated purposes." He hypothesizes that semantic redefinition combines with sensitivity to problems and verbal comprehension to produce a second-order verbal factor. This factor is not discussed by Pawlik (1966) or by Cattell (1971), which is surprising in view of these authors' other work and the relationship that must exist between this factor and personality.

Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) present three hypotheses related to the redefinition factor: (1) that it involves perceptual-reorganization ability, (2) that it involves a shift of function, and (3) that it involves moving a part from one whole to another. Their analysis supported the second hypothesis as the most defensible and concluded that Gestalt Transformation, Picture Gestalt and Object Synthesis were the best markers test for this factor. These three tests were included in the 1963 Kit as markers for this factor.

Only a few studies using any of these tests have appeared in the last decade (Adcock & Martin, 1971; Adcock & Webberley, 1971; Fleishman & Dusek, 1971; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Reed, 1966) and in almost all of these factor underdetermination was a problem. Consequently, it is impossible to decide whether the failure to obtain a clear redefinition factor is due to the tests or to the experimental design. In the two Adcock studies, redefinition and spontaneous flexibility tests tended to combine on a single factor but this did not occur in the other studies. The redefinition tests split onto different factors in both Reed's study and in three of the four grade levels in the Kropp and Stoker study. Only

the studies from Guilford's laboratory showed a clear redefinition factor, A factor determined in part by these Kit tests appeared in Nihira et al (1964); Hoepfner and Guilford (1965); Brown et al (1966); Dunham et al (1966); Hendricks et al (1969); and Hoepfner et al (1970); it was usually interpreted as divergent production of semantic classes.

In light of this evidence, the status of the semantic redefinition factor must be considered somewhat tentative. It may be a sub-factor of spontaneous flexibility or of a larger redefinition factor not restricted to the semantic domain. Much more research needs to be done in this area.

Syllogistic Reasoning

This is probably a sub-factor of the ability called Deduction by Thurstone. It was defined in the 1963 Kit as the "ability to reason from stated premises to their necessary conclusion."

Royce (1973) considers deduction and syllogistic reasoning separate factors. He defines deduction as "reasoning from the general to the specific; the ability to test the correctness of a meaningful conclusion by applying general principles to the individual case," and syllogistic reasoning as "ability in formal reasoning from stated premises to rule out nonpermissible combinations and thus to arrive at necessary conclusions." As was mentioned earlier, Pawlik (1966) feels that deduction is the only distinctly separate reasoning factor. He defines it as involving "reasoning from the general to the specific, the ability to test the correctness of a meaningful conclusion by applying general principles to the individual case." He points out that, while syllogistic reasoning tests are markers for deduction, figure classification tests show minor loadings on this factor.

Cattell (1971) suggests that deductive reasoning might also be called logical evaluation. He also points out that there are deductive steps in every inductive reasoning act. Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) point out that the ability called for in many syllogistic reasoning tests is not deduction, since the subject is not asked to provide an answer, but the ability to evaluate the correctness of the answer(s) presented. They suggest that there may be two kinds of deductive reasoning factors, involving relations and implications.

The tests included in the 1963 Kit as markers for syllogistic reasoning were Nonsense Syllogisms, which asks the subject to determine whether the conclusion logically follows from the prem-

ises; Logical Reasoning, which asks the subject to select the conclusion that can be correctly drawn from the premises; and Inference, which asks the subject to select the conclusion that can be validly drawn from earlier statements.

Several studies using these marker tests have appeared in the literature during the past decade (Bunderson, **1967;** Dunham & Bunderson, **1969;** Kropp & Stoker, Note **7;** Lemke et al, **1967;** Manley, **1965;** Mullins, **1967;** Nihira et al, **1964;** Reed, **1966).** Only the Bunderson and Nihira and, to some extent, Lemke, studies yielded a clear syllogistic or logical reasoning factor. Bunderson prefers to call this factor verbal reasoning and to define it more broadly than does the Kit. In the remaining studies Nonsense Syllogisms tended to load on factors which also included induction tests, and Logical Reasoning and Inference tended to load on factors with vocabulary and/or general reasoning tests. This suggests that these tests do not function similarly and that the markers for this factor should be reviewed.

Studies of other tests have also found'deductive type reasoning factors (Dye & Very, **1968; Keats, 1965;** Smith, **1966;** Very & Iacono, **1970).**

Spatial Orientation

There has been extensive discussion attempting to differ between this factor and the visualization factor. Spatial orientation was defined in the 1963 Kit **as** "the ability to perceive spatial patterns or to maintain orientation with respect to objects in space."

Various hypotheses have been presented to account for distinction between the spatial orientation and visualization factors. In the **1963** Kit manual it was suggested that spatial orientation involves "perception of the position and configuration of objects in space" with the observer himself as a reference point whereas visualization required the observer to manipulate the stimulus and alter its image. Werdelin **(1961)** pointed out that the entire figure is reacted to in spatial orientation but the figure must be broken into parts for visualization. In more recent studies, Werdelin and Stjernberg **(1969** and **1971)** have suggested that spatial orientation is dependent upon the perceptual speed factor and represents **a** more difficult or less practiced aspect of that factor. This partially confirms Zimmerman's **(1954)** hypothesis that item complexity accounts for some of the differentiation between spatial visualization test factors. **Ian** Smith **(1964)** has argued that the distinction

between spatial orientation and Visualization has not been clearly demonstrated.

Royce **(1973)** defines spatial orientation as the "ability to put together by visual imagination parts that are out **of** place in a visual pattern and to identify such 'out of place' percepts." Pawlik **(1966)** points out that some authors have considered that there may be two similar factors, spatial relations and spatial orientation. He defines the spatial relations factor **as** requiring the identification of an object when seen from different angles or positions. He describes spatial orientation **as** involving problems "in which the body orientation of **the** observer is an essential part of the problem."

Guilford **(1967)** considers spatial relations and spatial orientation to be **a** single factor designated in his structure of intellect model as the cognition of visual figural systems. He hypothesizes that this is a sub-factor of **a** broader ability which also includes kinesthetic and auditory systems. The kinesthetic sub-factor is based on the ability to make right-left discriminations while the auditory sub-factor involves perceiving similarities and differences in rhythms and melodies.

The tests included in the **1963** Kit as markers for spatial orientation were Card Rotations, which requires the subject to detect whether or not cards **of** various configurations have been turned over as well as rotated; Cube Comparisons, which requires the subject to determine whether or not two cubes are the same but rotated to different positions; and Spatial Orientation, **a** test from Guilford's laboratory which requires the subject to select the correct new position for the prow **of** a boat given the motion indicated in two pictures. The latter test would represent what Pawlik calls the spatial orientation factor, while the first two would represent his concept **of** a spatial relations factor.

Two **of** these marker tests, Card Rotations and Cube Comparisons, have been used in 'several studies (Ekstrom, **1967;** Frederiksen, **1965;** Mullins, **1967; Nasca, 1965)** all of which found fairly clear spatial orientation factors. Card Rotations and Spatial Relations marked **a** clear factor for Flores and Evans **(1972).** Hoffman et **al (1968)** also **used** the Spatial Orientation Test and obtained a factor which seems clearly dependent upon relationship of the stimuli to the observer and his bodily frame of reference.

Four studieq (Arnold, **1967;** El-Abd, **1970;** Messick and French, **1975;** Vandenberg, **1967)** have employed the Thurstone tests for this factor. Arnold, El-Abd, and Vandenberg all obtained clear

spatial orientation factors, but in the Messick and French study spatial and disembedding skills combined.

Several other studies (Anderson & Leton, **1964;** Droege & Hawk, **1970; Keats, 1965;** Strowig & Alexakos, **1969;** Very & Iacono, **1970;** Weiner, **1964)** contain factors which may also represent this ability but which are difficult to interpret due to underdetermination of factors and/or inadequate descriptions of the tests.

Sensitivity to Problems

This factor was defined in the **1963** Kit as "the ability to recognize practical problems."

Royce **(1973)** defines it more broadly **as** the "ability to imagine problems associated with function or change of function of objects and to suggest ways to deal with these problems." The latter part of this definition may be questioned since two **of** the three marker tests do not require the subject to suggest changes or improvements, only to point out the problem. Royce hypothesizes that sensitivity to problems combines with verbal comprehension and semantic redefinition to form a second-order verbal factor. Pawlik **(1966)** describes this factor as "recognizing the existence **of** a problem" and comments that "no direct temperament correlates of the Sensitivity to Problems factor are known, although broader personality associations seem rather likely."

The tests selected as markers for the sensitivity to problems factor in the **1963** Kit were the Apparatus Test, which asks the subject to suggest improvements for common objects; Seeing Problems, which asks the subject to list problems that might arise in a given situation; and Seeing Deficiencies, which asks the subject, to point out the fault in a plan of action.

Only two studies (Kropp & Stoker, Note **7;** Nasca, **1965)** outside of Guilford's laboratory have attempted to find this factor. These were only partially successful. In both studies, the Apparatus Test and Seeing Problems were used. The two tests did load on the same factor in the oldest group of students studied by Kropp and Stoker, although this factor also included tests of ideational and expressional fluency. The Nasca study had a factor with loadings for Seeing Problems and a test called Seeing Science Deficiencies.

In the two studies done in Guilford's laboratory (Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Hoepfner et al, **1968)** Seeing Problems was a strong marker for this factor once and the Apparatus Test was **a** strong marker once.

In light of the above data, there is some question as to whether the sensitivity to problems factor has been adequately enough demonstrated for inclusion in a revised Kit.

Spatial Scanning

The spatial scanning factor was defined in the **1963** Kit as "speed in visually exploring a wide or complicated spatial field."

Royce **(1973)** defines this factor as the "ability to quickly survey a complex field to find a particular configuration representing a pathway through the field." He considers that it is a component of a second-order visualization factor. Spatial scanning may also be a sub-factor of a broader factor of planning ability.

The tests developed as markers for the spatial scanning factor in the **1963** Kit were Maze Tracing Speed, which requires **tho** subject to complete a series of pencil-and-paper mazes; Choosing a Path, which requires the subject to select the pair **of** wires which will complete an electric circuit; and Map Planning, which requires the subject to find the shortest route between two points without encountering any road blocks.

Several factor analytic studies have used **two** or more of thcsc marker tests but only Bunderson **(1967)** and Lemlce et al **(1967)** found a clear spatial scanning factor. Moreover, in the Bunderson study, Guilford's Planning Air Maneuvers Test, supposedly a marker of adaptive flexibility, loaded on the factor including two spatial scanning tests. Khan **(1970)** found that the spatial scanning factor was not differentiated at the grade, 7 level but did appear clearly at grade **9.** Frederiksen **(1965)** found that the Map Planning Test failed to appear on the same factor **as** the other two spatial scanning markers. Haynes **(1970) used** similar tests from Guilford's laboratory and did not obtain a spatial scanning factor, but a study by Hoffman et **al (1968)** in Guilford's laboratory obtained a factor which appears to be spatial scanning.

It must be concluded that the marker tests for this factor may have to be revised. Maze Tracing appears to show some variance on perceptual speed, especially with younger subjects.

Verbal Comprehension

This factor was defined in the **1963** Kit manual as "the ability to understand the English language." The specificity of the factor to the English language is based on Guthrie's **(1963)** study which found separate verbal factors in both English and Tagalog with subjects who spoke both of these languages.

Royce (1973), in defining verbal comprehension as "facility in understanding of English words, sentences, and paragraphs," also considers this factor to be language specific while Pawlik (1966) defines it as relating to the "knowledge of words and their meaning as well as to application of this knowledge in understanding connected discourse."

A question regarding the breadth and language specificity of the verbal comprehension factor can be raised since Harris and Harris (Note 5) found a similar factor which includes "comprehension of information including induction of classes when verbal and pictorial semantic content is employed." This finding suggests a more general factor of verbal ability or it may represent the overlap between verbal comprehension and induction. Still another possibility is that this is Guilford's CMR, Cognition of Semantic Relations.

Two studies (Haag & David, 1969; Messick & French, 1975) have suggested a factor related to "availability and flexibility in the use of multiple meaning words" or flexibility of vocabulary which may be a sub-factor of verbal comprehension, a confounding of verbal comprehension with one or more flexibility factors, or a separate ability. Several of the factors in Nihira et al (1964) could be interpreted as sub-factors of verbal comprehension; these include verbal relations and verbal implications.

The tests selected as markers for the verbal comprehension factor in the 1963 Kit are all vocabulary tests. Since other authors (Pawlik, 1966; Cattell, 1971) have suggested that the factor could also be marked with tests of reading comprehension, verbal analogies, matching proverbs, grammar and syntax, it may be valuable to reconsider having this factor marked solely by vocabulary tests.

Verbal comprehension factors have appeared in many studies during the past decade (Arnold, 1967; Brown et al, 1966; Cave, 1970; Droege & Hawk, 1970; Duncanson, 1966; Dunham & Bunderson, 1969; Dunham et al, 1966; Dye & Very, 1968; El-Abd, 1970; Flores & Evans, 1972; Gershon et al, 1963; Hendricks et al, 1969; Guilford et al, 1970; Hoepfner et al, 1964; Hoepfner et al, 1970; Hoffman et al, 1968; Khan, 1970; Keats, 1965; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7; Lemke et al, 1967; Locke, 1963; McCartin & Meyers, 1966; Manley, 1965; Mullins, 1967; Nihira et al, 1964; Pimsleur, 1962; Pounders, 1970; Rankin & Thompson, 1966; Reed, 1966; Singer, 1965; Strowig & Alexakos, 1969; Tenopyr et al, 1966; Traub, 1970). Many of these appear to be broader than simply "the ability to understand the English language" and some

seem to include verbal reasoning or to represent a confounding of verbal ability and reasoning. Vandenberg (1967) found both a factor for native language and a verbal comprehension factor marked by tests in English. This suggests for individuals fluent in more than one language a separate verbal comprehension factor for each language.

