

Research Article

EXAMINATION NORM OF VISUAL –MOVEMENT ABILITY

***Javad Khalatbari**

Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT

The aim of present project is to examine growing Geshtalt hypothesis on the basic of growth influence and ability to comprehend design of this examination and also providing norm table for scoring exam on Iranian child in the range at 5-10 years old that live in Alborz province. 326 people have been examined on study that includes girl and boy in an individual exam. All of them were healthy and studying in public schools. The way of sampling was random. Being norm of children have been evacuating in term of emotional and intellectual according to judgment of authority and educational organization and have been used for studying Neuropsychology especially movement – visual growth from Geshtalt examination. This examination was designed by Miss Bender in 1938 and include 3 visual card in 4×6 inch size (10×15cm). There is one design on each of the card and each card derived from designing that in this card. The value of this examination was published by psychology American association of child and adult performance regime and scoring was codified by Copitz (1963-1970). Finding showed that present project is arrangement of other results of done projects. So by increasing age, the writing value in drawing pictures decrease and this decrease has been more in 7-8 years old child which decreases gradually. According to the project findings, we can state that this examination apply for one reliable tool for evaluating movement- visual of Iranian child. This examination isn't influenced by the special culture and equality.

Key Word: Norm, Reliability, Justifiability Norm Finding

INTRODUCTION

Psychology as a science has a very long history, but recognizing it as an independence science was done in the second half of 19th century. Psychology has been used to categorize children who have problem or it is necessary to place in school regime or in class or in special category, have been estimated so different culture may cause group and individual difference in behavior using free cultural test was allowed that intellectual skill have been discussed independence of related influence to culture. At first, Visual designing examination of Geshtalt supply as a tool for studying possibility of brain harm. There is basic difference between children and adult in drawing card of this examination and we as on tool for estimating activity, growth in visual – movement in 4-11 years old so studying about horn of this (Geshtalt) examination about Iranian child is about using this examination for parenting is about and psychological purpose totally, studies about this examination show this test could be describe as growth test. Kopitz (1974) obtain mean score of this examination for 5-11 years old and summarized in several project and has been listed more than 1100 projects in 11th edit of this book then Wechsler, put them in adult category and excavation is on the basic of Geshtalt and TAT examination also Vatkinz findings and colleagues (1993) prove that Bender examination is against some bilateral studies and important project findings that include 5 or 6 examination that have been used widely. Results have been published for the first time in (1964) and next result in (1975) and have shown that he had searched for more pictures for determined children that whit of them of norm and not norm. Also he has shown in Dinmor (1972) searching according to Kopitz (1975) that educated black children show better performance to non-educated black children, so there is not any difference between educated and non-educated white children and also white children who are deprived show better performance to black children.

Research Article

The project results based on study on Japanese, European and American child's showing that Japanese children's performance is better than European and American children. Japanese children in 5-6 years old have the same score with first grade American children.

Some project has been done by Zadeh and Habib (1379) in Tehran. This project has been done on 101 girl and boy child in 5-11 years old and the same project was done in Tabriz that 277 girl and boy child was in 7-10 years old who are with norm, were studied. The result act in direction to other result, project was done as a primitive study relates to visual-movement examination by safari and Tizdast that 60 child suffer from harming brain and 60 children selected with norm. The reliability of this project has been done by re-examination that report according of statistic analysis with confident 15% and this result was meaningful Poran Behbodi has done project as a comparing children who have disorder and non-disorder children in 1372 that come to conclusion that was equal with 197 girl and 232 boy who suffer from learning disorder, then come to conclusion that there are meaningful difference in negative direction to normal children and Shahnaim Abolghasemi has done project in 1975 for Norm finding in Gillan and Mazandaran province that have the same result by approving Miss Kopitz hypothesis project have been studied in follow:

- Geshtalt Bender examination has meaningful justifiability for children in 5-10 years old who have in Albors province.
- Geshtalt Bener examination has acceptable reliability for children in 5-10 years old who live in Alborze province.
- American form and the result of Tehran children project and Tabrizi Gillan and Mazandaran children in 5-40 years old that is honest for present project.

Method

Statistic society, sample and way of project performance: statistic society was boy and daughter in 10-5 years old and has been examine by Bender Geshtalt test and by individual examination. Examination way has been done by branching and grouping and children norm have been evaluating by emotionally and intellectually by judgment of educational organization.

Tool

Geshtalt Bender examination: Geshtalt – Bender Examination apply as a reliable tool for estimating movement – visited understanding. This examination has been made by Bender and Lauretta (1938). and derived from verthaimer and consist of 9 pictorial card in 4×6 inch 512 and there is one picture on them and this picture have several point, right lines, curve and angles, performance regime and scoring has codified by Koppitz, this examination use this entry skill to school predicting educational growing, pre recognizing problem and learning, valuing exulting problem from grow inability and also use for non-verbal intellectual. It is worth to say that in this examination, each wrong consist of one score and zero wrong minimal and maximal wrong which is calculated is 30 score reliability of Koppitz regime is acceptable totally and the value of agreement between degrading for Koppitz regime have been reported (88%, 96%). Although re-examining reliability with time distance during 4 months is low to some extent (58%, 66%).

