A shortened version of Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices for children and adolescents

Anna Langener¹, Anne-Wil Kramer¹, Wouter van den Bos^{*,1}, Hilde M. Huizenga^{*,1,2,3}

¹Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands;

²Amsterdam Brain and Cognition Center, The Netherlands;

³Research Priority Area Yield, The Netherlands

*shared senior authorship

Address of correspondence:

Anne-Wil Kramer

Department of Psychology: Developmental Psychology

University of Amsterdam Postbus 15916

1001 NK Amsterdam

The Netherlands

Email: a.kramer@uva.nl

Abstract

Numerous developmental studies assess general cognitive ability, not as the primary variable of interest, but rather as a background variable. The Raven's Progressive Matrices is an easy to administer non-verbal test that is widely used to measure general cognitive ability.

However, the relatively long administration time (up to 45 minutes) is still a drawback for developmental studies as it often leaves little time to assess the primary variable of interest.

Therefore, we used a machine learning approach - regularized regression in combination with cross validation - to develop a short 15 item version. We did so for two age groups, namely 9 to 12 years and 13 to 16 years. The short versions predicted the scores on the standard full 60 items versions to a very high degree $r = 0.89$ (9-12 years) and $r = 0.93$ (13-16 years). We, therefore, recommend using the short version to measure general cognitive ability as a background variable in developmental studies.

Keywords. Raven's Progressive Matrices, Short Form, Developmental Research, General Cognitive ability, Penalized Regression

Introduction

In developmental studies general cognitive ability is often measured as a background variable, rather than a variable of interest (see for example: Cheung et al., 2016; Meinhardt-Injac et al., 2020). Hence, a general cognitive ability test is added to the test battery, significantly lengthening the test administration. Especially for children and adolescents this might be an issue due to a limited attention span, and limited time to take part in research. As a result, measuring general cognitive ability may substantially interfere with the measurement of interest. Therefore, it is of importance that a short test is available for children and adolescents. Here we develop such a test based on the frequently used Raven's Progressive Matrices (RPM).

The RPM is a non-verbal test that is widely used to assess "general cognitive ability" (Raven, 1989). Three different versions of the RPM exist; the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM), the Coloured Progressive Matrices (CPM), which is easier, and the Advanced Progressive Matrices (APM), which is more difficult. The original 60-item RSPM is the most frequently used version and can be used for all age groups. Each item shows a geometric pattern with a missing piece. Participants must select the correct answer option that completes the pattern. The test consists of five sets (A, B, C, D, E) each with 12 items. Each set becomes progressively more difficult. Originally published in 1938, the test has been analyzed over the years and is regarded as a valid indicator of general cognitive ability worldwide (Pind, Gunnarsdóttir & Jóhannesson, 2003; Raven, 2000). Although there are many advantages in using a well-validated psychometric instrument, one limitation is the long administration time, which is often prohibitive for developmental populations.

Shortened RSPM's have been proposed for adult samples. Van der Elst and colleagues (2013) evaluated a shortened version with 36 items (set B, C, D) of the RSPM, and Bilker and colleagues (2012) created a short version of the RSPM with only nine items. Given that both short versions were based on an adult sample, these may not be suitable for children and

adolescents. For instance, items on the easier sets (A, B) may be more predictive for the final score for children compared to adults (who probably have all of these correct). Similar short versions exist for the CPM and the APM (e.g. Arthur & Day, 1994; Bors & Stokes, 1998, Smits, Smit, van den Heuvel, & Jonker, 1997;), but none of these were derived in developmental populations. Finally, there is a timed version of the RPSM, with a 20-minute time limit, validated in an adult sample (Hamel & Schmittmann, 2006). However, a potential drawback of the timed version is that it may have a two-dimensional structure, that is ability and intellectual efficiency (as noted by Raven, Raven & Court, 1993; 1998), instead of a one-dimensional structure, ability (Hamel & Schmittmann, 2006). In conclusion, no short version of the RSPM currently exists that is suitable for children and adolescents.

In our research, we focused on the RSPM, because it is widely used and often considered to be one of the best measures for cognitive ability (Perret & Dauvier, 2018; Qiu et al., 2020). Since the best set of items to assess individual differences in general cognitive ability is likely to be different in different age groups, our goal was to develop separate short versions for two age groups (age 9-12 years and 13-16 years). We analyzed existing RSPM data for these two age groups separately. We used penalized regression in a cross validation set-up as an item-reduction technique. That is, we estimated first in one part of the data which subset of items provided the best predictor of the total Raven score, we did this using penalized regression, a technique especially suited for prediction purposes (e.g. Matsui & Konishi, 2011; Tibshirani, 1996; Zou & Hastie, 2005). In the second part of the data we then determined how well this subset predicted the total Raven score.