Taylor et al (1967), in a study of communication abilities, found that a vocabulary test appeared "to be one of the most factorially complex scores in the study" in contrast to most other studies which have found this type of test a relatively pure measure of verbal comprehension.

Khan (1972) has explored the relationship between vocabulary learning and the development of verbal ability.

Visualization

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "tho ability to manipulate or transform the image of spatial patterns into other visual arrangements."

Royce (1973) postulates visualization factors at both the first-order and second-order levels and suggests that visualization may be linked to field articulation. He defines visualization as the "ability to manipulate visual percepts (to image change in forms) and thus to 'see' how things would look under altered conditions." Pawlik (1966) describes visualization as "the ability to imagine properly the movement or spatial configuration of a configuration or some of its parts."

As was mentioned earlier, there has been frequent difficulty in differentiating between spatial orientation and visualization factors. Hypotheses have been made which suggest that visualization is simply a more difficult or complex type of spatial orientation, that the relationship of the stimulus to the observer is less important in visualization than in spatial orientation, or that visualization involves reacting analytically to the components of the stimulus rather than to the figure as a whole.

Cattell (1971) does not accept visualization as a primary factor, and concludes that the work by Horn (1965) has demonstrated that it is a higher-order factor. This second-order visualization factor includes spatial ability, adaptive flexibility, speed of closure, and flexibility of closure.,

The marker tests for visualization in the 1963 Kit were Form Board, which requires the subject to indicate which pieces will fit together to make a given outline; Paper Folding, which requires

the subject to select the drawing that correctly shows where holes will be in an unfolded sheet of paper which has previously been shown folded and punched; and Surface Development which requires the subject to indicate on a flat form, which can be folded to make a solid figure, the points corresponding to those on the solid.

Apparently there has been very little interest in the visualization factor; only three factor analytic studies using these marker tests have appeared in the past decade (Frederiksen, 1965; Ekstrom, 1967; and Hoffman et al, 1968). All of these obtained a relatively clear visualization factor.

Figural Adaptive Flexibility

This factor, which has appeared primarily in Guilford's work, was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to change set in order to meet new requirements imposed by figural problems."

It has been defined by Royce (1973) as the "ability to try out in imagination various possible arrangements of the elements of a visual pattern and thus to converge on one arrangement which satisfies several stated criteria." Royce hypothesizes that adaptive flexibility combines with several other factors to form a second-order visualization factor. As was mentioned earlier, Wardell (1973) thinks that adaptive flexibility is identical with flexibility of closure.

Cattell (1971) also believes that adaptive flexibility is a primary factor which is associated with the higher-order visualization factor. Pawlik (1966) points out that the emphasis in both flexibility factors "is not on quantity but diversity of ideas produced." Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) defines adaptive flexibility as "the ability to change set in order to meet requirements imposed by changing conditions."

There has been considerable controversy over the nature of flexibility and its relation to fluency and originality. Harvey et al (1970) and Madeus (1967) found that the fluency and flexibility aspects of Torrance's tests combine into a single factor.

The tests selected for the 1963 Kit as markers for adaptive flexibility were two Match Problems Tests, which require the subject to indicate different patterns in which matches can be removed to leave a given number of squares or triangles, and Planning Air Maneuvers, which requires the examinee to select the most direct path for skywriting pairs of letters. Guilford (personal

communication, 1971) has recently expressed doubts about the suitability of Planning Air Maneuvers as a marker for this factor. If only Match Problem Tests can mark this factor, it is probably too test specific for inclusion in a new Kit.

Five studies (Adcock & Martin, 1971; Bunderson, 1967; Hoepfner & Guilford, 1965; Hoffman et al, 1968; Kropp & Stoker, Note 7) have used two or more of these tests. A clear adaptive flexibility factor appears in the Hoepfner study and in the Adcock and Martin study although, in the latter, the authors interpret it as figural fluency. In the Bunderson study, three Match Problems Tests loaded on the same factor but Planning Air Maneuvers loaded on a factor which was dominated by spatial scanning tests. The two adaptive flexibility tests (Match Problems and Planning Air Maneuvers) tended to load on the same factor at most grade levels in the Kropp and Stoker study but this factor also included tests from several of the reasoning factors as well, suggesting that there may be more than one type of strategy which can lead to high scores on these tests—creative or logical. The Hoffman study concluded that Planning Air Maneuvers is a convergent rather than divergent type task since the subject does not suggest new solutions to the problem.

It thus must be concluded that the nature of this factor has not been clearly demonstrated and that, if it is to be included in a future Kit, new types of marker tests will have to be developed.

Spontaneous Semantic **Flexibility**

This factor was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to produce a diversity of verbally expressed ideas in a situation that is relatively unrestricted."

Royce (1973) defines spontaneous flexibility as "facility in imagining diverse functions and classifications for objects" and hypothesizes that it, with induction, deduction, and syllogistic reasoning, forms a second-order reasoning factor. This conceptualization seems at odds with most other views of this factor that stress its set changing aspects. Pawlik (1966), for example, describes spontaneous flexibility as "the facility of producing a diversity of ideas." He also points out that "it differs from ideational fluency in that emphasis is not on quantity but on diversity of ideas produced."

Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) have suggested that spontaneous flexibility is the opposite of perseveration. They define this

factor as "the ability to produce diversity into ideas generated in a relatively unstructured situation."

Cattell **(1971)** does not discuss spontaneous flexibility and considers that his ideational flexibility vs. firmness factor is comparable to originality. It seems more likely that Cattell's factor may be a combination of flexibility and originality.

The tests included in the **1963** Kit **as** markers for spontaneous flexibility were the Utility and Alternate Uses Tests, which require the subject to list different uses for an object and which are scored for the number of times the class of uses changes; and Object Naming, which requires the subject to name as many objects as possible that belong to **a** given class.

Scoring of the tests which are based on class changes is difficult. Although categories for the classes of uses can be developed prior to scoring, it is necessary to have scorers read through each set of item responses before scoring to develop a "feel" for the subject's thought pattern and to sense the rare case when the *a priori* categories are inappropriate. The ethics of ***not*** telling the subject that he is to be scored for category changes has also been questioned; however, if the criterion of category change was revealed, these changes would no longer be "spontaneous."

One or more of these marker tests have been used in several studies during the past decade (Adcock & Martin, **1971;** Brown et al, **1966;** Dunham et al, **1966;** Haag & David, **1969;** Wendricks et al, **1969;** Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Hocpfner et al, **1970;** Holtz, **1971;** and Reed, **1966). A** fairly clear spontaneous flexibility factor appeared only in the studies from Guilford's laboratory. A test called Multiple Grouping, which asks the subject to produce as many different logical groupings of **a** list of objects as possible, was found by this laboratory to be a better marker for spontaneous flexibility than Object Naming.

In the studies done outside of Guilford's laboratory, the spontaneous flexibility factor did not fare as well. Adcock and Martin (1971) found that redefinition and spontaneous flexibility tests from the Kit combined into *a* single factor. Reed **(1966)** was unable to obtain a clear spontaneous flexibility factor although he **used all** three marker tests. Neither Holtz **(1971)** nor Haag and David **(1969)** clearly determined this factor due to underrepresentation. The Haag and David flexibility of vocabulary factor is probably a confounding of verbal comprehension and semantic flexibility.

Several other studies have employed Uses-type tests and obtained a flexibility score by counting the number of shifts in category (Biggs et al, **1971;** Cave, **1970;** Singer & Roby, **1967).** However, factors were undetermined in most of these studies. Singer and Roby found that the **Uses** test loaded on **a** factor which also included scores on the Adventure and Self-Reliant scales of the D-F Opinion Survey.

May and Metcalf **(1965)** looked at the effects of different instructions and scoring procedures on tests of spontaneous flexibility. They concluded that:

1. Spontaneous flexibility is probably not a factor which is independent of scoring system, mental set induced by test instructions, and examination task.
2. Spontaneous flexibility probably should be measured with tests of uses rather than improvements, under a mental set of fluency rather than flexibility.
3. Spontaneous flexibility probably should be scored either by the "unconventional uses" scheme or the "categories" scheme, but not by the "principles" scheme.

It seems necessary to conclude that this factor has not been well-demonstrated outside of Guilford's laboratory. Object Naming should be dropped as a marker for this factor and the possibility of using a test such as Multiple Grouping as **a** marker explored. The problems of set as developed by instructions and of scoring need further research. Additionally, it seems important to determine whether or not the "spontaneous" aspect of this factor is important. If not, there seems little to differentiate it from Redefinition.

Possible New Factors

During the past decade, several new factors have been demonstrated clearly enough to warrant consideration for inclusion in a new Kit of Cognitive Factors. The criteria for inclusion of a new factor in the Kit is that the factor has been found in at least three different studies and by at least two different researchers or laboratories. In addition, this review will discuss factors approaching but not attaining these criteria.

These factors include: Automatic Processes, Cognition of Behavioral Systems, Concept Formation, Estimation, Experiential Evaluation, Figural Fluency, **Figural** Illusions, Figural Relations, Integration, Meaningful Memory, Memory for Order, Visual Memory, and Verbal Closure.

Automatic Processes

The existence of some type of automatic processes, automatization, or automated learning factor has been suggested in three studies (Werdelin, **1958; Keats, 1965;** Flores & Evans, **1972).** Each **of** these has suggested that this factor is related to the number facility factor and most suggest that it is also related to perceptual speed and possibly to other areas as well.

Werdelin and Stjernberg **(1971)** have described the automatization process as occurring on "problems which involve the application of rules to a symbol. The rules become automatized and the problems get loadings on the N factor." Flores and Evans stale that their second-order factor is defined by "individual differences in processes that are susceptible to **a** high degree of automatization." This type of process clearly characterizes the elementary arithmetic operations, which are usually drilled. Simple clerical tasks such as checking **A's** or matching diagrams may also involve a quickly learned automated response. Coombs **(1941)** also interpreted the numerical facility factor in **a** similar manner.

There seems to be adequate evidence to suggest the existence of **a** factor which is based on response to overlearned material. A major question **is** whether this is merely **a** reconceptualization of the factors of numerical facility and/or perceptual speed or has broader implications. At present, the evidence for an automatic process factor does not warrant its inclusion in the revised Kit. There is also the question of the relationship of an automatic process factor to the automatization cognitive style which has been defined as "greater or lesser ability to perform simple repetitive tasks than expected from the individual's general level of ability" (Broverman et al, 1964).

The studies which suggest an automatic process factor again raise the question of the relationship of difficulty to factor structure. This has been discussed by Guilford **(1941), Zimmerman (1954)** and Werdelin and Stjernberg **(1971)** among others. It seems likely that, to the degree that increased test difficulty changes the subject's strategy or approach to the test items, difficulty can be **a** major determinant of **a** factor.

Behavioral Relations **and** Systems

Behavioral relations can be defined as the ability to judge the interaction between two individuals so as to indicate how one of the individuals feels about the situation. The behavioral relations factor has been found in three studies (O'Sullivan et al, **1965;**

Tenopyr et al, **1966;** Hendricks et al, **1969)** in Guilford's laboratory. The tests which appear to be the best markers for this factor are Social Relations, which requires the subject to select the statement that would best indicate the thoughts **of a** marked figure in *a* pair; and Silhouette Relations, which requires the subject to select the picture that shows the expression suggested by the relationship of the two figures.

A behavioral systems factor has **also** been found in three studies in Guilford's laboratory (O'Sullivan et al, **1965;** Tenopyr et al, **1966;** Hendricks et al, **1969)** but not elsewhere. This factor involves "a temporal sequence **of** events in which **human** interactions are the important links between events." The tests which have been the best markers for the factor are Missing Cartoons, which requires the subject to select a scene to fill the gap in **a** series **of** four pantomimes; Missing Pictures, which is similar to Missing Cartoons but in photographic form; and Facial Situations, which requires the subject to select the best alternative to explain the expressions on the faces of a pair of figures.

Very little work on behavioral €actors has been done outside of Guilford's laboratory. Other factor analyses of social intelligence (Thorndike, **1936;** Woodrow, **1939;** Wedeck, **1947;** El-Abd, **1963)** have produced behavior-type factors but none are clearly related to either of the Guilford factors ,which are discussed here. There may be some relationship between **this** factor and the Picture Arrangement **task** of the Wechsler Intelligence Test. However, it must be concluded that behavioral factors, while promising, have not been adequately enough demonstrated €or inclusion in the revised Kit.

Chunking Memory

The capacity **of** the memory to use **a** limited number of symbols to represent larger amounts of information has been **called** "chunking" (Miller, **1956).**

The existence of a chunking memory factor was hypothesized by Bunderson **(1967). He** developed two tests, Binary Digit **Span** and Three-Letter Span, which because of patterns and redundancies in *the* content were expected to encourage the chunking process. **A** clear chunking memory factor did emerge in his analysis. Moreover, this factor bore an important relationship to learning measures and "is quite central to much high-level thinking." This factor appears to offer great promise for investigators interested in **memory** because of its correspondence to **a** process that has appeared in laboratory studies of memory. Unfortunately, it has

not been replicated in other factor studies and so cannot be included in the revised Kit.

Concept Formation

This factor is a sub-factor of induction. Despite this, it is suggested that it be included in the revised Kit as *a* separate factor to allow researchers to differentiate between the two steps in the inductive reasoning process: **(1)** the attainment of the concept from the stimuli, and **(2)** the selection of other stimuli which do or do not exhibit the concept.