Research Method

In this project, 326 daughter and boy students divided according to month and years of birth to 11 age groups for determine examiner age, refer to than file that exist in primary school and for knowing their norm condition we refer to educational organization authority. After performing Geshtalt Bender that perform individually, quality of examine response to Koppitz scoring regime have been studied and devote one examiner, one wrong then for calculating possible difference of score mean in age group, the mean wrong and standard deviation of score calculate from age groups finally for determine available difference between groups in terms of wrong and comparing this static with finding norm result in America in 1974, have used parametric examine with independence groups.

Research Article

Table 1: The average and standard deviation of analysis ages consider to abundance and having meaning of following table with comparing to the American norm 1974.

t	S	$\bar{X}$	N	سن
0/94	3/16	12	9	5-5/5
	Iran			
	3/3	13/1	47	
0/088	USA			5/6 -5/11
	4/2	9/6	10	
	3/4	9/7	130	
0/13	4/14	8/7	25	6-6/5
	3/3	8/6	175	
	3/37	7/6	35	
0/16	3/5	7/2	60	6/6-6/11
	3/4	4/62	50	
	3/3	5/8	61	
2/07	2/4	3/05	20	7/6-7/11
	2/8	4/6	47	
	2/01	2/8	50	
3/58	2/5	4/2	53	8-8/5
	2/42	2/52	46	
	3/5	3	60	
0/90	1/75	2	36	8/6-8/11
	2	2	78	
	2/6	2/8	35	
0	2/1	2/8	47	9/6-9/11
	2	2	10	
	2/1	2/3	76	
:326N				10 سالههبالا

Table 2.1: Ages between 5-5/5 with average 12 and standard deviation 2:3/16 and deviation less than 5/68 and 2 standard deviation up to 18/32.

Annexed Numbers	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Numbersz	-2/21	-1/89	-1/5	-1/2	0/94	-0/63	-0/3	0	0/31	0/63	0/94	1/26	1/58	1/89	2/21
Numberst	27/9	31/1	35	38	40/6	43/7	47	50	53/1	56/3	59/4	62/6	65/8	68/9	7/1

Table 2.2: Ages between 11-6/5 with average 9/6 and standard deviation 4/2 and 2 deviation less than 1/2 and 2 standard deviation up to 20/4.

Annexed Numbers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Numbersz	-2/04	-1/80	-1/57	-1/3	-1/09	-0/85	-0/61	-0/38	-0/14	-0/09	0/3	0/57	0/80	1/04	1/28	1/52	1/76	2	2/23	2/47
Numberst	29/6	32	34/3	37	39/1	41/5	43/9	46/2	48/6	49/1	50/3	55/7	58	60/4	62/8	65/2	67/6	70	72/3	74/7

Table 2.-3: Ages between 5-6 with average 7/8 and standard deviation 2:4/14 and 2 deviation less than 0/42 and 2 standard deviation up to 16/98.

Annexed Numbers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Numbersz	-2/10	-1/85	-1/61	-1/37	-1/06	-0/89	-0/65	-0/41	-0/16	0/07	0/31	0/55	0/79	1/03	1/28	1/59	1/76	2/00
Numberst	29	31/5	33/9	36/3	39/4	41/1	43/5	45/9	48/4	50/7	53/1	55/5	57/9	60/3	62/8	65/9	67/6	70/00

Table 2.4: Ages between 11/6-6/6 with average 7/6 and standard deviation 2:3/37 and 2 deviation less than 0/86 and 12 standard deviation up to 14/34.

Annexed Numbers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12	13	14	15
Numbersz	-2/25	-1/95	-1/66	-1/36	-1/06	-0/77	-0/47	-0/17	0/11	0/41	0/71	1	1/30	1/60	1/89	2/19
Numberst	27/5	30/5	33/4	36/4	39/4	42/3	45/3	48/3	48/9	54/1	57/1	60	63	66	68/9	71/9

Table 2.5: Ages between 7-7/5 with average 4/62 and standard deviation 2:3/4 and 2 deviation less than -2/18and 2 standard deviation up to 11/42.

Annexed Number	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12
Numbersz	-1/94	-1/65	-1/35	-1/06	-0/77	-0/47	-0/18	0/11	0/4	0/7	0/99	1/28	1/58	1/87	2/17
Numberst	30/6	33/5	36/5	39/4	42/3	45/3	48/2	51/1	54	57	59/9	62/8	65/8	68/7	71/7

Table 2.6: Ages between 7/6-7/11 with average 3/5 and standard deviation 2:2/4 and 2 deviation less than -1/75 and 2 standard deviation up to 7/85.

Annexed Numbers	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Numbersz	-1/68	-1/27	-0/85	-0/43	-0/02	0/39	0/81	1/22	1/64	2/06
Numberst	3/32	37/3	41/5	45/7	49/8	53/9	58/1	62/2	66/4	70/6

Research Article

Table 2.7: Ages between 8-8/5 with average 2/8 and standard deviation 2:2/01 and 2 deviation less than -1/22 and 2 standard deviation up to 6/82.

