

Seeing Reason: Visuospatial Ability, Sex Differences and the Raven's  
Progressive Matrices

Nicolette Amanda Waschl

School of Psychology, University of Adelaide

*A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

*Doctor of Philosophy*

March, 2017



## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Tables .....	ix
List of Figures .....	xi
List of Abbreviations .....	xiii
Abstract .....	xvi
Declaration .....	xviii
Acknowledgements .....	xix
Chapter 1: Literature Review and Introduction .....	1
Intelligence Theory .....	2
Cattell-Horn-Carroll Theory .....	3
Other Theoretical Frameworks .....	10
The Raven’s Progressive Matrices .....	12
Validity and Reliability of the RPM .....	13
The Dimensionality Problem .....	14
Preliminary Conclusions: The RPM, Dimensionality and Gv .....	32
Sex Differences in Cognitive Abilities .....	33
Methodological Issues in the Study of Sex Differences .....	34
Sex Differences in Gv .....	38
Sex Differences in Gf .....	41
General Conclusions and Remaining Questions .....	49
Chapter 2: Exegesis .....	51
Preamble .....	51
Issue One: The RPM Tests .....	52
Structure of the RPM Tests .....	52

Validity of the RPM Tests .....	57
New Contributions .....	57
Issue Two: Intelligence Theory .....	58
The relationship between Gf and Gv .....	58
New Contributions .....	60
Issue Three: Sex Differences .....	61
New Contributions .....	62
Issues Beyond the Scope of this Thesis .....	63
Chapter 3: Paper 1 .....	65
Preamble .....	65
Rule Synthesis.....	66
Results of Rule Synthesis.....	69
Dillon et al.'s (1981) Factor Analysis.....	72
Preliminary Conclusions from Solution Taxonomy Synthesis.....	75
Paper 1 .....	76
Abstract.....	79
Method .....	86
Participants and Measures.....	86
Data Analysis .....	88
Results.....	92
Sex Differences in Items and Item Types .....	92
Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	94
Measurement Invariance and Latent Mean Differences .....	101
Rasch Analysis and Differential Item Functioning.....	102
Discussion.....	112

Chapter 4: Paper 2.....	117
Preamble .....	117
Paper 2 .....	119
Abstract.....	123
Method.....	130
Participants.....	130
Measures .....	130
Design .....	133
Analysis .....	133
Results.....	136
Descriptive Statistics.....	136
Structural Equation Models .....	141
Sex Differences .....	153
Discussion.....	155
Chapter 5: Paper 3.....	161
Methodology .....	162
Selection of Measures to Include.....	162
Literature Search.....	163
Search Terms .....	165
Sample Three .....	166
Grey Literature.....	167
Reference Lists of Identified Papers .....	168
Data Collection .....	168
Paper 3 .....	169
Abstract.....	173

Theoretical Framework .....	174
Previous Meta-Analyses .....	176
Moderators .....	177
Present Study .....	179
Method .....	180
Selection of Measures to Include .....	180
Literature Search .....	187
Inclusion Criteria .....	188
Meta-Analytic Techniques and Procedures .....	189
Results.....	191
Descriptive Statistics.....	191
Heterogeneity and Subgroup Analyses .....	209
Sensitivity Analysis and Publication Bias .....	224
Discussion.....	227
Item Stimuli and Item Type .....	227
Individual Tests.....	228
Limitations .....	230
Implications for Future Research and Practice .....	231
Chapter 6: Paper 4.....	233
Preamble .....	233
Paper 4 .....	235
Abstract .....	238
Method .....	243
Participants and Data Preparation.....	243
Results.....	246

Exploratory Factor Analysis .....	246
Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling (ESEM) .....	252
Confirmatory Factor Analysis .....	255
Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis .....	259
Discussion .....	262
Chapter 7: General Discussion and Research Conclusions .....	266
Research Conclusions: Paper 1 .....	266
Research Conclusions: Paper 2 .....	267
Research Conclusions: Paper 3 .....	268
Research Conclusions: Paper 4 .....	268
General Discussion: Significance and Implications .....	269
RPM as a measure of Gf .....	269
Sex Differences, Gv and the RPM .....	270
RPM and Academic Achievement .....	271
Alternative Explanations .....	277
Implications for Intelligence Theory and Measurement .....	280
Measurement of Inductive Reasoning .....	281
Sex Differences in Inductive Reasoning .....	284
Test-specific versus Content-specific Variance .....	285
Figural and Alphabetic Inductive Reasoning .....	286
Developmental Differences .....	287
Manifest and Latent Differences .....	287
Strategy Differences .....	288
General Discussion: Limitations and Future Research .....	289
RPM and Gv .....	289

