The Standardization of the Clock Drawing Test (CDT) for People with Stroke Using Rasch Analysis
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Abstract. [Purpose] The aim of this study was to standardize the clock drawing test (CDT) for people with stroke using Rasch analysis. [Subjects and Methods] Seventeen items of the CDT identified through a literature review were performed by 159 stroke patients. The data was analyzed with Winstep version 3.57 using the Rasch model to examine the unidimensionality of the items’ fit, the distribution of the items’ difficulty, and the reliability and appropriateness of the rating scale. [Result] Ten out of the 159 participations (6.2%) were considered misfit subjects, and one item of the CDT was determined to be a misfit item based on Rasch analysis. The rating scales were judged as suitable because the observed average showed an array of vertical orders and MNSQ values < 2. The separate index and reliability of the subject (1.98, 0.80) and item (6.45, 0.97) showed relatively high values. [Conclusion] This study is the first to examine the CDT scale in stroke patients by Rasch analysis. The CDT is expected to be useful for screening stroke patients with cognitive problems.
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INTRODUCTION

Cognitive screening tests need to detect and manage the problems associated with deteriorated cognitive functions caused by stroke, traumatic brain injury or neurological psychiatric disorders, such as dementia or delirium1). MMSE (Mini-Mental Status Examination) and NCSE (Neuro-behavior Cognitive Status Examination) have been used mainly as tools for screening the cognitive function in clinical practice.

Stroke-induced cognitive impairments in patients of various ages are expected to increase in an aging society3). However, cognitive screening tests are being performed mainly for Alzheimer-type dementia (AD). Few studies have described the characteristics of dementia caused by stroke, and their findings are inconsistent4, 5). Therefore, more study of vascular dementia and the development of an appropriate screening tool is needed.

Because of the ease of use, the clock drawing test (CDT) has been widely used in differential diagnosis of early dementia6, 7). In particular, the CDT can discriminate patients with early dementia by their visual perception impairment.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

Seventeen items of the CDT identified through a literature review were performed by 159 stroke patients. All subjects gave their written informed consent to participation in the experiment in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

The seventeen items with six different classifications were selected by considering previous studies14-20). We or-
organized all six categories of the seventeen items by adding a circle, hands, numbers of the clock categories proposed by Freedman (1994) to the categories consisting of the response, memory and time. Table 1 lists the references related to the configuration of the items.

The statistical software, Winstep (Chicago, IL, USA) 3.57.1 version, was used for statistical analysis of the data. Rasch analysis is a one dimensional model that asserts that an item response is the result of an interaction between the respondent’s ability and the parameters of the item scale21).

The Rasch model is sometimes referred to as a rating scale. The rating scale model is appropriate for modeling Likert-type response data. The rating scale model was used because the CDT consists of a Likert scale and uses the same rating scale for all items22, 23).

The infit mean square statistic (infit MNSQ) and the outfit mean square statistic (outfit MNSQ) were calculated as measures of item fit. Table 2 shows the item fit statistics: entry order.

Table 1. Item classification through a literature review

| Item of the CDT | Sunderland (1989) | Wolf-Klein (1989) | Mendez (1992) | Freedman (1994) | Shua-Haim (1996) | Lam (1998) | Woodford (2007) |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1. Behavioral response | * | * | * | * | | | |
| 2. Language response | * | * | * | | | | |
| 3. Size of circle | * | * | * | | | | |
| 4. Closed of circle | * | * | * | | | | |
| 5. Symmetry of circle | * | * | * | | | | |
| 6. Twelve numbers | * | * | * | | | | |
| 7. Numbers other than | * | * | * | | | | |
| 8. Location (3, 6, 9, 12) | * | * | * | | | | |
| 9. Location (1, 2, 4, 5) | * | * | * | | | | |
| 10. Location (7, 8, 10, 11) | * | * | * | | | | |
| 11. Memory of the time (11:10) | + | | | | | | |
| 12. Memory of the procedures | | | | | | | |
| 13. Hour & minute hands | * | * | * | * | | | |
| 14. Length of hands | * | * | * | | | | |
| 15. Exact time | * | * | * | | | | |
| 16. Central point | * | * | | | | | |
| 17. The time to perform | | | | | | | |