Method

Sample characteristics

We requested existing data from several research groups. For the younger age group (around 9 to 12 years), we received one dataset ($n = 298$) from the Orwell (Oral and written language learning) study of the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Van Koert et al., 2020). The sample characteristics can be found in Table 1. In the Netherlands, 9 to 12 year olds go to school together irrespective of their capacities. So, we expect the mean and variance of the general cognitive ability to be representative of the general population.

For the older age group (around 13 to 16 years) we received three datasets ($n = 1071$) (see acknowledgments). The sample characteristics are depicted in Table 1. Most participants (82.4%) were from the pre-(applied)university school level in the Netherlands (HAVO or VWO). The other participants (17.6%) were from pre-vocational school level in the Netherlands (MAVO). Note that in the third dataset, the timed version of the RSPM (Hamel & Schmittmann, 2006) was used, thus, the data might have a two-dimensional structure instead of a one-dimensional structure.

Participants with missing values (younger age group: $n = 11$, older age group: $n = 43$,) and duplicates within the dataset (younger age group: $n = 0$, older age group: $n = 4$) were excluded from the analysis. For the older age group, participants that were younger than 12.5 years ($n = 37$) were excluded as well to avoid overlapping ages in the two different age groups. Item A1 and A2 (the first and second item of set A) were used as practice items in the younger age group and were therefore omitted.

Item selection with penalized regression

We used penalized regression to select a subset of items that could predict the total test score of each participant. This subset of items could then be used instead of the 60-item RSPM. Penalized regression adds a penalty and tuning parameter to the linear regression model and thereby reduces the coefficients of less essential items to zero (Tibshirani, 1996; Zou & Hastie, 2005). Thus, we obtain a subset of items that predicts the total score on the RSPM best. Penalized regression requires that we choose a penalty parameter (λ).

Additionally, we must choose a tuning parameter (α), which determines the relative influence of the so-called Ridge and Lasso penalty. In the next paragraph, it is explained how these penalty and tuning parameters are chosen. When α is equal to one, only the Lasso penalty is used, and when α equals zero, only the Ridge penalty is used. A value between zero and one means that Elastic Net Penalty is chosen, which thus combines the Lasso and Ridge penalty (Zou & Hastie, 2005). All calculations were done in R with the package Glmnet (Friedman, Hastie, & Tibshirani, 2010).

We split our dataset randomly in a development (80%) and validation (20%) set (Figure 1). For the younger age group (9-12) the validation set contained 58 participants and for the older age group (13-16) 199 participants. In order to find the best penalty and tuning parameters (λ and α), we randomly split the development set again in a train set (40%) and test set (40%).

With the aim of finding the best value for the penalty and tuning parameters, we used the algorithm depicted in Figure 2; First, we set an initial value for the penalty and tuning parameters. Second, we estimate the penalized regression model. By doing so we obtained a coefficient for each item. Some coefficients were shrunk to zero, thus these are not included in the initial short version. Third, we examined the correlations between the initial short version and the long version in the test set (cf. Figure 2). We repeated this algorithm for different combinations of penalty and tuning parameters ($\lambda = 2$ to 3.5, $\alpha = 0.5$ to 1). A higher

penalty parameter sets the weight of more coefficients to zero. Thus, a higher penalty parameter leads to the selection of fewer items. Therefore, with varying the penalty and tuning parameters we obtain various short versions differing in the number of items that are selected. Short versions with the same length may contain different items, consequently we chose the penalty and tuning parameters that lead to the short version with the highest correlation in the test set. Due to practical reasons (limited amount of time, limited attention span), we decided that our short version should not exceed the length of 15 items.

Validation

We examined in the validation set the correlation between the sum score on the final short form and the sum score on the original 60-item version.

Furthermore, we performed an additional analysis, namely Monte Carlo cross validation, in order to check if our results are robust. That is, we applied the same procedure again as described above just with a different random split of the train and test set (Figure 3). Meaning that we split our development set randomly in a different train and test set for each iteration. Afterwards, we calculated again the best penalty and tuning parameters as described above. We retested the procedure 100 times and examined whether the same items were selected.