A concept formation factor was first found by Adkins and Lyerly **(1952).** This factor had its major loadings on tests of Picture-Group Naming, which requires the subject to assign to a group of objects that are alike in some way **a** name under which all the objects could be subsumed; Word-Group Naming, which is a verbal counterpart of the preceding test; and a verbal analogies test. Since *a* separate factor readily identifiable as induction and loading on different tests also appears in the same study, there is support for presenting concept formation and induction as separate factors.

A similar factor, initially called abstraction naming and later renamed convergent production of semantic units in the SI schema, has appeared in studies in Guilford's laboratory (Guilford et al, **1952;** Guilford, Kettner, and Christensen, **1956;** O'Sullivan, Guilford and de Mille, **1965;** and Dunham et al, **1966).** Guilford **(1967)** reports that the strongest tests for this factor are Picture-Group Naming, Word-Group Naming, Verbal-Relations Naming, and Number Group Naming. However, the similarity among these measures suggests that this could also be a method-of-testing factor. It would be interesting to determine if the concept formation factor is related to Halstead's **(1947)** abstraction factor.

Several of Gulliksen's students have studied the relationship of concept learning to abilities (Allison, **1960;** Bunderson, **1967;** Duncanson, **1966;** Manley, **1965).** The concept formation tasks in these researches are more complex than the naming tasks, making their relationship to the previous studies somewhat uncertain. Duncanson obtained a factor on which only the concept learning tasks had significant loadings and which did not include any of the factor marker tests from the Kit. Allison's four verbal concept learning tasks loaded on a single factor which was related to most of the reference factors, especially those identified as intellectual and numerical ability. He also found **a** spatial concept learning

factor. Manley found three concept learning factors, one each for verbal tasks, for card sorting **tasks,** and for Goldstein tasks. His verbal concepts factor appears to be identical to Allison's but no reference tests were strongly related to his concept learning factors. Bunderson found that different kinds of abilities were important at different stages of concept learning.

Lemke et al **(1967) also found** a concept attainment factor which had its main loadings on tests requiring the ability to present or state **a** given concept. Again, marker tests for induction and for other reasoning and memory factors did not **load** on the concept attainment factor.

The components of concept learning have also been studied by Dunham et al **(1968).** They concluded that there were "common variances represented by the learning task scores that were not common to the tests" and that "there are factors common to both **tasks** and tests." They point out that the NMU factor can only appear in learning studies if the learners have mastered the concepts.

While some of these factors could be explained **as** being attributable to the testing method employed, it seems at least equally likely that they represent a concept attainment factor. Unlike Pawlik **(1966),** we do not consider the ability to name a concept to be a sub-factor of expressional fluency. It seems important to differentiate between Carroll's **(1941)** factor of facility in attaching appropriate names of symbols to stimuli and this concept naming factor. This factor may also be related to the feature extraction or iiaming process which occurs when material is being transferred among the memory systems. **A** discussion of this process may be found in Atkinson and Shiffrin **(1968)** or in Kumar **(1971).**

The above material supports the inclusion of **a** conccpt attainment factor in the revised Kit. The concept attainment factor will be defined **as "the** ability to cognize **an** abstract class or relation, usually by naming." It is suggested that **tests** similar to Word-Group Naming, Picture-Group Naming, and Naming Meaningful Trends be used **as** markers for this factor. However, the method of testing needs to **be** varied more than is currently the case with these tests.

Estimation

Three studies have found **a** factor which seems to be related to estimation ability (Dye & Very, **1968;** McKenna, 1968; Very & Iacono, **1970).**

McKenna found a factor which involves quantitative aptitude, category width as determined from an estimation questionnaire, and accuracy of spatial judgment. This may be an estimation factor or may be more closely related to cognitive style or to general reasoning. As was mentioned earlier, Messick and Kogan **(1965)** have discussed the relationship of cognitive style to estimative solutions to quantitative problems. The estimation factors in these studies are considerably broader constructs than the Length Estimation factor in the **1963** Kit.

Dye and Very **(1968)** and Very and Iacono **(1970)** both found an estimative ability factor which appeared to involve two tests requiring an estimative approach to quantitative problems and the ability to evaluate hypotheses. This may be **a** confounding of estimative ability and other factors.

The evidence from these three studies does not seem to be clear enough to warrant the inclusion of an estimation factor in the revised Kit.

Figural Fluency

Figural fluency factors have appeared in several studies (Bereiter, **1960;** Gershon et al, **1963;** Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Hoffman et al, **1968;** and Cave, **1970).** There may be several distinct sub-factors in this area; for example, Guilford and Hoepfner **(1971)** describe a figural elaboration factor, divergent production of figural implications, and **a** factor of divergent production of figural systems, while Bereiter hypothesized separate factors for figural and structural ideational fluency.

The tests which **have** been used to mark this factor require the subject to elaborate on an existing figure, such as in Guilford's, Decorations or Production of Figural Effects tests, to produce **a** number of figures in response to a given stimuli, such as in Guilford's Alternate Signs Test, or to produce as many different figures as possible from **a** limited number of elements, as in Guilford's Designs, Make a Figure, Make a Mark, or Making Objects tests. In each case, the ease of producing many different figures in response to the situation is the essence of the process. As is the case with ideational fluency, quantity is emphasized, not quality, set shifting, or innovation.

Figural Illusions and Perceptual Alternations

Two different factors or sub-factors which appear to be related have been found. One has to do with susceptibility to optical

illusions, the other with perceptual alternation in tests of reversible perceptions.

Both of these were originally found by Thurstone **(1944).** More recently, **an** illusion factor has been found clearly in a study by Hettema **(1968)** and much more tentatively in **a** study by Aftanas and Royce **(1969).** A perceptual alternations factor found by Kunnapas **(1969)** and defined as the "readiness with which the subject oscillates between alternating percepts," may be similar to Thurstone's perceptual alternations factor.

These factors are important because of their relationship to personality. Hettema **(1968)** has described the relationship of his illusion factor to the cognitive styles **of** field dependence and leveling-sharpening. Allport **(1956)** has also suggested that there may be a relationship between illusions and field dependence by his statement that illusions are "situations in which a part embedded in the context **of** the **whole** appears different from its appearance when it is perceived separately."

More work is necessary to establish the nature of these factors and to learn more about their relationship to the closure factors and to cognitive styles. They are not yet clearly enough established for inclusion in the revised Kit.

Figural Relations

In a number of studies, primarily in Guilford's laboratory, it has been suggested that the induction factor would be better handled as several sub-factors, one of which would be a figural relations factor. It was earlier argued that concept attainment, also probably an induction sub-factor, should be treated independently because it represents a step in the inductive reasoning process which can stand by itself and which can be demonstrated without the presence of other steps in the inductive process. Does figural relations also involve a separate and distinctive reasoning process or is it the same process as is applied in solving problems **of** symbolic or semantic relations?

Separate figural relations factors, such as cognition of figural classes and cognition of figural relations, have appeared in three recent studies in Guilford's laboratory (Gershon et al, **1963;** Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Dunham et al, **1966).** Additionally it has appeared in the Harrises' **(1971)** reanalysis of **two** of Guilford's earlier studies (Guilford et al, **1952;** Guilford et al, **1956).** The comparable common factor technique yielded in each study a factor which appears to be a figural relations factor, with major loadings

on tests such as Figure Analogies, Figure Classification, Figure Matching, and Figure Matrix, as well as a separate factor involving similar tests in the verbal and pictorial domain. This suggests that a figural relations factor may be independent of the methodological techniques used in Guilford's laboratory, although perhaps dependent on the same tests. A figural reasoning factor was found in preschool children by Meyers et al **(1964).**

However, there does not seem to be sufficient evidence as yet to justify inclusion of a figural relations factor in the revised Kit.

Integration

This factor was defined by French **(1951)** as "the ability simultaneously to bear in mind and to combine or integrate several conditions, premises, or rules, in order to produce the correct response." It first appeared in the Army Air Forces study (Guilford & Lacey, **1947).** It was more clearly identified by Lucas and French **(1953).** More recently Traub **(1970)** has **also** obtained an integration factor marked by one of French's following directions tests and by another similar test. Rankin and Thompson **(1966)** found a factor which they interpret as "non-intellectual following of directions" which may be related to integration but their factor is not determined by an adequate number of variables.

A similar and possibly identical factor, identified as internalization, appears in Droege and Hawk **(1970).** They describe the tests on this factor as having in common "a requirement of internalized rules, internalizing useful approaches to doing the items, or memorizing materials." These authors suggest that this factor is similar to Guilford's memory of symbolic relationships and that it supports Coombs **(1941)** and Werdelin **(1958)** in "the theory that numerical ability is characterized by a facility in manipulating a symbolic system according to a specified set of rules."

It is recommended that a factor called integration and marked by following directions tests which require the retention of rules be included in the revised Kit. Further research is necessary to determine the nature of this factor.

Meaningful Memory

This factor was found by Kelley **(1954)** and by Jones **(1954).** As Lumsden **(1965)** has commented, the term meaningful memory seems too general since in both these studies the factor was restricted to verbal material. Tests loading on the meaningful memory factor in these studies included Memory for Words, Sentence Completion Memory, and Memory for Limericks. "Other tests using material which was apparently equally meaningful (*e.g.*, Memory for Relations, Picture Memory, Paragraph Memory) had low loadings on the factor" (Lumsden, **1965).**

Brown et al **(1966)** suggest that Kelley's meaningful memory factor is either memory for semantic systems or a confounding of that factor and memory for semantic implications. This interpretation seems doubtful in light of Brown's later definition of memory for semantic systems as "the ability to remember the ordering of meaningful material." Brown's memory for semantic relations appears close to Kelley's meaningful memory factor. Order does not appear to be a relevant aspect of either Kelley's or Jones' meaningful memory factor. None of the studies of memory done in Guilford's laboratory have found a factor which appears identical to meaningful memory although Dunham's et al **(1966)** memory for semantic classes seems close.

Cattell **(1971),** as was earlier mentioned, has stated that meaningful memory "represents only a projection of intelligence into memorizing performance."

Lumsden **(1965)** suggests that the meaningful memory factor might be better conceptualized as a related rote memory factor defined as "the ability to retain substance related to existing contents of memory." He obtained a related rote memory factor in his study as well as other memory factors which suggest a splitting of meaningful memory as it was hypothesized by Kelley. Tenopyr **(1966)** has also suggested that there might be an associative (or rote) memory factor which involves "relations more meaningful than contiguity" in addition to a memory factor defined in terms of paired associates learning.

McKenna **(1968)** found a factor interpreted as memory for emphasis which may be related to meaningful memory.

Arnold **(1967)** attempted to obtain a meaningful memory factor. She did so, but the results are unclear because of too few tests to determine the factor. The markers appear, on only a very weak factor of their own, while they have higher loadings on a verbal factor.

Petrov **(1970)** has found both a verbal memory factor and a factor of long-term retention of verbal material.

This evidence does not support the existence of a meaningful memory factor. It does suggest that there may be a somewhat similar factor involving the rote memory of related material. Per-

haps it is a memory for concrete (as opposed to abstract) material. More research needs to be done in this area.

Memory for Order

This factor, called memory for position temporal succession, was first found by Christal **(1958).** In this study, the factor was marked by tests of Sequence Memory, Position in Succession, and Position **Recall.**

As was mentioned previously, Brown et al **(1968)** consider that the factor memory for semantic systems involves the ability to remember order. Tenopyr **(1966)** obtained a memory for symbolic systems factor, which also involves order as a memory system.

In **a** study of six-year-old children, Orpet and Meyers **(1966)** found **a** factor which includes the Knox Cube Tapping Test, which requires the subject to tap cubes in the same sequence as the examiner, and the WISC Digits Forward. Although the authors consider this factor to represent visual memory for **figural** units, it is suggested that it may be **a** memory for order factor.

This evidence is not strong enough to recommend the inclusion of **a** memory for order factor in the revised Kit. More research needs to be done to ascertain whether this factor might be **a** subfactor of rote or meaningful memory.

Visual Memory

This factor was first suggested in a study by Carlson **(1937)** which was later re-analyzed by Humphreys and Fruchter **(1945).** It also appeared in several studies conducted by the Army Air Force *(cf.* Guilford and Lacey, **1947).** Later studies by Guilford, Fruchter, and Zimmerman **(1952),** Roff **(1951, 1953),** and by Christal **(1958)** helped to confirm it.

However, there has been considerable debate **as** to whether or not the visual memory factor was due to test content. Thurstone **(1946)** believed that "the memorizing factor transcends the nature of the content" while others (for example, Humphreys & Fruchter, **1945)** have stated that "memory factors can probably be multiplied almost indefinitely by relatively slight changes in the format and contents of memory tests." Recent work in memory (for example, Neisser, **1967)** has demonstrated the existence of iconic memory, which is used to store visual impressions. This suggests that visual memory is not simply the result of test content but also involves a cognitive process different from that used in other memory factors.

Guilford and Hoepfner (1971) describe six visual-figural memory abilities. These were investigated in Bradley et **al (1969).** However, only the factor memory for figural systems has been replicated in their laboratory (Hoffman et al, **1968).** It seems likely that this is the same aspect **of** visual memory involved in the Air Force (Guilford & Lacey, **1944)** and Christal **(1958)** studies. Other studies in the **past** decade **which** include factors that may be visual memory are Duncanson **(1966)** and Orpet and Meyers **(1966).** Petrov **(1970)** has found both an iconic memory factor and a factor for short-term retention **of** visual material.