Flexibility of Closure .....	289
Components of RPM Performance, Gv and Sex Differences .....	289
Short Forms.....	291
Sex Differences and Measuring Inductive Reasoning .....	291
Sample Representativeness .....	291
Letter Series Tests.....	292
Experimental Investigations.....	293
Strategy Use .....	294
Final Comments .....	294
References.....	296
Appendix A.....	339
Appendix B .....	361
Appendix C.....	365
Appendix D.....	368



## List of Tables

Table 1.1	Description of the sixteen broad abilities under the CHC model.....	5
Table 1.2	Solution strategies from Carpenter et al. (1990) .....	18
Table 1.3	Solution strategies from DeShon et al. (1995) .....	19
Table 3.1	Comparison of Modified DeShon et al. (1995) with Carpenter et al. (1990) .....	71
Table 3.2	Dillon et al.'s (1981) item types .....	73
Paper 1: Table 1	Classifications of APM Items .....	82
Paper 1: Table 2	Sex differences in individual items .....	93
Paper 1: Table 3	Sex differences in item types .....	94
Paper 1: Table 4	Model fit indices: Sample 1 .....	96
Paper 1: Table 5	Model fit indices: Sample 2 .....	98
Paper 1: Table 6	Model fit indices: Sample 3 .....	100
Paper 1: Table 7	Measurement invariance statistics.....	102
Paper 1: Table 8	Item fit and DIF: Sample 1.....	106
Paper 1: Table 9	Misfitting items: Sample 2 .....	107
Paper 1: Table 10	Item fit and DIF: Sample 2.....	109
Paper 1: Table 11	Item fit and DIF: Sample 3.....	111
Paper 2: Table 1	Descriptive Statistics .....	138
Paper 2: Table 2	Correlations: APM Sample 1 .....	139
Paper 2: Table 3	Correlations: APM Sample 2 and SPM Sample.....	140
Paper 2: Table 4	Fit Statistics for Measurement Models: APM Sample 2.....	144
Paper 2: Table 5	Fit Statistics for Measurement Models: SPM Sample .....	149
Paper 2: Table 6	Measurement invariance statistics.....	154

Table 5.1	Years searched.....	164
Paper 3: Table 1	Measures of inductive reasoning identified and included in searches .....	181
Paper 3: Table 2	Studies included in analysis .....	193
Paper 3: Table 3	Number of data points for each test category .....	210
Paper 3: Table 4	Summary statistics by test category and test .....	212
Paper 4: Table 1	Subtest means for Group 1 and 2 compared to 2007 and 2012 Australian norms .....	245
Paper 4: Table 2	Factor loadings and communalities for the two-factor solution (Gf/Gc) GRT2 test.....	249
Paper 4: Table 3	Verbal reasoning items by factor.....	250
Paper 4: Table 4	Average loadings of different item types on Factors I and II.....	251
Paper 4: Table 5	Items demonstrating Differential Item Functioning .....	255
Paper 4: Table 6	Factor loadings and threshold values for GRT2 two-factor confirmatory model .....	257
Paper 4: Table 7	Measurement invariance statistics.....	259
Table 7.1	Means and standard deviations.....	274
Table 7.2	Correlations .....	275
Table 7.3	Regression models.....	276