Additionally, we checked for floor and ceiling effects. Thus, we checked if our short version measures well for the low and high ability range. Therefore, we examined the density plot of the Raven's score on the short version. A skewed density plot to the left entails that the test might not measure well for participants below average. Similar, a skewed density plot to the right entails that the test does not measure well for participants above average, which would indicate a ceiling effect.

Next, we investigated how well our chosen method performs compared to a traditional item-reduction technique, namely Item Response Theory (IRT; Hambleton & van der Linden,

1982). Please see the supplementary material for more information regarding the item selection with IRT.

Last, we examined how well our developed short form performs compared to 15 randomly selected unique items. Therefore, we randomly selected a subset of 15 unique items out of 60 items. Afterward we examined the correlation between the obtained random short form and the full form in the validation set. We did this 100 times.

Results

Penalized Regression

For the first age group, the following fifteen items were selected for the short version: A12, B5, B9, B10, B11, C8, C9, D4, D5, D6, D7, D9, D10, E1, E5. For the second age group, the following items were selected: A6, B10, B12, C11, D1, D2, D4, D6, D9, D10, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6. This thus indicated that for the youngest age group more easy items were included as compared to the oldest age group.

Validation

We randomly split our data set in a development and validation data set, that was not involved in the test construction process. For the youngest age group, the correlation between the sum score on the short version and the sum score on the original 60-item version was $r = 0.89$. For the oldest age group, the correlation between the sum score on the short version and the original 60-item version was $r = 0.93$.

Table 2 shows the validation set correlations between the score on the short version and the score on the original 60-item version, as function of a different number of items. We required that the short version should not exceed 15 items. Fortunately, it can be seen that including more items does not add much information.

To further investigate the robustness of our selected set of items we used Monte Carlo cross validation. As can be seen in Figure 4, most of the items were selected at least 50% of

the cases. Only item D5 was selected for only 4% of the cases. Thus, although there is some variability, indicating other short versions may perform equally well, the set of selected items for the short version is relatively consistent. Figure 4 shows how often an item is included in the short version out of 100 times.

To inspect potential ceiling effects, Figure 5 shows the density plot of the Raven's score on the short version and on the standard version. The score of the standard version is skewed to the right, especially for the older age group. This indicates that many individuals answered many items correctly. Our short form inherits this effect for the older age group. Thus, it is likely that a ceiling effect appears in the older age group irrespective of whether the short or long version is used.

Further, we compared the short version obtained by penalized regression with the short version obtained by IRT (see supplementary material). In the validation set, the short form obtained by Item Response has a slightly lower correlation with the original 60-item version (Youngest age group $r = .88$; Older age group $r = .87$ for IRT whereas they were 0.89 and 0.93 for penalized regression). Moreover, the short version obtained by IRT has a lower Cronbach's Alpha than the short version obtained by penalized regression (Youngest age group $\alpha = .65$; Older age group $\alpha = .73$ for IRT whereas they were 0.78 and 0.80 for penalized regression), which indicates that the short version selected by penalized regression has a higher internal consistency.

Last, we compared the performance of our developed short form with the performance of a randomly selected subset of 15 items. We did this 100 times. For the younger age group, the mean correlation of the randomly selected subsets is $r = 0.85$ (min = 0.77, max = 0.93). Here our selected subset with penalized regression ($r = 0.89$) outperforms 94% of the cases. For the older age group the mean correlation of the randomly selected subsets is $r = 0.85$ (min = 0.72, max = 0.91). Our selected subset with penalized regression ($r = 0.93$) outperforms all of the randomly selected subsets. Figure 6 shows the distribution of the 100 correlations

compared to the short form obtained by penalized regression. This indicates that our selected short forms perform better than a randomly selected subset of items.

Discussion

We developed two short versions of the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices that showed high predictive validity of the score on the original 60-item version (r 's $>.89$). These versions consisted of 15 instead of 60 items which reduce the administration time of the RSPM. Therefore, these short versions can confidently be used by developmental researchers that are interested in having a short but reliable proxy for general cognitive ability as a background variable.

We validated our short version with a cross validation approach. Most of the items were selected at least 50% of the cases. However, the items are pretty similar, thus it might be that some of them are easily interchangeable. Bilker and colleagues (2012) developed a 9-item short version for an adult sample and concluded as well that there might be more than one optimal short form. Thus, it seems that the item selection does not depend on the random split of train and test set, however, it might be that there are more item combinations which are sufficient as a short version of the RSPM.