The tests which appear to be the best markers for the memory for figural systems sub-factor are System-Shape Recognition, which requires the subject' to recognize the positions and orientations of simple figures studied earlier; Monogram Recall, which requires the subject to sketch arrangements of groups of three letters studied earlier; and Orientation Memory, which requires the subject to recall the locations **of** buildings on a previously studied **map.** The tests which seemed to be the best markers for visual memory in other studies include Map Memory, which **re**quires the subject to select the one of five small maps that is an accurate reproduction 'of **a** section of **a** large map previously studied; Plane Formation, which requires the subject to indicate the sections of **a** grid where planes were seen in a study picture; Position Memory, which requires the subject to recall the items as they appeared on a study page; and Space Memory, which requires the subject to identify the symbols that were located in each section of **a** study page.

It is recommended that **a** visual memory factor be included in the revised Kit. Research is needed to determine whether there is more than one factor in this domain.

Verbal Closure

This factor. which can be defined **as** the ability to solve problems requiring the identification of words when some of the letters are missing, disarranged, or mixed with other letters, was first found by Pemberton **(1952)** and by Mooney **(1954).** It appears to be similar to Guilford's factor called cognition **of** symbolic units. Messick and French **(1975)** have suggested that there may be separate factors or sub-factors for speed **of** verbal closure and for flexibility of verbal closure.

In the past decade verbal closure factors have appeared in studies by Adcock and Webberley **(1971),** Harris and Harris (Note

5), Messick and French **(1975)** and, somewhat less clearly, in several studies' in *Guilford's* laboratory (Gcrshon et **al, 1963;** Hoepfner et **al, 1964;** Hoepfner & Guilford, **1965;** Tenopyr et **al,** 1966; and Hoepfner et **al, 1968).** Additionally, three factor analytic studies of the cloze technique (Carver et al, Note **2;** Ohnmacht et **al, 1970;** Weaver & Kingston, **1963)** suggest that this procedure is probably related to semantic or verbal closure.

Tests which are suggested as markers for the verbal closure factor include Anagrams, which requires the subject to rearrange the letters of one word to form another word; Incomplete Words, which requires the subject to fill in the missing letters of common words; Four Letter Words, which requires the subject to locate four-letter words in a line of letters; and Scrambled Words, which requires the subject to unscramble four-letter nonsense words to make common words.

The evidence for this factor is sufficiently strong to recommend its inclusion in the revised Kit,

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS IN REPLICATING DIVERGENT PRODUCTION FACTORS

ABSTRACT

A battery of twenty-three tests, designed to measure the factors of associational fluency, expressional fluency, originality, semantic redefinition, sensitivity to problems, figural flexibility, and semantic flexibility were administered to fourteen groups of naval recruits. More than 350 subjects took each test. Factor analysis indicated that the associational and expressional fluency factors and the figural flexibility factor had been replicated. A new factor, called object flexibility, combined parts of the redefinition and semantic flexibility factors. Originality was found to be a combination of expressional fluency and object flexibility rather than a separate factor.

Factors and Reference Tests

As part of a project to revise the **1963** Kit, it was necessary to develop new "factor-referenced)' or "marker" tests for several cognitive factors related to divergent production. This portion of the project included developing twenty-two new tests, conducting a field try-out of these tests, and, from the data obtained, revising the tests and revising the definitions of the factors.

Divergent production is the term used to describe cognitive processes which involve the ability to produce a variety of words, phrases, or ideas in response to **a** stimulus. Tests of this type have many possible responses to **a** question rather than **a** single correct answer. The seven cognitive factors involved in this study are: **(1)** associational fluency, **(2)** expressional fluency, **(3)** originality, **(4)** semantic redefinition, (5) sensitivity to problems, (6) figural adaptive flexibility, and **(7)** semantic flexibility. The literature relevant to each factor reviewed in Chapter II is **a** part of the process of clarifying the definition of each factor and of developing hypotheses about the kinds **of** tests which would best mark these factors.

Associational fluency (FA). The tests developed **for** the associational fluency factor in this study ask the subject to write synonyms or antonyms for words, to provide words or phrases to complete figures of speech, **and** to list examples of objects in specified categories. The tests for this and the other factors in the study are listed in Table **1.**

Expressional fluency (FE). The tests developed for this factor require the subject to make sentences of a specified length when the initial letter of some words is specified, to write as **many**

Table 1
Summary of Test Variables in the Divergent Production Study

Test	Factor	# of Items*	Mean	S.D.	# of Subjects
11 Controlled Association†	FA	8	24.0	10.0	741
12 Opposites	FA	8	25.0	8.3	731
13 Figures of Speech	FA	10	20.0	6.7	746
14 Examples	FA	8	79.4	15.2	752
21 Making Sentences	FE	20	10.1	3.7	722
22 Arranging Words	FE	2	6.1	2.3	697
28 Rewriting	FE	6	6.5	2.9	728
31 Repartee	O	10	14.5	5.7	710
32 Cartoon Captions	O	6	10.6	6.7	728
33 Story Continuations	O	8	12.4	4.7	742
34 What Would Happen	O	8	11.2	4.6	757
41 Finding Useful Parts	RE	20	12.1	3.6	734
42 Combining Objects	RE	20	19.4	7.1	710
43 Substitute Uses	RE	20	14.4	4.0	697
51 Improving Things	SP	30	12.5	6.6	362
62 Planning	SP	10	4.2	2.1	719
53 Improving Laws and Custom	SP	20	8.9	4.2	360
61 Toothpicks	XF	10	6.1	3.7	733
62 Planning Patterns	XF	12	12.7	9.3	625
63 Storage	XF	2	1.8	1.7	675
71 Making Groups	XS	4	10.9	3.8	667
72 Different Uses	XS	8	13.9	6.2	719
73 Listing Objects	XS	2	39.9	9.3	736

*Since divergent production is involved, the number of possible responses exceeds the number of stimulus items
†This test from the 1963 Factor Kit was included for comparison purposes

sentences as possible using four specified words, and to rewrite sentences in several different ways.

Originality (O). The tests for this factor required the subject to rewrite a conversation to make it more interesting, to think of captions for cartoons, to write surprise endings for stories, and to think of the possible consequences of a described situation.

Semantic redefinition (RE). The tests require the subject to select the object which has a part that can meet a specified need, to name two objects which could be combined and used together to meet a specified need, and to think of common objects that can serve as substitutes for a given object.

Sensitivity to problems (SP). The tests require the subject to think of innovations for improving common objects, to point out logical deficiencies in plans, and to suggest improvements in laws and customs.

Figural adaptive flexibility (XF). The tests require the subject to provide different solutions for problems requiring the arrangement of toothpicks to form a specified number of squares,

to arrange a certain number of letters in different ways on a matrix of dots, and to arrange in different ways a number of small boxes in a larger container.

Semantic flexibility (XS). The tests developed for this factor require the subject to combine the objects in a list into different groups, to think of different uses for common objects, and to list objects that might be found in a given location.

Subjects and Experimental Design

The subjects were male Naval Recruits being processed through the Navy Training Center at San Diego, California, during the spring of 1972. The subjects were tested on fourteen different days with three or four companies being tested on a particular day. Data on the General Classification Test scores of the subjects indicate that the sample was probably representative of the Naval recruit population at the time of the study.

Since it was not feasible to administer all twenty-three tests to all subjects, an experimental design was developed in which daily samples were administered a selected subset of tests. Each test was given on several days to different subjects so as to minimize sampling bias. The number of subjects taking each test, shown in Table 1, ranges from a low of 350 to a high of 757. It should be noted that the design does not allow a complete matrix of intercorrelations among all tests.

Factor Analysis

The intercorrelations among the tests, based on tests taken by a common group of subjects, is shown in Table 2. All correlations are based on more than 350 subjects and on samples obtained on more than one day. As was expected, the highest correlations occur among tests for the same factor with slightly lower correlations among tests for factors which are hypothesized to combine into higher-order factors (such as fluency or flexibility). An exception is the Planning Patterns test which doesn't correlate well with anything, probably because of its low reliability (alpha coefficient .49).

The Minres method was used to obtain direct factor analysis, and, after determining the fit was adequate, derived orthogonal and oblique factors were obtained by Varimax and Oblimin rotations, respectively. Because the experimental design precluded obtaining a single solution for the entire group of tests, several

rized in Table 3. The factor symbols are used where the factor match seems reasonable.

As can be seen, associational fluency can be clearly differenti-

Table 2
Intercorrelation of Divergent Production Tests

Test	11	12	13	14	21	22	23	31	32	33	34	41	42	43	51	52	53	61	62	63	71	72	73
11	1.00	.64	.48	.45	.40	.44	.42								.23			.24	.14	.08	.24	.40	.43
12	.64	1.00	.51	.63	.48	.47	.47		.38	.51	.38							.27	.19	.20	.48	.46	.58
13	.48	.51	1.00	.49	.43	.45	.37		.33	.49	.27							.07	.18	−.14	.24	.41	.48
14	.45	.63	.49	1.00	.53	.54	.53		.39	.60	.55							.36	.12	.27	.38	.46	.70
21					1.00	.55	.53	.51	.28	.56		.33	.48	.40	.23								
22					.55	1.00	.48	.50	.30	.50		.30	.38	.48	.34								
23					.53	.48	1.00	.45	.38	.50		.40	.61	.47	.27								
31								1.00	.43	.53	.49	.29	.46	.37				.27	.00	.21	.42	.47	.52
32								.43	1.00	.55	.44						.31				.18	.41	.35
33								.53	.55	1.00	.53						.31				.36	.48	.41
34								.49	.44	.53	1.00						.42	.29	.13	.29	.52	.53	.60
41												1.00	.49	.46	.38	.40		.31	−.07	.35	.37	.34	.36
42												.49	1.00	.57	.49	.44		.40	.12	.41	.56	.55	.62
43												.46	.57	1.00	.51	.46		.33	−.01	.40	.42	.48	.54
51															1.00	.36							
52															.36	1.00	.50	.37	.00	.41	.33	.30	.32
53																.50	1.00	.18	−.04	.20			
61																		1.00	.18	.39	.26	.26	.26
62																		.18	1.00	.13	.02	.10	.04
63																		.39	.13	1.00	.22	.29	.16
71																					1.00	.47	.37
72																					.47	1.00	.49
73																					.37	.49	1.00

ated from expressional fluency, originality, and adaptive flexibility but not from semantic flexibility. The Controlled Associations and Opposites tests seem to be the best markers for this factor. The Figures of Speech test has some variance on expressional fluency. The Examples test was not a satisfactory marker for this factor.

Table 3
Oblique Factor Analysis of Divergent Production Tests: Schematic Summarization

Test	FA	FE	FA	O	FA XS	XF	FA XS	XF	FA 4	FE O	2	FE O	SR	FE O	SR 3	SR 2	FE	SR	O XS 1	O XS	XF 3	O XS	XF 3	XS 3	SR XS	XF	SR XS XF 3	XS 1	XS 3	XS 1	XF 3	SP 2	XF 3	XS
11	++	0			++	0	++	0	0																									
12	++	0	++	0	++	0	++	0	0																									
13	+	0	+	0	++	-	+	-	0																									
14	0	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	++																									
21	0	++								++	0	++	0	++	0	0	++	0																
22	0	++								++	0	++	0	++	0	0	+	0																
23	0	++								++	0	+	+	+	0	+	++	0																
31										++	0	++	0	++	0	0			++	0	++	0	+	0	0										
32			0	++						0	++								+	0														
33			0	++						++	0								++	0														
34			0	++															++	0	++	0	++	0	0										
41												0	++	0	0	+	0	+							+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+		
42												0	++	0	0	++	0	+							++	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0		
43												0	++	0	++	0	0	+							+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0		
51																	0	++																
52																																		
53																									0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	++	
61					0	+	0	+	0												0	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
63					0	++	0	++	0												0	++	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	++	0	++	0
71					+	0	+	0	0										0	++	++	+	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	
72					+	0	++	0	0										++	0	++	0	++	0	0	++	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	++	
73					++	0	+	0	+										++	0	++	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	

Key: ++ = Coefficients of .60 or higher
+ = Coefficients between .30 and .59
0 = Coefficients between .29 and −.29
− = Coefficients between −.30 and −.59

Expressional fluency can be clearly differentiated from associational fluency and semantic redefinition but not from originality. The Making Sentences and Arranging Words tests appear to be the best markers for this factor. The Rewriting test has considerable variance on semantic redefinition.

Originality appears to be differentiated from associational fluency and figural flexibility but not from expressional fluency or semantic flexibility. During analysis the Cartoon Captions test was dropped because it seemed to be measuring something different from the other originality tests.

While semantic redefinition is clearly differentiated from expressional fluency and figural flexibility, there is a definite question as to whether or not it can be separated from semantic flexibility.

It is difficult to make any decisions about the sensitivity to problems factor from the current analysis. The correlations among the pairs of tests are not high. The factor analyses for these tests show a tendency for them to combine with Semantic redefinition or flexibility tests.

The figural flexibility factor appears to be clearly differentiated from most of the other factors. The Planning Patterns Test is omitted because of low reliability.

While it is possible to differentiate between semantic flexibility and figural flexibility, it is more difficult to decide if the associational fluency and semantic redefinition factors are really measuring something different from semantic flexibility.

!Discussion and Conclusions

It seems likely that the divergent production factors which are being studied here were too narrowly conceptualized by Guilford.

The difficulty in separating associational fluency and semantic flexibility may be related to individual differences in the breadth of defining a word; Bereiter **(1960)** suggested that this may be part of a broader personality factor arising from "differences in looseness or rigor with which Ss interpret the given restrictions."

The problem of separating expressional fluency and originality may be related to the subjects' level of fluency. It seems likely that there is some minimal level of expressional competency which is necessary before creativity or originality in expression is possible.

Other researchers (Ward, **1967;** Fee, **1968;** Cropley and Maslany, **1969;** Murphy, **1973)** have found it impossible to obtain separate factors for the number of responses (fluency) and unique responses (originality), *so* the problems in obtaining an originality factor in this study are hardly unprecedented.