## List of Figures

Figure 3.1	a) Addition/Subtraction; b) Superimposition; c) Superimposition with cancellation. ....	67
Figure 3.2	Superimposition with conditional placement.....	68
Figure 3.3	a) Quantitative pairwise progression; (b) Movement; (c) Rotation. ....	69
Paper 1: Figure 1	Test information curves for the combined group for each sample. ....	103
Paper 1: Figure 2	ICCs for three representative items from Sample 1.....	104
Paper 1: Figure 3	ICCs for three representative items from Sample 2.....	108
Paper 1: Figure 4	ICCs for three representative items from Sample 3.....	110
Paper 2: Figure 1	APM Sample 1 Model: Structural equation model showing standardized coefficients for reasoning and rotation to latent APM and residual latent APM.....	142
Paper 2: Figure 2	APM Sample 2 Model 1: Structural equation model showing standardized coefficients for latent Gv and inductive reasoning to latent APM and residual latent APM.....	145
Paper 2: Figure 3	APM Sample 2 Model 2: Structural equation model showing standardized coefficients for ability measures to latent APM and residual latent APM.....	146
Paper 2: Figure 4	SPM Model 1: Structural equation model showing standardized coefficients for latent Gv and inductive reasoning to latent SPM and residual latent SPM .....	151

Paper 2: Figure 5	SPM Model 2: Structural equation model showing standardized coefficients for ability measures to latent SPM and residual latent SPM.....	152
Paper 3: Figure 1	Forest plot of effect sizes for the Advanced Progressive Matrices.....	215
Paper 3: Figure 2	Forest plot of effect sizes for the Standard Progressive Matrices.....	217
Paper 3: Figure 3	Forest plot of effect sizes for the WAIS – Matrix Reasoning.....	218
Paper 3: Figure 4	Forest plot of effect sizes for the Differential Aptitude Test – Abstract Reasoning .....	220
Paper 3: Figure 5	Forest plot of effect sizes for the Differential Aptitude Test – Verbal Reasoning.....	221
Paper 3: Figure 6	Forest plot of effect sizes for the Primary Mental Abilities - Reasoning.....	222
Paper 3: Figure 7	Forest plot of effect sizes for the CFIT .....	223
Paper 3: Figure 8	Forest plot of effect sizes for the WAIS - Similarities.....	223
Paper 3: Figure 9	Funnel plot. ....	226
Paper 4: Figure 1	Factor scores by sex. ....	253
Paper 4: Figure 2	Factor scores by age .....	253
Paper 4: Figure 3	Second-order correlated uniqueness model .....	261

## List of Abbreviations

2PL	Two-parameter logistic
3PL	Three-parameter logistic
AH	Alice Heim Test
APM	Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices
AR	Abstract Reasoning (GRT2 subtest)
BIS	Berlin Structure of Intelligence
CAB-I	Comprehensive Ability Battery – Inductive Reasoning
CAB-Cf	Comprehensive Ability Battery – Flexibility of Closure
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
CFIT	Cattell's Culture Fair Intelligence Test
CHC	Cattell-Horn-Carroll
CPM	Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices
CTT	Classical Test Theory
DAS	Differential Aptitude Scales
DAT	Differential Aptitude Tests
DAT-AR	Differential Aptitude Tests – Abstract Reasoning
DAT-VR	Differential Aptitude Tests – Verbal Reasoning
DIF	Differential item functioning
DWLS	Diagonally weighted least squares
EA	Esoteric Analogies Test
EFA	Exploratory factor analysis
ESEM	Exploratory structural equation modeling
ETS	Educational Testing Service

<i>g</i>	General intelligence
Gc	Crystallised ability
Gf	Fluid ability
GRT2	General Reasoning Test 2
Gq	Quantitative ability
Gv	Visuospatial ability
I	Induction
ICC	Item characteristic curve
IQ	Intelligence Quotient
IRT	Item Response Theory
IST	Intelligence Structure Test
K-BIT	Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test
K-SNAP	Kaufman Short Neuropsychological Assessment Procedure
KAIT	Kaufman Adolescent and Adult Intelligence Test
MGCFA	Multiple-group confirmatory factor analysis
MIMIC	Multiple-indicator Multiple-causes
ML	Maximum likelihood
MRT	Mental Rotation Test
MTMM	Multitrait-multimethod
NR	Numerical Reasoning (GRT2 subtest)
PCA	Principal components analysis
PF	Paper Folding Test
PMA-R	Primary Mental Abilities – Reasoning
PSVT:R	Perdue Spatial Visualization Test of Rotations
RG	Sequential reasoning

RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
RPM	Raven's Progressive Matrices
RQ	Quantitative reasoning
SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
SRMR	Standardized Root Mean Square Residual
SPM	Standard Raven's Progressive Matrices
US	United States
UK	United Kingdom
VPR	Verbal-Perceptual-Image Rotation
VR	Verbal Reasoning (GRT2 subtest)
WAIS	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale
WLSMV	Weighted least squares mean and variance adjusted
WJ-III	Woodcock-Johnson Test of Cognitive Abilities – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Edition

## **Abstract**

This thesis sought to address the role of visuospatial ability in measures of inductive reasoning, with a particular focus on the Raven's Progressive Matrices (RPM). Given that males tend to perform better on certain measures of visuospatial ability, sex differences in performance on the RPM tests and in other measures of inductive reasoning were also examined.