Annexed Numbers	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Numbersz	-2/38	-1/89	-1/39	-0/89	-0/39	0/09	0/59	1/09	1/59	2/08
Numberst	26/2	31/1	36/1	41/1	46/1	50/9	55/1	60/9	65/9	70/8

Table 2.8: Ages between 8/6-8/11 with average 2/52 and standard deviation 2:2/42 and 2 deviation less than -2/32 and 2 standard deviation up to 11/42.

Annexed Numbers	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Numbersz	-1/71	-1/04	-0/62	0/21	0/19	0/61	1/02	1/43	1/85	2/26
Numberst	35/5	39/6	43/8	47/9	51/9	56/1	60/2	64/3	58/5	72/6

Table 2.9: Ages between 9-9/5 with average 2 and standard deviation 2:1/75 and 2 deviation less than -1/5 and 12 standard deviation up to 5/5.

Annexed Numbers	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Numbersz	-1/71	-1/14	-0/57	0	0/57	1/14	1/71	2/28
Numberst	32/9	38/6	44/3	50	55/7	61/4	67/1	72/8

Table 2.10: Ages between 9-9/6 with average 2/8 and standard deviation 2:2/6 and 2 deviation less than -2/4 and 2 standard deviation up to 8.

Annexed Numbers	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Numbersz	-2/23	-1/84	-1/46	-1/07	-0/69	-0/30	0/07	0/46	0/84	1/23	1/61	2
Numberst	27/7	31/6	35/4	39/3	43/1	47	50/7	54/6	58/4	62/3	66/1	7

Table 2.11: Ages between 10 with average 2 and standard deviation 2:2 and 2 deviation less than -2 and 2 standard deviation up to 6.

Annexed Numbers	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Numbersz	-2	-1/5	-1	-0/5	0	0/5	1	1/5	2
Numberst	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70

RESULTS

Show that according to Table 1 and series Table 2, present project is arrangement of other project result, that have been done so by increasing age, the wrong value in drawing picture decrease and this decreasing is more 7 to 8 years old and decrease gradually so findings of this project show that Geshtalt Bender is one acceptable tool for estimating visual-movement of Iranian children the present project show this examination is influenced by special culture, after analyzing data, we obtain below data. For answering standard the first hypothesis about justifiability of examination the mean and standard deviation obtain from wrong score of each group age that show decreasing wring in the same time by increasing age and don't examination on 8 groups have shown meaning difference but show Geshtalt examination have

Research Article

justifiability and have very important application and acceptable reliability in society Discussion and conclusion.

Comparing present result with related result about Tabrizi children have meaningful difference in age levels that show related information about Tabrizi and Tehrani children about this project comparing discussion and conclusion the result of done projects on Tabrizi children with American finding norm show that there is not possibility in each of possible level have meaningful difference between Iranian and American children in terms of answering and the value of wrong score in this examination.

Comparing children result of Tehrani and Tabrizi children in 9 years old in 5 levels have meaningful difference but there isn't in another groups.

Comparing result project in three groups: 7-7/5 and 7/6 to 7/411, 8-8/5 obtained compare to norm American children and show meaningful difference in (0/05) level but doesn't exist in other level.

Total result of project is verifying other result which is done by Koppitz (1958) in other country and cities that by increasing age, the wrong value decrease and this decrease is more in 7 to 8 years old and decrease gradually and total decreasing in wrong value determine that by rowing child, ability of movement visual increase and may be this increase is as a result from experience which is compiled daily.

REFERENCE

AckerMan PT et al., (1971). Children with specific learning disabilities. *Jornal of learning Disabilities* **4** 437-446.

Aiken (1985). Lew is R, psychological testing and saaessment, Massachissetts. *Allyn and Bacon Inc.*

Bender and Lauretta (1938). A visual motor Gestalt test and its clinical use. *The American or the Psychiatric, Association Inc* (New York).

Bendfer (1938). Bender Motor Gestalt test. *The American Pregnancy Association* (New York) **1**(46).

Zadeh G and Habib (1988). A plot study of the Bender- Geshtalt test in a sample of Iranian normal children. *Journal of Chin. Byuch* **44**.

Koppizz EM (1963). The Bender- Gestalt tests for young children. *Grune and Stratton Inc* (New York).

Kaplan, Robertm and Saccuzzo Dennisp (1991). Psychological testing principles, Applications, and Lssues, California. *Brookes 1 Cole Publishing Compang.*

Koppitz EM (1958). Relationships between the Bender Gestalt test and the wechslerIntellige- ne scale for Children. *Journal of clinical psychological* **74** 473-476.

Marnat GG (1990). Hand book of psychological assement. (New York).

Marley ML (1982). Organic brain pathology and the Bender Gestalt test. *Grune and Stratton* (New York).

Pascal G and Stutell B (1951). The Bender Gestalt test. *Grune and Stratton* (New York).