These findings tend to confirm the statement in Chapter II that there is little basis for differentiating between semantic redefinition and semantic flexibility, especially if the element of "spontaneous" changing of classes is not a critical part of the latter factor.

It might be possible to interpret the data in this study as comprising three larger factors:

I. Fluency of Association which includes the factors previously defined as associational fluency, semantic redefinition, and; possibly, semantic flexibility

II. Fluency of Expression which includes both expressional fluency and originality and, possibly, semantic flexibility

and 111. Fluency of Figures which includes figural flexibility and possibly other factors not part of this study.

However, this approach seems to be describing these factors too broadly.

The following factors appear fairly clear:

I. Associational Fluency which should be redefined to include all types of 'grouping responses and to involve tasks which require the recognition of common or associated properties

11. Expressional Fluency which should be redefined as the ability to think of word groups or phrases

III. Object Flexibility which should probably be conceptualized as the kind of mental set changing required to think of different uses for objects

and IV. Figural Flexibility which may be a figural form of object flexibility

There is some evidence to suggest that the kinds of mental processes required in listing specific components of a class or in listing objects that might be found together may constitute a currently undefined factor or be a part of object flexibility. Semantic originality seems to be a combination of expressional fluency and object flexibility rather than a separate factor.

CHAPTER IV

AN ATTEMPT TO CONFIRM FIVE NEW COGNITIVE REFERENCE FACTORS

ABSTRACT

The review of factor analytic literature indicated that the factors of concept attainment, verbal closure, figural fluency, integrative processes, and visual memory might be well-enough established to be considered as reference factors. Testa were developed to serve as markers for these factors. These testa were included in a battery of thirty-three tests which was designed to measure these five factors and also the factors of speed of closure, numerical facility, general reasoning, logical reasoning, spatial orientation, and figural flexibility. This test battery wae administered, using a matrix sampling experimental design, to more than 2,600 male naval recruits. Factor analysis indicated that the verbal closure, figural fluency, and verbal memory factors were successfully replicated, that there is some confusion between the integrative processes factor and some reasoning factors, and that the concept attainment factor could not be replicated.

Factors and Reference Tests

In conjunction with the revision of the 1063 Kit, the literature on cognitive factors was reviewed in Chapter II to determine what new factors had been found or had appeared in a sufficient number of studies to meet the criteria for a reference factor. The standard for a reference factor is that it has been found in a minimum of three studies done by at least two different researchers or laboratories. As discussed and described in the last section of Chapter II, five factors, not included in the earlier editions of the Factor Kit, met this requirement: (1) concept attainment, (2) verbal closure, (3) figural fluency, (4) integrative processes, and (5) visual memory.

The purpose of this study was to construct new tests similar to those which the literature described as having heavy loadings on these new factors and then, for a given sample of subjects, to determine the extent to which these factors could be substantiated and differentiated from other factors.

This section contains a brief description of the types of tests developed or selected for each factor.

Concept attainment (CA). The tests which were developed for this factor required the subject to find and mark two groups of four consecutive numbers which have some similarity or relationship, to describe how one group of three complex figures differs from another group, and to decide whether or not five words

in a list are conceptually related. The factors and the tests for each are shown in Table 4.

Verbal closure (CV). The tests require the subject to select from an array of letters the one letter which will begin a common

Table 4

Summary of Test Variables in the New Factors Study

Factor	Test Name	Number	No. of Items	Mean	S.D.	No. of Subjects
CA	Finding Number Groups	011	20	6.26	2.84	460
	Figure Group Naming	012	20	6.90	2.83	680
	Recognizing Word Groups	013	48	30.60	7.91	567
CS	Gestalt Completion**	031	20	16.24	3.66	544
	Concealed Words**	032	GO*	23.67	6.44	644
	Snowy Pictures	033	24	6.67	3.03	562
CV	Scrambled Words	041	50	27.06	9.92	553
	Hidden Words	043	114	63.98	16.87	663
	Incomplete Words	044	100	26.47	18.61	663
FF	Ornamentation	071	48	21.94	10.00	542
	Elaboration	072	40	24.21	8.96	545
	Symbols	073	5†	9.06	3.76	646
IP	Calendar	111	20	8.84	3.84,	674
	Following Directions	112	20	10.39	3.79	562
	Language Rules	113	30	17.22	7.48	558
MV	Shape Memory	141	32	21.40	4.28	662
	Building Memory	142	24*	10.90	4.73	564
	Map Memory	143	24*	17.12	3.90	563
N	Subtraction & Multiplication**	163	60	19.30	9.13	563
	Alphabet Distance Speed	154	120	20.73	12.73	562
	Addition & Subtraction Correction	166	120	42.72	14.29	663
RG	Mathematics Aptitude**	181	15	4.66	3.63	544
	Deciphering Languages'	183	24	8.78	3.04	570
	Necessary Arithmetic Operations**	184	16	4.80	3.09	544
RL	**Nonsense Syllogisms****	201	15†	6.46	2.12	557
	Diagramming Relationships	202	30†	12.13	6.21	557
	Letter Group Reasoning	204	48	36.80	7.09	541
S	**Card Rotations****	211	10†	43.96	24.60	550
	Cube Comparisons**	212	21	6.18	6.11	550
	Spatial Aspects	218	40	7.87	6.46	551
XF	Toothpicks	261	5†	4.11	2.62	551
	Drawing Assembly	262	2†	6.03	3.27	649
	Storage	263	1†	2.02	2.66	551

*One item not scored

†The number of etimuli;. score is the total number of correct responses to these stimuli

+*Testfrom the 1963 Factor kit

word when all of the letters are rearranged, to find and circle one or more four-letter words in each of several apparently random lines of letters, and to provide one or more letters to complete common words.

Figural fluency (FF). The testa require the subject to make as many different decorations as possible on two common objects, to supplement the existing decorations on two objects with as many different additions as possible, and to draw several different symbols for each of several words or phrases.

Integrative processes (ZP). The tests require the subject to select certain dates on a calendar by following fairly complex instructions, to determine the point in a matrix of letters that would be reached following a complex set of directions, and to make translations from English to an artificial language by following a complex series of rules.

Visual memory (MV). The tests developed for this factor require the subject to identify which irregular forms were previously seen, to indicate the location of certain buildings on a previously studied map, and to identify those maps which were previously presented.

In addition to these five new cognitive reference factors, six other factors were included in this study. These factors, (1) speed of closure, (2) numerical facility, (3) general reasoning, (4) logical reasoning, (5) spatial orientation, and (6) figural flexibility, were selected primarily because of the possibility of confusion between these established reference factors and the new factors. For example, it seemed desirable to determine whether figural fluency and figural flexibility could be separated since other researchers have sometimes had problems in distinguishing between fluency and flexibility. In some cases, because recent literature had modified the previous conceptualization of these established factors, new tests for these factors were developed.

Speed of closure (CS) is the ability to unite an apparently disparate perceptual field into a single gestalt. This factor was included in this study to determine if the Concealed Words test, a marker for this factor in the 1963 Kit, might tend to load on verbal closure instead, A new test for this factor, requiring the subject to identify objects partially obliterated by snow-like spatters, was developed.

The numerical facility factor (N) is defined as the ability to perform basic arithmetic operations with speed and accuracy. This factor was included to determine its relationship to the kinds of

reasoning required in concept attainment and integrative processes. Additionally, two new tests were developed for this factor to determine if it might be more broadly defined. These new tests require the subject to count as rapidly as possible the number of letters intervening between letter pairs and to indicate whether or not simple arithmetic problems have been completed correctly.

General reasoning (RG) was defined in the 1963 Kit as "the ability to solve a broad range of reasoning problems, including those of a mathematical nature." This factor was also included primarily to study its relationship to concept attainment and integrative processes. One new test, not related to mathematics, was developed for this factor. It requires the subject to use reasoning, from a few cues, to determine which of several possible translations of an artificial language is correct.

Logical reasoning (RL), which was called syllogistic reasoning in the 1963 Kit, is the ability to reason from stated premises to their conclusions. This factor was included to determine its relationship to concept attainment. Two new tests were developed for this factor; one requires the subject to select the diagram which best illustrates the relationship among three objects, while the other requires the subject to determine whether conclusions drawn about the relationships among groups of letters are true or false.

Spatial orientation (S) is the ability to perceive spatial patterns or to maintain spatial orientation with respect to objects in space, This factor was included chiefly to determine its relationship to the figural flexibility factor. A new test developed for this factor involves rather complex determinations of how the viewer's orientation has changed in relation to an object pictured in two different positions.

Figural flexibility is defined as the ability to change set in order to meet new requirements imposed by figural problems. Two new marker tests for this factor had been developed in an earlier study (Ekstrom, French, and Harman, 1974). An additional new test was developed for this factor, requiring the subject to use a limited number of figural elements in as many different ways as possible. This factor was included to determine if it could be differentiated from figural fluency since difficulty has occurred in separating semantic factors of flexibility and fluency.

The final test battery consisted of the thirty-three tests listed in Table 4.

Subjects and Experimental Design

The subjects were more than 2,500 male naval recruits being processed through the Navy Training Center at San Diego, California, during the spring of 1974. It should be noted that these subjects were all volunteer recruits and may not therefore represent a random sample of young adult males.

Because time constraints made it impossible to administer the entire test battery to any one group of subjects, a matrix sampling design was employed. Each individual was tested in a one-hour testing session and each test was administered in five or six different testing sessions. This provided approximately 500 cases on which to base the test statistics for each measure and from 80 to 98 cases to determine the correlations between any pairs of tests.

Psychometric Properties of the Tests

An item analysis was made for most of the newly developed tests. This analysis included the difficulty of each item and the item-test biserial correlation. In general, items that correlate less than .40 with total test score were not considered sufficiently valid for inclusion in marker tests. Four of the newly developed tests had no items which correlated less than .40 with total score. The median biserials for the item analyzed tests ranged from .44 to .80. The median difficulty (determined by percent passing an item correctly) for the item analyzed tests ranged from .21 to .85. Seven of the item analyzed tests had median difficulties below .50; it was concluded that these new tests were probably too difficult for this population, many of whom had not completed high school.

Reliabilities, usually computed as the split-half correlation between the two parts of the test adjusted to double length by the Spearman-Brown correction, were obtained for most of the tests. Coefficient alpha reliabilities were also computed for the item-analyzed tests. Except for the Nonsense Syllogisms tests, which had an alpha coefficient of .38, the tests had good to excellent reliabilities, generally in excess of .70.

The means and standard deviation for each test are shown in Table 4. As can be seen, a number of the tests were probably too difficult for this group.

Factor Analysis

The intercorrelations among the tests are shown in the upper triangle of Table 5. As was indicated earlier, because of the matrix

sampling design the number of cases on which these coefficients are based varies. The number of cases for each coefficient is given in the lower triangle of this table.

Table 5
Intercorrelation of Tests in the New Factors Study*

Test	011	012	013	031	032	033	041	043	044	071	072	073	111	112	113	141	142	143	153	154	155	181	183	184	201	202	204	211	212	213	261	262	263
CA 011		37	-02	21	31	31	21	17	26	22	26	05	15	39	21	-00	16	17	15	34	32	39	01	30	-10	13	16	31	31	24	14	22	22
2			33	27	13	23	23	14	32	23	14	11	44	31	42	08	24	26	14	39	50	46	40	25	36	41	21	35	47	41	19	29	25
3	86			16	13	23	27	13	23	14	11	14	31	42	42	08	24	26	14	41	50	46	40	21	36	32	24	36	26	30	35	23	20
	93	88		12	-05	04	46	41	27	-02	11	21	18	42	28	-06	20	-06	18	41	35	40	21	35	19	32	24	36	26	30	35	19	25
CS 031				26	32		-08	-09	14	-11	-11	13	28	15	-03	03	23	-02	13	12	-04	-03	-03		23	21	20	26	24	28	-03	08	13
2				19			17	17	39	26	12	23	20	16	07	28	09	-11	09	20	-15	32	03	21	18	21	04	15	-16	-07	18	24	14
3	86	85	87	87	86		29	02	-13	20	20	13	29	21	38	35	-22	01	20	15	01	20	14	01	08	16	15	19	19	21	10	11	05
CV 041		91	86	93	94		47	60		17	24	15	39	45	28	-01	28	04	32	24	43	18	-06	34	04	21	19	40	22	32	28	30	34
3		89	94	97	87	88	88	47		34	20	09	32	31	40	18	12	19	48	32	50	23	08	17	-04	19	28	22	37	28	12	13	07
4		89	90	97	87	88	97	88	E96	30	09	32	35	41	52	08	12	19	24	48	50	20	12	27	15	24	26	15	20	44	19	07	14
FF 071		90	97	87	85	97	92	97	97		71	39		05	22	14	17	13	08	29	02	21	-10	-71	06	23	-03	-23	-22	-06	13	10	-14
2		93	97	87	89	97	87	92	97	575		39		02	16	10	09	11	09	16	14	02	-04	19	03	21	-03	-15	-16	-07	19	28	-25
3		93	91	97	87	85	97	97	97	543	545		-09	10	21	-04	09	-13	11	19	16	28	24	19	12	30	-02	-22	-17	-15	06	34	-12
ZP 111		93	97	87	85	97	94	97	97	97			54	53		07	36	33	53	45	41	60	68	75	35	69	15	38	60	32	40	15	47	45
2		86	94	91	91	88	92	97	97	91	92	68				12	29	25	65	27	34	07	41	51	04	22	31	38	29	27	27	42	40
3		87	90	89	85	83	95	88	90	85	85	89	92	90	92	25	29	02	55	53	59	75	22	57	26	43	66	33	33	37	34	35	37	26
KT 141		92	87	96	91	92	92	95	95	96	96	96	96	90	92		40	38	00	23	13	41	28	21	-02	-05	21	30	25	37	21	-01	00
2		83	87	90	81	82	89	92	84	84	92	92	91	97	92	86		47	18	26	23	37	20	31	22	22	21	12	29	23	20	17	22
3		87	91	94	88	88	89	93	96	96	94	93	96	89	89	89	96		-10	22	01	44	11	21	04	22	02	35	18	38	02	22	28
N 153		91	86	94	89	89	97	91	97	97	97	97	91	93	92	90	92	88		33	69	48	12	50	07	20	25	08	-02	02	22	28	11
4		91	86	94	88	88	91	97	97	97	97	91	97	93	92	92	93	92	562		46	56	19	56	15	47	29	16	25	29	25	29	32
5		91	86	94	89	89	97	91	97	97	97	97	97	93	92	93	92	86	563	562		63	21	67	01	43	09	34	36	24	25	31	27
RG 181		87	87	90	87	85	89	88	88	88	87	87	87	97	89	89	89	90	97	97	97			49	60	13	50	28	07	42	40	15	32	44
2		89	93	90	92	96	91	95	96	96	95	96	97	95	89	90	96	96	96	96	96	93		30	16	47	50	38	21	32	17	07	17	27
4		87	87	90	87	85	89	88	88	88	87	87	87	89	85	89	89	89	87	87	87	544	90		16	52	28	28	32	16	29	28	23	38
RL 201		89	92	96	87	87	87	87	87	95	95	96	94	92	92	92	92	94	96	96	96	87	91	87		30	17	15	16	20	-17	-06	09
		87	92	90	89	89	92	88	88	88	95	95	97	90	91	86	95	95	95	95	95	88	88	88	547		38	26	19	32	06	-00	15
		88	87	89	87	87	83	82	85	85	76	78	79	84	85	88	89	89	87	86	87	89	90	89	90	87		36	25	33	16	21	08
S 21		91	86	90	91	95	91	96	96	96	77	79	80	92	90	96	95	86	96	97	96	93	93	93	96	91	79		42	40	21	17	22
		91	86	90	91	96	91	96	96	98	77	79	80	92	93	96	95	86	96	97	96	93	93	93	96	91	79	675		37	01	10	13
		87	82	90	87	83	89	87	89	88	74	76	77	83	84	88	88	88	87	87	87	87	91	91	83	82	76	967	967		01	11	40
XF 26		89	94	96	87	88	90	90	90	90	77	79	80	97	91	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	95	91	93	96	79	80	80	77		19	22
		94	94	97	87	88	93	90	90	90	76	78	79	97	91	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	96	92	79	79	79	79	550		15
		94	94	97	87	88	93	93	90	90	77	79	80	97	91	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	96	92	79	80	80	77	551	550	