* Items used in each study, + suggestion item

Table 2. Item fit statistics: entry order

| (N)Items | Measure | S.E. | Infit MNSQ | Z-value | Outfit MNSQ | Z-value |
|----------|---------|------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------|
| 1. Behavioral response* | −6.66 | 1.83 | Minimum estimated measure |
| 2. Language response | −3.28 | 0.42 | 1.28 | 0.90 | 2.12 | 1.30 |
| 3. Size of circle | −1.78 | 0.27 | 1.21 | 1.30 | 2.43 | 2.30 |
| 4. Closed of circle | −1.23 | 0.25 | 1.17 | 1.20 | 0.96 | 0.00 |
| 5. Symmetry of circle | −1.11 | 0.24 | 1.27 | 1.90 | 1.26 | 0.80 |
| 6. Twelve numbers | 0.62 | 0.20 | 1.07 | 0.80 | 1.07 | 0.50 |
| 7. Numbers other than | −0.05 | 0.21 | 1.06 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 0.10 |
| 8. Location (3, 6, 9, 12) | 0.94 | 0.20 | 0.81 | −2.20 | 0.80 | −1.20 |
| 9. Location (1, 2, 4, 5) | 2.07 | 0.21 | 0.79 | −2.30 | 0.59 | −1.70 |
| 10. Location (7, 8, 10, 11) | 1.90 | 0.20 | 0.89 | −1.20 | 0.77 | −0.90 |
| 11. Memory of the time (11:10) | 1.41 | 0.20 | 1.33 | 3.40 | 1.45 | 2.00 |
| 12. Memory of the procedures | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.88 | −1.10 | 0.80 | −1.10 |
| 13. Hour & minute hands | −1.00 | 0.24 | 0.62 | −3.20 | 0.39 | −2.50 |
| 14. Length of hands | 1.18 | 0.20 | 1.07 | 0.90 | 0.99 | 0.00 |
| 15. Exact time | 0.78 | 0.20 | 0.72 | −3.40 | 0.56 | −3.10 |
| 16. Central point | −0.05 | 0.21 | 1.01 | 0.10 | 1.13 | 0.70 |
| 17. The time to perform | −0.42 | 0.22 | 1.02 | 0.20 | 1.10 | 0.50 |

*Item did not fit, that is, infit MNSQ outside 0.6–1.4 range or Z-value outside −2–2 range
fit mean square statistic (outfit MNSQ) were used to confirm the unidimensionality as well as to identify the misfit items and subjects\(^{24}\). In this study, an item or subject was considered an appropriate model fit if the infit and outfit MNSQ had a range of 0.6–1.4, as well as a Z score between −2 and 2.

In Rasch analysis, both the subject’s ability and item difficulty are expressed as logits. Logits with a greater positive magnitude represent increasing item difficulty. The subject separation index (SI) and item SI represent the ability of a given test to separate cognition. SI must exceed 2 to achieve the desired level of separation reliability (SR), at least 0.80, and SI must exceed 3 to achieve an SR of at least 0.90\(^{22}\).

Each item was characterized by a series of threshold parameters that define the difficulty or probability of the response categories in Rasch analysis. The rating scale analysis includes the category frequencies, average measure, threshold estimates, probability curves and category fit. The item was considered an appropriate rating scale if the rating scale had an outfit MNSQ of less than 2, as well as a range of 1.0–5.0 logits for its threshold estimates\(^{22}\).

**RESULTS**

Ten out of the 159 participants (6.2\%) were considered misfit subjects because their standard infit values exceeded 2. After further analysis, these participants were excluded from the analysis.

Table 2 lists the results of Rasch analysis. Overall, one item of the CDT was determined to be a misfit item based on Rasch analysis. The misfitting item was ‘Behavioral response’.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of both the item location and subject measure plotted along the same ability levels and hierarchical order of the 16 items of the Winstep output.

Table 3 summarizes the rating scale analysis. The rating scales were judged as suitable, because the observed average showed an array of vertical order and MNSQ < 2.

The SI and the SR of the subjects (1.98, 0.80) and items (6.45, 0.97) showed a relatively high value. Generally, the SI increases with increasing number of subjects or items. In addition, the SR is the same as KR-20 or Cronbach’s alpha.

**DISCUSSION**

The main aim of this study was to standardize the CDT for stroke patients using Rasch analysis. Its unidimensionality was examined through an item fit, distribution of the item difficulty, and the reliability and the appropriateness of the rating scale.

A review of the literature showed that the reliability of the 17 items of the CDT was satisfactory, and the rating scale of the CDT was appropriate for stroke patients. The usefulness of the CDT can vary depending on whether a scoring system is used. This study used a screening tool developed by adding questions appropriate for stroke patients.

In previous studies, the CDT was used to assess patients with dementia, psychiatric disorders, and mild cognitive impairment. These studies reported that the CDT has high sensitivity and specificity, and is a good assessment tool\(^{10, 16, 25, 26}\). In the present study, appropriate items were selected according to the characteristics of stroke patients, and then used in actual evaluation. Therefore, the CDT will be useful for stroke patients with cognitive problems.

In this study, the misfit item was ‘behavioral response’. Because the questions for this item were considered too easy, one item was removed from the CDT on account of the results of Rasch analysis. On the other hand, the item of ‘verbal response’ was a fit. These results prove the existence
of cognitive-response processes. In particular, the results indicate that the language cognitive response is more difficult than that of the behavioral response.

‘Verbal response’ was the easiest item among the sixteen items of the CDT and the ‘behavioral response’ was the most difficult. The distribution of both item locations and participants showed a high score in the CDT.

The rating scale of the CDT was determined to be appropriate for stroke patients. Rasch analysis is more useful because it can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the latent structure.

The results of this study may have limited generalization to stroke patients because of the lack of consensus among scholars and researchers in its development. Therefore, further studies on stroke patients with cognitive problems will be needed.

Despite these limitations, this study is the first to examine the CDT scale in stroke patients using Rasch analysis. In future studies, the CDT will be used to screen stroke patients with cognitive problems.
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