The issue of the involvement of visuospatial ability in the RPM tests is important at both a practical and a theoretical level. At the practical level, these tests are often used as a sole measure of general intelligence, and conclusions regarding the relationship of general intelligence to other variables are made on the basis of results from this test. If the RPM tests require a substantive amount of visuospatial ability, this is problematic to the interpretation of results on this test as reflective of general intelligence. At a theoretical level, investigation of this question pertains to an understanding of the relationship between visuospatial abilities and fluid ability generally, but inductive reasoning more specifically. Many commonly used measures of inductive reasoning are presented in a visual format (e.g. abstract figures) and these tests are often shown to cross-load on both fluid and visuospatial factors.

This thesis addresses the issues of visuospatial ability and sex differences in the RPM by examining (1) the dimensionality of the Advanced RPM tests; (2) the role of Gv in performance on the RPM tests; and (3) sex differences in raw scores on the RPM and other measures of inductive reasoning. Additionally, the psychometric properties of the General Reasoning Test 2 (GRT2) in the Australian population were examined. This included an investigation of the relationship between figural, verbal and numeric reasoning items as well as sex differences.



Study 1 used confirmatory factor analysis and Rasch modeling to investigate the dimensionality of the Advanced RPM, measurement invariance and differential item functioning across sex. Study 2 used structural equation modeling to examine, in three separate samples, how well visuospatial abilities could account for the variance in a latent RPM factor not already accounted for by alternative fluid ability measures. This study additionally assessed invariance of the structural relationships between visuospatial ability, fluid ability and RPM across sex. Study 3 used meta-analytic techniques to synthesise research concerning sex differences on measures of inductive reasoning, considering the item stimulus and item type as potential moderators of this difference. Study 4 used exploratory and confirmatory structural equation modeling to examine the psychometric properties of the GRT2.

Results indicate that although the RPM tests are largely unidimensional, visuospatial ability is involved in performance. Furthermore, sex differences in raw scores and at the latent level were found, favouring males. Investigation of sex differences in inductive reasoning measures more broadly indicated that the figural format of these tests may contribute to the male advantage often identified; however, examination of the influence of the stimulus and type of question used in reasoning items in the GRT2 indicated that these do not meaningfully impact the latent construct measured.

## Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I acknowledge that copyright of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Nicolette Waschl

Date: 29/03/17

## Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my principal supervisor, Professor Nick Burns; thank you for your patience, kindness and knowledge. I am grateful to have had a supervisor whom I always felt had my best interests at heart and whom I knew I was always able to approach with any concerns or questions I may have had. Thank you also to my co-supervisors Emeritus Professor Ted Nettelbeck and Dr. Irina Baetu, for their support during my PhD study. To Ted for always taking an interest in my work and providing invaluable feedback, and to Irina for the programming lessons and helpful chats.

My sincere thanks also goes to others who have enabled me to conduct this research; Dr. Simon Jackson, who provided data used in Papers 1 and 2, Stephen Kohl who provided data used in Paper 4, and Professor Andy Baker who was involved in providing data used in Paper 2. Also thank you to those authors who kindly provided me with unpublished information subsequently included in Paper 3. Thank you to Professor Jane Mathias and Associate Professor Siva Alagumalai for sharing with me their knowledge of meta-analysis and Rasch analysis.

I would like to thank Daniel McCluskey for his support during my time spent as a PhD candidate; you have been endlessly patient and understanding with my never-ending student status. Thank you also to my parents who have supported and encouraged me always, and to mum for taking the time to proof this document. Finally, thank you to my fellow PhD students and friends, particularly Erica, Michael and Jen, for all the coffee and beer (and wine and cheese).