*The correlation coefficients (with decimal point understood to precede each number) appear in the upper triangle; the number of cases on which each correlation is based is shown in the lower triangle.

The Minres method was used to obtain direct factor analyses. The criterion of using the number of principal components with roots greater than one lead to eleven common factors (fortuitously matching the number of factors designed in the experiment). However, despite the fact that unities had been used in the diagonal, the last four roots became negative. This indicates that this is probably an improper, non-Grammian, matrix and that the number of factors indicated by this criterion is almost definitely an overestimate.

When the eleven factors were rotated to orthogonal final factors by varimax and to oblique final factors by oblimin and orthoblique methods, it became apparent from the number of instances of a factor being identified by a single test that, indeed, too many factors had been extracted. Consequently, six, seven, and eight-factor solutions were then computed. Only the six-factor solution, shown in Table 6, did not produce Heywood cases.

Table 6
Varimax Solution for New Factors: 6 Factors

Test	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	h^2
011						.32	.27
2			.47				.45
3	.39	.37					.29
031			.30			.34	.26
2						.31	.28
3						.87	.83
041		.70				.32	.69
3		.63					.49
4		.74					.67
071				.82			.77
2				.76			.62
3			.31	.62			.57
111	.78						.74
2	.59	.35					.55
3	.71						.65
141					.61		.40
2					.39		.32
3					.78		.65
163	.65	.34					.64
4	.68						.43
5	.69	.49					.76
181	.81		.31		.37		.90
3			.69				.57
4	.75						.66
201			.63				.40
2	.36		.68				.52
4	.44						.36
211		.30		-.36			.47
2				-.32		.31	.44
3		.38	.36		.48		.60
261	.32						.18
2	.48						.31
3	.37						.28
Total	6.64	2.82	2.40	2.32	2.12	1.82	17.62

None of the solutions was very satisfactory in clearly identifying and delineating the factors that had been hypothesized. While the new factors of figural fluency, verbal closure, and visual memory appeared fairly clear, the integrative processes factor seemed inextricably intermingled with number facility, general reasoning and logical reasoning. Since one of the purposes of this study was to see how closely the obtained factors, using the new tests, would match the intended factor structure, it was decided to obtain the best orthogonal and oblique solutions to the desired targets. As can be seen from the orthogonal solution in Table 7, the resulting procrustean rotations are much closer to the hypothesized factors but are not as clean-cut as would be if all the intended markers were truly effective.

Table 7
Orthogonal Procrustes Factor Solution for New Factors: 11 Factors

Test	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
011	.74	.40						.31	.31		
2	.50								.34	.52	.50
3	.39							-.33	.45		
031		.67									
2		.57	.31		.43		-.55				
3		.59			.45		-.66				.41
041			.82							.33	
3			.54	.34	.32		.36				
4											
071				.68							
2				.71							
3				.66							
111											
2				.49	.49			.50			
3					.47			.39			
141	-.32					.63					
2						.38					
3						.93					
153			.30		.37		.62				
4							.36				
5			.31		.36		.64				
181					.54			.56			
3								.53			
4							.43	.50			
201									.57		.43
2									.50		
4					.36					.31	
211										.50	
2					.34					.56	
3						.34				.37	
261											.40
2					.37						.34
3											.36

Discussion and Conclusions

Of the new factors, verbal closure, visual memory, and figural fluency seemed to be clearly distinctive. The integrative processes factor seemed to be somewhat indistinct and difficult to separate from some of the reasoning factors. The concept attainment was not adequately replicated.

The verbal closure and speed of closure factors separated much more easily than had been anticipated. It had been thought that the verbal content of the Concealed Words Test might make it load with tests **of** verbal closure. This did occur in the eleven factor orthogonal solution but did not occur in the six factor solution; it was also insignificant in the targeted solution. This **implies** that speed of closure requires **a** search of the visual memory store for objects or words which might fit a given configuration while the search in verbal closure requires the subject to focus on the lexographic properties of the stimulus.

The figural fluency factor also proved to be very distinctive. While this factor might have combined with the figural flexibility factor, as has sometimes happened with semantic factors of fluency and flexibility, such a combination did not occur in any analysis. These data suggest that figural fluency may be a projection of the semantic ideational fluency factor into the figural realm and, as such, it should be clearly distinguishable from flexibility. In both ideational fluency and figural fluency the extent of set-breaking required is trivial compared to that demanded for the flexibility factors.

The visual memory factor split in the original eleven factor solutions but **was** clearly distinct in the six factor and targeted solutions. The Building Memory test appears to be a less satisfactory marker for this factor than the other two tests but Shape Memory shows more variance on other factors in the target solution.

As mentioned earlier, **a** major problem in this study was the tendency of the integrative processes factor to combine with several other factors, especially general reasoning. Even in the targeted solutions, the data supporting this factor are weak. One possible hypothesis is that general reasoning involves the ability to organize and use information systematically when problem solving. If so, then when the set of data to be integrated is or can be organized in some systematic fashion or when the systematic **organization** of the data is **a** strategy which may be employed by **a** significant proportion of subjects, it may be difficult to obtain

separate factors **of** general reasoning and **of** integrative processes. If it were not that similar tests have worked well in other studies, it would be difficult to recommend that they might work better as markers for the integrative processes factor in other samples *of* subjects.

Of the new tests tried out **as** additional markers for established factors, Snowy Pictures, Addition and Subtraction Correction, and Diagramming Relationships seemed to work well. Deciphering Languages, which had been designed to be **a** marker for general reasoning, appears to be **a** better measure for logical reasoning, Several of these tests need *to* be simplified if they are **to** be **used** with secondary-school age subjects.

It can be concluded that **the** attempt to replicate the verbal closure and figural fluency factors **was** successful, that the visual memory factor was adequately confirmed, that there is some confusion between integrative processes **and** some of the reasoning factors, and that the attempt to replicate the concept attainment factor failed completely.

Reference Notes

1. Ball, R. S., & Merrifield, P. R. Factor analysis of infant and preschool tests. Paper presented at symposium on Social Research and Child Development, Berkeley, California, 1963.

2. Carver, R. P., Johnson, R. L., & Friedman, H. L. Factor analysis of the ability to comprehend time-compressed speech. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, February 1971.

3. Eindhoven, J. Personal communication, 1972.

4. Ellis, N. R. Memory processes in retardates and normals: Theoretical and empirical considerations. Paper presented at the Gatlinburg Conference on Research and Theory in Mental Retardation, March 1968.

5. Harris, C. W., & Harris, M. L. Evidence concerning the Thurstone, Guttman, and Guilford schema for classifying selected cognitive abilities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, February 1971.

6. Johnson, R. L. Personal communications, 1971 and 1972.

7. Kropp, R. P., & Stoker, H. W. The construction and validation of tests of the cognitive processes as described in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1966.

8. Lovinger, R. J., Harris, A. J., & Cohen, J. Factor analysis of intellectual performance in disadvantaged Negro adolescents. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, February 1966.

HCA

98/688 = 14.24%

10c/46c (= 22%)

References

Adams, J. S. *Human memory.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Adcock, C. J., & Martin, W. A. Flexibility and creativity. *Journal of General Psychology,* 1971, *85,* 71-76.

Adcock, C. J., & Webberley, M. Primary mental abilities. *Journal of General Psychology,* 1971, *84,* 229-243.

Adkins, D., & Lyerly, S. *Factor analysis of reasoning tests.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1952.

Aftanas, M. S., & Royce, J. R. A factor analysis of brain damage tests administered to normal subjects with factor score comparisons across age. *Multivariate Behavioral Research,* 1969, *4,* 459-481.

Allison, R. B. *Learning parameters and human abilities.* (Tech. Rep., Educational Testing Service and Princeton University.) Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1960.

Allport, F. H. *Theories of perception and the concept of structure.* New York: Wiley, 1955.

Anderson, H. E., Jr., & Leton, D. A. Factor analysis of the California Test of Mental Maturity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 1964, *24,* 513-523.

Anderson, H. E., Jr., White, W. F., & Stevens, J. C. Student creativity, intelligence, achievement, and teacher classroom behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology,* 1969, *78,* 99-107.

Arnold, E. M. Is temporal integration a distinct mental ability? *Australian Journal of Psychology,* 1967, *19,* 41-47.

Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. Human memory: A proposed system and its control process. In K. W. Spence & J. T. Spence (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation.* New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bart, W. M. The factor structure of formal operations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1971, *41,* 70-77.

Bennett, S. N. Divergent thinking abilities—A validation study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1973, *43,* 1-7.

Bereiter, C. Verbal and ideational fluency in superior tenth grade students. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1960, *51,* 337-345.

Biggs, J. B., Fitzgerald, D., & Atkinson, S. M. Convergent and divergent abilities in children and teachers' ratings of competence and certain classroom behaviors. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1971, *41,* 277-286.

Blaine, D., Dunham, J., & Pyle, T. Type and amount of available past instances in concept learning. *Psychonomic Science,* 1968, *12,* 159-160.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bradley, P. A., Hoepfner, R., & Guilford, J. P. A factor analysis of figural-memory abilities. *Reports from the Psychology Laboratory, University of Southern California,* No. 43, 1969.

Broverman, D., Broverman, I., Vogel, W., & Palmer, R. The automatization cognitive style and physical development. *Child Development,* 1964, *35,* 1343-1359.

Brown, S. W., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. A factor analysis of semantic memory abilities. *Reports from the Psychology Laboratory, University of Southern California,* No. 37, July 1966.

Brown, S. W., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Six semantic-memory abilities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 1968, *28,* 691-717.

Bunderson, C. V. *Transfer functions and learning curves: The use of ability constructs in studying human learning* (ETS RB-64-62). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1964.