We proposed penalized regression in a cross validation setup as an item reduction technique. To evaluate whether this is an appropriate method we compared this with another item reduction approach via Item Response Theory. Indeed, we found that the items selected by penalized regression have a higher predictive value than those items selected by Item Response Theory.

Several potential limitations warrant discussion. One limitation of our study is that the majority of the sample (86%) from the older age group (13-16) was a combination of above-average and pre-university level students which means that the items selected might be less

representative for students of the average level. For future research it might be interesting to include individuals from other school-levels, mainly students from pre-vocational schools.

Second, the original 60-item version of the RSPM shows ceiling effects. Pind and colleagues (2003) investigated school norms and reported ceiling effects in Iceland's higher school classes (pupils aged around 13 to 16 years). They concluded that the test is only appropriate for children in the first seven grades (pupils age around 6 to 13 years). Raven (2000) reported ceiling effects as well among young adults. We should be aware that our short version for the older age group most likely inherits this ceiling effect. Thus, for future research, in order to be able to discriminate between general cognitive ability in an adolescent above-average sample, we recommend to also develop a short version for the Raven Advanced Progressive Matrices.

Third, due to the smaller number of items, participants are not able to practice with easy items before they get to the difficult items in the short versions. This may lower their score if the short version is actually administered. On the other hand, this may also lead to less fatigue and/ or boredom (Gonthier & Roulin, 2019). In future research it may be worthwhile to check whether performance on long and short versions differs.

Last, we developed a test that can be used as a paper-pencil test to assess cognitive ability in adolescents. This has the advantage that the test is easy to use but might miss on opportunities that require test administration on a computer. In future research, it may be beneficial to develop a short form based on computer adaptive testing. Computer adaptive testing dynamically selects the next item based on the participant's answer of the previous item. Makransky and colleagues (2016) used computer adaptive testing to develop a short form of the MacArthur–Bates Communicative Development Inventory and found strong evidence that this is a helpful tool to reduce the test length.

To conclude, we developed short versions of the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices. We did so for children and adolescents separately. The short versions, consisting of 15 instead

of 60 items, provide a good prediction of the score on the full length test, and therefore can be used in developmental research where general cognitive ability is assessed as a background variable.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Orwell (Oral and written language learning) study of the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Van Koert et al., 2020) for sharing their collected Raven data with us that we used to develop the short version for the younger age group. Besides we thank Dr. Lydia Krabbendam, Dr. Nikki Lee, Dr. Mariët van Buuren, Miriam Hollarek, Reubs Walsh, Hester Sijtsma, Rebecca van Rijn and Nicky Lute for sharing their collected Raven data with us that we used to develop the short version for the older age group (Team #Soconnect).

References

- Arthur, W., & Day, D. V. (1994). Development of a Short form for the Raven Advanced Progressive Matrices Test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 394–403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164494054002013>
- Bilker, W. B., Hansen, J. A., Brensinger, Collen. M., Richard, J., Gur, Raquel & Gur, Ruben (2012). Development of abbreviated nine-item forms of the Raven's standard progressive matrices test. *Assessment*, 19, 354–369. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191112446655>
- Bors, D. A., & Stokes, T. L. (1998). Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices: Norms for First-Year University Students and the Development of a Short Form. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 382–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164498058003002>
- Cheung, H., Chan, Y., & Tsui, W. C. G. (2016). Effect of lie labelling on children's evaluation of selfish, polite, and altruistic lies. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 34(3), 325-339.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33, 1–22.
- Gonthier, C., & Roulin, J. L. (2019). Intraindividual strategy shifts in Raven's matrices, and their dependence on working memory capacity and need for cognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
- Hambleton, R. K., & van der Linden, W. J. (1982). Advances in Item Response Theory and Applications: An Introduction. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 6, 373–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662168200600401>
- Hamel, R., & Schmittmann, V. D. (2006). The 20-Minute Version as a Predictor of the Raven Advanced Progressive Matrices Test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 1039–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164406288169>
- Makransky, G., Dale, P. S., Havmose, P., & Bleses, D. (2016). An Item Response Theory–Based, Computerized Adaptive Testing Version of the MacArthur–Bates

