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ABSTRACT

The current study was conducted in two parts. Study 1 examined the Rey Auditory-Verbal Learning Test (AVLT) performance of 353 individuals who had been referred to an outpatient psychology clinic having sustained a traumatic brain injury (TBI). Individuals were divided into subgroups based on their patterns of performance on the AVLT. Individuals with low trial 1 scores were divided into three groups based on their subsequent AVLT performance. Individuals with low delayed-recall scores were divided into four groups based on their performance on preceding AVLT trials. For the TBI group as a whole, significant correlations were found between AVLT scores and age, education, and general intelligence (as measured by verbal IQ). Study 2 investigated relative ratings of everyday memory performance on the Patient Competency Rating Scale. This data was available for 82 of the individuals in the initial sample. The relationship between reported everyday memory performance and test performance on the AVLT was examined for this group. No significant correlations were found between these two variables. Low correlations were found between patient and relative ratings on the PCRS. Individuals were divided in four groups based on their everyday memory and test performance. Individuals with low everyday memory performance were found to have a similar type and number of difficulties, regardless of their AVLT performance.

The results of this study highlight the varied performance of individuals after TBI, both on memory tests such as the AVLT and reported everyday memory performance. The AVLT should not be used to predict the level of difficulty in daily life as the correlations are not significant.
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