Bunderson, C. V. *Transfer of mental abilities at different stages of practice in the solution of concept problems* (ETS RB-67-20). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Burt, C. The factor analysis of the Wechsler scale II. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 1960, *13*, 82-87.
Cardinet, J., & Rousson, M. Etude factorielle de tests d'aptitudes scolaires. *Schweitzerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 1967, *26*, 256-269, 362-379.
Carlson, H. S. Factor analysis of memory ability. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1937, *21*, 477-492.
Carroll, J. B. A factor analysis of verbal abilities. *Psychometrika*, 1941, *6*, 279-307.
Carroll, J. B. *Psychometric tests as cognitive tasks: A new "Structure of Intellect"* (ETS RB-74-16). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.
Cassel, R. N., & Eichstaedt, A. C. Factorial structure of CQT, ACT, and SAT scores for 50 available college freshmen. *Journal of Psychology*, 1969, *71*, 199-204.
Cattell, R. B. *Abilities: Their structure, growth, and action.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.
Cave, R. L. A combined factor analysis of creativity and intelligence. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1970, *5*, 177-191.
Christal, R. E. Factor analytic study of visual memory. *Psychological Monographs*, 1958, *72* (13, Whole No. 466).
Christensen, P. R., & Guilford, J. P. An experimental study of verbal fluency factors. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 1963, *26* (Part 1), 1-26.
Claeys, W. La structure factorielle de l'intelligence des Congolais au seuil de leurs études universitaires. *Psychologica Belgica*, 1967, *7*, 7-15.
Cohen, J. The factorial structure of the WAIS between early adulthood and old age. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1957, *21*, 451-457.
Coombs, C. H. A factorial study of number ability. *Psychometrika*, 1941, *6*, 161-189.
Cropley, A. J. Creativity and intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1966, *36*, 259-266.
Cropley, A. J., & Maslany, G. W. Reliability and factorial validity of the Wallach-Kogan creativity tests. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1969, *60*, 395-398.
Davis, P. C. A factor analysis of the Wechsler-Bellevue Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1956, *16*, 127-146.
Davis, L. J., Jr., & Swenson, W. M. Factor analysis of the Wechsler Memory Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, *35*, 430.
de Mille, R. Intellect after lobotomy in schizophrenia. *Psychological Monographs*, 1962, *76* (16, Whole No. 535).
Detterman, D. K., & Ellis, N. R. A factor analytic demonstration of two memory processes. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1970, *22*, 484-493.
Droege, R. C., & Hawk, J. A factorial investigation of nonreading aptitude tests. *Proceedings, 78th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association*, 1970, 113-114.
Duncanson, J. P. Learning and measured abilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1966, *57*, 220-229.
Dunham, J. L., & Bunderson, C. V. Effect of decision-rule instruction upon the relationship of cognitive abilities to performance in multiple-category concept problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1969, *60*, 121-125.
Dunham, J. L., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Abilities pertaining to classes and the learning of concepts. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 39, November 1966.
Dunham, J. L., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Multivariate approaches to discovering the intellectual components of concept learning. *Psychological Review*, 1968, *75*, 206-221.
Dunham, J. L., Guilford, J. P., and Hoepfner, R. The cognition, production, and memory of class concepts. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1969, *29*, 615-638.

Dye, N. W., & Very, P. S. Growth changes in factorial structure by age and sex. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1968, *78*, 55-88.
Ekstrom, R. B. *A comparison of two groups of reference tests measuring selected perception and closure factors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1967.
Ekstrom, R. B. *Cognitive factors: Some recent literature* (ETS PR-73-30). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
Ekstrom, R. B., French, J. W., & Harman, H. H. *Problems of replication of seven divergent production factors* (ETS PR 74-14). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.
Ekstrom, R. B., French, J. W., & Harman, H. H. *An attempt to confirm five recently identified cognitive factors* (ETS PR 75-17). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.
El-Abd, H. *A study of certain closure factors in relation to Guilford's structure of intellect.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London, 1963.
El-Abd, H. A. The intellect of East African students. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1970, *5*, 423-433.
Eysenck, H. J. Intellectual assessment: A theoretical and experimental approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1967, *37*, 81-98.
Fee, F. An alternative to Ward's factor analysis of Wallach and Kogan's "creativity" correlations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1968, *38*, 319-321.
Fleishman, E. A., & Rich, S. Role of kinesthetic and spatial-visual abilities in perceptual-motor learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1963, *66*, 6-11.
Fleishman, J. L., & Dusek, E. R. Reliability and learning factors associated with cognitive tests. *Psychological Reports*, 1971, *29*, 523-530.
Flores, M. B., & Evans, G. T. Some differences in cognitive abilities between selected Canadian and Filipino students. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1972, *7*, 175-191.
Follman, J., Miller, W., & Hernandez, D. Factor analysis of achievement, scholastic aptitude and critical thinking subtests. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1969, *38*, 48-53.
Frederiksen, C. H. Abilities, transfer, and information retrieval in verbal learning. *Multivariate Behavioral Research Monograph*, No. 69-2, 1969.
Frederiksen, J. *The role of cognitive factors in the recognition of ambiguous visual stimuli* (ETS RB-65-23). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1965.
French, J. W. The description of aptitude and achievement factors in terms of rotated factors. *Psychometric Monograph No. 5.* Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
French, J. W. *The description of personality measurements in terms of rotated factors.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953.
French, J. W. The relationship of problem-solving styles to the factor composition of tests. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1965, *25*, 9-28.
French, J. W. *Toward the establishment of noncognitive factors through literature search and interpretation* (ETS PR-73-20). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
French, J. W., Ekstrom, R. B., & Price, L. A. *Kit of reference tests for cognitive factors.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.
Games, P. A. A factor analysis of verbal learning tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1962, *63*, 1-11.
Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. Language aptitude, intelligence, and second-language achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1965, *56*, 191-199.
Gershon, A., Guilford, J. P., & Merrifield, P. R. Figural and symbolic divergent-production abilities in adolescent and adult populations. *Reports*

from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California, No. 29, April 1963.

Goolsby, T. M., Jr., Frary, R. B., & Lasco, R. A. Factorial structure and principal correlates of the Florida Bar Examination. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1968, *28*, 427-432.

Goolsby, T. M., Jr., Frary, R. B., & Lasco, R. A. Selecting and supplementing an appropriate achievement battery for an experimental school—A factor analytic approach. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1969, *29*, 403-408.

Goss, A. E., & Nodine, C. F. *Paired-associates learning*. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Gotts, E. E. *Indiana Perceptual Development Battery*. Bloomington, Indiana: Institute for Child Study, Indiana University, 1971.

Grant, G. V., & Schepers, J. M. An exploratory factor analysis of five new cognitive tests for African mineworkers. *Psychologiz Africana*, 1969, *12*, 181-192.

Grimaldi, J., Loveless, E., Hennessy, J., & Prior, J. Factor analysis of 1970-71 version of the Comparative Guidance and Placement Battery. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1971, *31*, 959-963.

Groen, G. J., & Parkman, J. M. A chronometric analysis of simple addition. *Psychological Review*, 1972, *79*, 329-343.

Guilford, J. P. The difficulty of a test and its factor composition. *Psychometrika*, 1941, *6*, 67-77.

Guilford, J. P. *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Guilford, J. P. Thurstone's primary mental abilities and structure-of-intellect abilities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1972, *77*, 129-143.

Guilford, J. P., Fulgosi, A., & Hoepfner, R. A multivariate analysis of some controlled-association tasks. *Journal of General Psychology*, 1970, *83*, 119-134.

Guilford, J. P., Fruchter, B., & Zimmerman, W. S. Factor analysis of the Army Air Forces Sheppard Field Battery of experimental aptitude tests. *Psychometrika*, 1952, *17*, 45-68.

Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Sixteen divergent-production abilities at the ninth-grade level. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1966, *1*, 43-66.

Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. *The analysis of intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Guilford, J. P., Hoepfner, R., & Peterson, H. Predicting achievement in ninth grade mathematics from measures of intellectual aptitude factors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1965, *25*, 659-682.

Guilford, J. P., Kettner, N. W., & Christensen, P. R. A factor analytic study of the factor called general reasoning. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1956, *16*, 438-453.

Guilford, J. P., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.) *Printed classification tests*. Army Air Force Aviation Psychology Program Research Reports, No. 5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Gustafson, R. A. Factor analyzing the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, *Psychology in the Schools*, 1970, *7*, 226-227.

Guthrie, G. M. Structures of abilities in a non-Western culture. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1963, *54*, 94-103.

Guthrie, G. M., Sinaiko, H. W., & Brislin, R. Non-verbal abilities of Americans and Vietnamese. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1971, *84*, 183-190.

Guttman, L. Integration of test design and analysis. *Proceedings of the 1969 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Haag, R. A., & David, K. H. The latent dimensions of several measures of creativity. *Journal of General Psychology*, 1969, *80*, 279-285.

Halstead, W. C. *Brain and intelligence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Harris, M. L., & Harris, C. W. A factor analytic interpretation strategy. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1971, *31*, 589-606.

Harvey, O. J., Hoffmeister, J. K., Coates, C., & White, B. J. A partial evaluation of Torrance's tests of creativity. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1970, *7*, 359-372.

Haynes, J. R. Hierarchical analysis of factors in cognition. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1970, *7*, 55-68.

Hendricks, M., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Measuring creative social abilities. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 42, January 1969.

Hertzka, A. F., Guilford, J. P., Christensen, P. R., & Berger, R. M. A factor-analytic study of evaluative abilities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1954, *14*, 581-597.

Hettema, J. Cognitive abilities as process variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1968, *10*, 461-471.

Hoepfner, R., & Guilford, J. P. Figural, symbolic, and semantic factors of creative potential in ninth-grade students. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 35, June 1965.

Hoepfner, R., Guilford, J. P., & Bradley, P. A. Identification of transformation abilities in the structure-of-intellect model. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 41, December 1968.

Hoepfner, R., Guilford, J. P., & Bradley, P. A. Information-transformation abilities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1970, *30*, 785-802.

Hoepfner, R., Guilford, J. P., & Merrifield, P. R. A factor analysis of the symbolic-evaluation abilities. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 33, December 1964.

Hoffman, K., Guilford, J. P., Hoepfner, R., & Doherty, W. A factor analysis of the figural-cognition and figural-evaluation abilities. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 40, December 1968.

Hollenbeck, G. P., & Kaufman, A. S. Factor analysis of the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1973, *29*, 41-45.

Holmberg, G. R. *A factor analysis of the intellectual abilities of deaf children as measured by the "structure of intellect" model*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1967.

Holtz, R. R. A study of selected creative thinking tests in conjunction with measures of personality and intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.

Horn, J. L., & Bramble, W. J. Second-order ability structure revealed in rights and wrongs scores. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1967, *58*, 115-122.

Horn, J. L., & Cattell, R. B. Refinement and test of the theory of fluid and crystallized intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1966, *57*, 253-270.

Hueftle, M. K. A factor analytic study of the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967.

Humphreys, L. G., & Fruchter, B. Re-analysis of Memory Batteries I and II. San Antonio Psychological Research Unit, Research Bulletin T 45-15, 1945.

Hundal, P. S., & Handa, R. K. A factor-analytic study of a test battery at age-level 14 years. *Psychological Studies*, 1967, *12*, 77-82.

Irvine, S. H. Towards a rationale for testing attainments and abilities in Africa. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1966, *36*, 24-32.

Irvine, S. H. Factor analyses of African abilities and attainments: Constructs across cultures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, *71*, 20-32(a).

Irvine, S. H. Figural tests of reasoning in Africa. *International Journal of Psychology*, 1969, *4*, 217-228(b).
Irvine, S. H. Affect and construct: A cross-cultural check on theories of intelligence. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1970, *80*, 23-30.
Jensen, A. R. *Individual differences in learning: Interference factor.* Cooperative Research Report No. 1867, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
Jones, L. V. Primary abilities in the Stanford-Binet, age 13. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1954, *84*, 125-147.
Kagan, J., Pearson, L., & Welch, L. Conceptual impulsivity and inductive reasoning. *Child Development*, 1966, *37*, 583-594.
Keats, J. A. An experimental study of cognitive factors. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 1965, *17*, 52-57.
Kelley, H. P. *A factor analysis of memory abilities* (ETS RB-54-7). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1954.
Khan, S. B. Development of mental abilities: An investigation of the "differentiation hypothesis." *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1970, *24*, 199-205.
Khan, S. B. Learning and the development of verbal ability. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1972, *9*, 607-614.
Klonoff, H. Factor analysis of a neuropsychological battery for children aged 9 to 15. *Perceptual Motor Skills*, 1971, *32*, 603-616.
Kohfeld, D. L. The prediction of perceptual-motor learning from independent verbal and motor measures. *Psychonomic Science*, 1966, *4*, 413-414.
Kotaskova, J. Faktorova analyza individualnich trendu vyvoje intelektovych schopnosti. *Psychologia a Patopsychologia Dietata*, 1967, *3*, 5-15.
Kumar, V. K. The structure of human memory and some educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 1971, *41*, 379-417.
Kunnapas, T. Figural reversal rate and personal tempo. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 1969, *10*, 27-32.
Lemke, E. A., Klausmeir, H. J., & Harris, C. W. Relationship of selected cognitive abilities to concept attainment and information processing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1967, *58*, 27-35.
Lesser, G. S., Fifer, G., & Clark, D. H. Mental abilities of children from different social class and cultural groups. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1965, *30*.
Locke, E. A. Some correlates of classroom and out-of-class achievement in gifted science students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1963, *54*, 238-248.
Lovell, K., & Shields, J. B. Some aspects of a study of the gifted child. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1967, *37*, 201-208.
Lucas, C. M., & French, J. W. *A factorial study of experimental tests of integration, judgement, and planning* (ETS RB-53-16). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953.
Lumsden, J. *The structure of immediate memory.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Western Australia, 1965.
Lunneborg, C. E. A research review of the Washington Pre-College Testing Program. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1966, *3*, 157-166.
Lunneborg, C. E., Greenmun, R., & Lunneborg, P. W. A factor analysis of the core elements of the CEEB Comparative Guidance and Placement Battery. *Educational Psychological Measurement*, 1970, *30*, 387-392.
MacArthur, R. S. Some cognitive abilities of Eskimo, White, and Indian-Metis pupils aged 9 to 12 years. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 1969, *1*, 50-59.
Madeus, G. F. Divergent thinking and intelligence: Another look at a controversial question. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1967, *4*, 227-235.
Manley, M. B. *A factor analytic study of three types of concept attainment tasks* (ETS RB-65-31). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1965.
Maxwell, A. E. Discrepancies in the variances of test results for normal and neurotic children. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 1960, *13*, 165-172.