- Communicative Development Inventory: Words & Sentences (CDI:WS). *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 59(2), 281–289.
https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-L-15-0202
- Matsui, H., & Konishi, S. (2011). Variable selection for functional regression models via the regularization. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 55, 3304–3310.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2011.06.016>
- Meinhardt-Injac, B., Daum, M. M., & Meinhardt, G. (2020). Theory of mind development from adolescence to adulthood: Testing the two-component model. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 38(2), 289–303.
- Perret, P., & Dauvier, B. (2018). Children's allocation of study time during the solution of raven's progressive matrices. *Journal of Intelligence*, 6, 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence6010009>
- Pind, J., Gunnarsdóttir, E. K., & Jóhannesson, H. S. (2003). Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices: new school age norms and a study of the test's validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 375–386. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00058-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00058-2)
- Qiu, C., Hatton, R., & Hou, M. (2020). Variations in Raven's Progressive Matrices scores among Chinese children and adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 164, 110064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110064>
- Raven, J. (1989). The Raven Progressive Matrices: A Review of National Norming Studies and Ethnic and Socioeconomic Variation Within the United States. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 26, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.1989.tb00314.x>
- Raven, J. (2000). The Raven's progressive matrices: Change and stability over culture and time. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0735>
- Raven, J., Raven, J. C., Court, J. H. (1993). Raven manual section 1: General overview. Oxford, England: Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Raven, J., Raven, J. C., Court, J. H. (1998). Raven manual section 4: Advanced progressive matrices. Oxford, England: Oxford Psychologists Press.

- Smits, C. H.M., Smit, J. H., van den Heuvel, N., & Jonker, C. (1997). Norms for an abbreviated Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices in an older sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 53*, 687–697
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), 58*, 267–288.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346178>
- Van der Elst, W., Ouwehand, C., van Rijn, P., Lee, N., van Boxtel, M., & Jolles, J. (2013). The shortened Raven Standard Progressive Matrices: Item response theory-based psychometric analyses and normative data. *Assessment, 20*, 48–59.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111415999>
- Van Koert, M., Leona, N., Rispens, J., van der Molen, M., Tijms, J. & Snellings, P. (2020). The Influence of L1 Dutch on Children's Foreign Language English Vocabulary and Grammar. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Zou, H., & Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and Variable Selection via the Elastic Net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology), 67*, 301–320.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3647580>

Table 1

Overview datasets

	Dataset	N	Age			RSPM Score		
			<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>
Younger age group	Orwell Study	289	<i>N.A. (N.A.)*</i>	<i>N.A.*</i>	<i>N. A.*</i>	37.17 (6.91)	15	56
	Dataset 1	557	13.14 (0.36)	12.52	14.55	44.43 (6.63)	10	59
	Dataset 2	157	13.99 (0.39)	12.61	14.65	44.59 (6.82)	19	56
	Dataset 3	273	14.75 (0.72)	13.03	17.3	42.15 (7.45)	11	58
Total		987	13.72 (0.86)	12.52	17.3	43.83 (6.97)	10	59

Note. N is calculated after omitting missing values. *: Due to data protection reasons we did not receive the exact age for each participant.

Table 2.

Overview different lengths of the short version.

Age group	Lambda	Alpha	Correlation (Validation)	Length
Younger age group	3.15	0.55	0.93	20
	2.45	0.7	0.92	19
	3.4	0.55	0.91	18
	2.35	0.8	0.90	17
	3.4	0.6	0.90	16
	3.15	0.65	0.89	15
	2.95	0.7	0.89	14
	2.15	0.95	0.88	13
	3.45	0.65	0.84	12
	2.8	0.8	0.83	11
Older age group	3.3	0.55	0.95	20
	2.15	0.85	0.95	19
	2	0.9	0.95	18
	2.85	0.7	0.94	17
	2.35	0.85	0.93	16
	2.2	0.9	0.93	15
	3.35	0.65	0.91	13
	2.9	0.75	0.91	12
	3.4	0.7	0.90	11

Figure 1. Splitting of the dataset.

Figure 2. Algorithm to choose the best tuning parameter.

Figure 3. Monte Carlo cross validation.

Figure 4. Results Monte Carlo cross validation. Items that are used for the short version are depicted in black.

Figure 5. Density of the total Raven's score on the standard (left) and short (right) version.

Figure 6. Boxplot of the correlations between the short version and original version for randomly selected subsets of items. The black vertical line indicates the same correlation for the short form obtained by penalized regression.