May, F., & Metcalf, A. A factor-analytic study of spontaneous flexibility measures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1965, *25*, 1039-1050.
McCartin, R. A., Sr., & Meyers, C. E. An exploration of six semantic factors at first grade. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1966, *1*, 74-94.
McKenna, V. V. *Stylistic factors in learning and retention* (ETS RB-68-28). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.
McWhinnie, H. J. A factor analytic study of perceptual behavior in 4th and 5th grade children. *Acta Psychologica, Amsterdam*, 1970, *34*, 89-97.
Messick, S., & French, J. W. Dimensions of closure in cognition and personality. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1975, *10*, 3-16.
Messick, S., & Kogan, N. Category width and quantitative aptitude. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1965, *20*, 493-497.
Meuris, G. Measurement of mental aptitudes in secondary education. *Revue de Psychologies et des Sciences de l'Education*, 1969, *4*, 270-279.
Meuris, G. Measurement of reasoning in high school education. *Information Psychologique*, October 1969, No. 36, 3-25.
Meuris, G. The structure of Primary Mental Abilities of Belgian secondary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1970, *7*, 191-197.
Meyer, W. J., & Bendig, A. W. A longitudinal study of the Primary Mental Abilities Test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1961, *52*, 50-60.
Meyers, C. E., Dingman, H. F., & Orpet, R. E. Four ability-factor hypotheses at three preliterate levels in normal and retarded children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1964, *29*.
Michael, W. B., Cathcart, R., & Zimmerman, W. S. Linguistic factors in various measures of communication skills for college students with implications for predictive validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1964, *24*, 363-367.
Miller, G. A. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 1956, *63*, 81-97.
Mittler, P., & Ward, J. The use of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities on British four-year-old children: A normative and factorial study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1970, *40*, 43-54.
Montgomery, G. W. G. A factorial study of communication and ability in deaf school leavers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1968, *38*, 27-37.
Mooney, C. M. A factorial study of closure. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1954, *8*, 51-60.
Mukherjee, B. N. The factorial structure of aptitude tests at successive grade levels. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 1962, *25* (Part 1), 59-69.
Mullins, P. G. *An alternative form of examination in geography at GCE "O" level.* Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Manchester (England) University, 1967.
Murphy, R. T. *Investigation of a creativity dimension* (ETS RB-73-12). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
Nasca, D. *Effect of varied presentation of laboratory exercises within programmed materials on specific intellectual factors of science problem solving behavior.* Brockport, N.Y.: State University College, 1965.
Neisser, U. Visual search. *Scientific American*, 1964, *210*, 94-102.
Neisser, U. *Cognitive psychology.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
Nguyen-Xuan, Anh. Investigation of a hypothesis concerning the development process using a factorial model. *Bulletin de l'Institute National d'Etude de Travail et d'Orientation Professionnelle*, 1969, Vol. 25.
Nihira, K., Guilford, J. P., Hoepfner, R., & Merrifield, P. R. A factor analysis of the semantic-evaluation abilities. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 32, December 1964.
Norden, K. The structure of abilities in a group of deaf adolescents. *Educational and Psychological Interactions*, 1970, No. 32.
Norman, D. A. (Ed.) *Models of human memory.* New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Nunnally, J. C., & Hodges, W. F. Some dimensions of individual differences in word association. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1965, *4*, 82-88.
O'Connor, G. Problems of optimum selection. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1968, *27*, 715-720.
Ohnmacht, F. W., Weaver, W. W., & Kohler, E. T. Cloze and closure: A factorial study. *Journal of Psychology*, 1970, *74*, 205-217.
Olson, A. V. Factor analytic studies of the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. *Journal of Special Education*, 1968, *2*, 429-433.
Olson, A. V., & Fitzgibbon, N. H. Factor analytic investigation of two reading readiness tests. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1968, *27*, 611-614.
Olson, J. R. *A factor analytic study of the relation between speed of visual perception and language abilities of deaf adolescents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966.
Orpet, R. E., & Meyers, C. E. Six structure-of-intellect hypotheses in six-year-old children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1966, *57*, 341-346.
Osborne, R. T., & Lindsey, J. M. A longitudinal investigation of changes in the factorial composition of intelligence with age in young school children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1967, *110*, 49-58.
O'Sullivan, M., Guilford, J. P., & de Mille, R. Measurement of social intelligence. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, 1965, No. 34.
Paivio, A. A factor-analytic study of word attributes and verbal learning. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1968, *7*, 41-49.
Parker, J. F., Jr. The identification of performance dimensions through factor analysis. *Human Factors*, 1967, *9*, 367-373.
Pawlik, K. Concepts and calculations in human cognitive abilities. In R. B. Cattell (Ed.), *Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
Pemberton, C. The closure factors related to other cognitive processes. *Psychometrika*, 1952, *17*, 267-288.
Petrov, Y. I. Memory structure as a psychic function. *Voprosi Psikhologii*, 1970, *16*, 132-136.
Pimsleur, P., Stockwell, R. P., & Comrey, A. L. Forcign language learning ability. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1962, *53*, 15-26.
Pounders, C. J. The Admission Test for Graduate Study in Business: A factor analytic study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1970, *30*, 469-473.
Quereshi, M. Y. Patterns of psycholinguistic development during early and middle childhood. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1967, *27*, 353-365.
Radcliffe, J. A. WAIS factorial structure and factor scores for ages 18 to 54. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 1966, *18*, 228-238.
Ramsey, P. H., & Vane, J. R. A factor analytic study of the Stanford-Binet with young children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1970, *8*, 279-284.
Rankin, R. J., & Thompson, K. A factor analytic approach to impulse as measured by Arrow Dot I, Q, and SORT. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1966, *23*, 1239-1245.
Rankin, R., & Thompson, K. A factorial investigation of scores on the Porteus Maze. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1966, *23*, 1255-1260.
Reed, S. C. *Some relationships between conceptual complexity and mental abilities* (ETS RB-66-33). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966.
Richards, P. N., & Bolton, N. Type of mathematics teaching, mathematical ability, and divergent thinking in junior school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1971, *41*, 32-37.
Roff, M. *Personnel selection and classification procedures: Spatial tests.* Randolph Field, Texas: USAF School of Aviation Medicine, 1951.
Roff, M. A factorial study of tests in the perceptual area. *Psychometric Monograph*, 1953, No. 8.

Royce, J. R. The conceptual framework for a multi-factor theory of individuality. In J. R. Royce (Ed.), *Multivariate analysis and psychological theory*. London and New York: Academic Press, 1973. Pp. 305-407.
Royce, J. R., Yeudall, L. T., & Bock, C. Factor analytic studies of human brain damage: I. First- and second-order factors and their brain correlates. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1976, *11*, 381-418.
Ryan, S. F., & Whimbey, A. E. STM abilities in LTM tasks. *Psychonomic Science*, 1968, *10*, 297-298.
Secadas, F. Una concepción evolutivo-diferencial de la inteligencia. *Revista de Psicologia General y Aplicada*, 1967, *22*, 83-106.
Semler, I. J., & Iscoe, I. Structure of intelligence in Negro and White children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1966, *57*, 326-336.
Silverstein, A. B. An alternative factor analytic solution for Wechsler's intelligence scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1969, *29*, 763-767.
Singer, E., & Roby, T. B. Dimensions of decision-making behavior. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1967, *24*, 571-595.
Singer, H. Validity of the Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity Test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1965, *25*, 479-491.
Smart, R. C. The changing composition of "intelligence": A replication of a factor analysis. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1965, *107*, 111-116.
Smith, I. M. *Spatial ability: Its educational and social significance.* San Diego, California: Knapp, 1964.
Smith, W. C. *A factor analytic study of the "Test of Sound Reasoning."* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966.
Stjernberg, G., & Werdelin, I. On the nature of the perceptual speed factor. *Didakometry*, 1968, No. 20.
Stott, L. H., & Ball, R. S. *Evaluation of infant and preschool tests.* Detroit: Merrill-Palmer, 1963.
Strowig, R. W., & Alexakos, C. E. Overlap between achievement and aptitude scores. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 1969, *2*, 157-167.
Taylor, C. W., Ghiselin, B., & Yagi, K. *Exploratory research on communication abilities and creative abilities.* Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah, 1967.
Tenopyr, M. L. *A factor-analytic study of symbolic-memory abilities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.
Tenopyr, M. L., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. A factor analysis of symbolic memory abilities. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 38, December 1966.
Thorndike, R. L. Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1936, *27*, 231-233.
Thurstone, L. L. A factorial study of perception. *Psychometric Monograph*, 1944, No. 4.
Thurstone, L. L. Theories of intelligence. *Scientific Monthly*, 1946, *62*, 101-112.
Traub, R. A factor analysis of programmed learning and ability measures. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 1970, *2*, 44-59.
Vandenberg, S. G. The hereditary abilities study: Hereditary components in a psychological test battery. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 1962, *14*, 220-237.
Vandenberg, S. G. Factor analytic studies of the Lincoln Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1964, *19*, 23-41.
Vandenberg, S. G. The primary mental abilities of South American students: A second comparative study of the generality of a cognitive factor structure. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1967, *2*, 175-198.
Vernon, P. E. Effects of administration and scoring on divergent thinking tests. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1971, *41*, 245-257.
Very, P. S., & Iacono, C. H. Differential factor structure of seventh grade students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1970, *117*, 239-251.
Wallach, M. A., & Kogan, N. *Modes of thinking in young children: A study*

of the creativity-intelligence distinction. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
Ward, J. An oblique factorization of Wallach and Kogan's "creativity" correlations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1967, *37,* 380-382.
Ward, J. The factor structure of the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1970, *40,* 65-67.
Wardell, D. *Cognitive-affective linkages and the concept of style.* Edmonton: University of Alberta, Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Psychology, 1973.
Wardell, D. *Possible changes in the taxonomies in Royce.* Edmonton: University of Alberta, Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Psychology, 1973.
Weaver, W. W., & Kingston, A. J. A factor analysis of the cloze procedure and other measures of reading and language ability. *Journal of Communication,* 1963, *13,* 252-261.
Wedeck, J. The relationship between personality and psychological ability. *British Journal of Psychology,* 1947, *37,* 133-151.
Weiner, M. Organization of mental abilities from ages 14 to 54. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 1964, *24,* 573-587.
Werdelin, I. *Mathematical ability: Experimental and factorial studies.* Lund, Sweden: Gleerups, 1958.
Werdelin, I. *Geometrical ability and the space factor in boys and girls.* Lund, Sweden: Gleerups, 1961.
Werdelin, I. A study of age differences in factorial structure. *Didakometry,* 1966, No. 6.
Werdelin, I. A synthesis of two factor analyses of problem solving in mathematics. *Didakometry,* 1966, No. 8.
Werdelin, I., & Stjernberg, G. On the nature of the perceptual speed factor. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology,* 1969, *10,* 185-192.
Werdelin, I., & Stjernberg, G. The relationship between difficulty and factor loadings of some visual-perceptual test. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology,* 1971, *12,* 21-28.
Whimbey, A., Fischhof, V., & Silikowitz, R. Memory span: A forgotten capacity. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1969, *60,* 56-58.
Wilson, R. C., Guilford, J. P., Christensen, P. R., & Lewis, D. J. A factor-analytic study of creative-thinking abilities. *Psychometrika,* 1954, *19,* 297-311.
Wisland, M., & Many, W. A. A factorial study of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities with children having above average intelligence. *Educational and Psychology Measurement,* 1969, *29,* 367-376.
Witkin, H. A., Oltman, P. K., Raskin, E., & Karp, S. A. *A manual for the Embedded Figures Test.* Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1971.
Woodrow, H. The common factors in fifty-two mental tests. *Psychometrika,* 1939, *4,* 99-108.
Zimmerman, W. S. Hypotheses concerning the nature of the spatial factors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 1954, *14,* 396-400.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

In view of the page limitations of this journal (approximately 128 per issue), and in order to publish as many good papers as possible, we ask that manuscripts be kept to a reasonable length (not over 40 doublespace typewritten pages).

Manuscripts that have a naverage number of tables, figures, and equations, judged to be consistent with the requirements of the paper, will be published completely free of charge. In the case of a manuscript of greater length or one having extensive mathematical formulas and symbols, the author has the option of paying for the additional cost of the printing, as estimated by the journal printer. The additional cost will be billed to the author prior to publication.

Tables and figures will be reproduced from camera-ready copy supplied by the authors. Tables must be typed on separate pages, never on the same page as text. Authors should retain the originals of tables and figures; copies should be submitted with the manuscript. If accepted, the final version of the manuscript must include the original copy of tables, prepared on an electric typewriter in a form suitable for photographic reproduction. Tables should be prepared with extra-wide margins; layout should conserve space, so that reproduction can be moderate. For legibility and convenience wide tables must be printed sideways on the page. Tables are to be numbered with arabic numerals. The word "Table," of the heading, should be centered and appear in capital letters on the first line, *e.g.,* TABLE 2. The title—starting on the line below the table number should have initial letters of principal words capitalized. Titles should be short; if two or more lines are required, they should be single-spaced. Underline *italicized* symbols. Double horizontal ruled lines should separate the heading from the subhead. A single line should appear between the subhead and the body of the table, and a single line should appear at the bottom of the table. Footnotes referring to any part of the table should be indicated by lower case letters, *a, b, etc.,* and the footnote should be single-spaced immediately below the table. The running head and/or page number should *not* be placed on table or figure pages, but they should be identified lightly in pencil on the back with the manuscript number and table or figure number. If possible, the table should be confined to one page. Draw graphs and charts in black ink on good quality paper, title each below the drawing and number consecutively; for example: Fig 1. A Graphical Representation of a Structural Model for Describing the Relationships of the Abilities Between Ages 10 and 13 for Girls. **Tables and figures must be original copies, or glossy photographic prints, acceptable for reproduction.**

Authors have an option of "open" reviewing (authors identified) or "blind" reviewing (authors not identified). Article reviews will be "open" unless the author specifically requests "blind" review when the manuscript is submitted, and the manuscript is prepared in a format appropriate for "blind" reviewing.