Behavior Rating Profile, Second Edition (BRP-2)

The Behavior Rating Profile, Second Edition (L. Brown & Hammill, 1990) is a multirater, multicontext instrument designed for use with students ages 6–6 to 18–6 years. The BRP-2 consists of three Student Rating Scales (Home, SRS:H; School, SRS:S; and Peers, SRS:P), a Teacher Rating Scale (TRS), a Parent Rating Scale (PRS), and a Sociogram. The three student scales are printed in a single booklet and are administered simultaneously. The authors propose that the BRP-2 be used to help identify students with emotional, behavioral, personal, or social adjustment problems in home, school, or social–interpersonal settings. The ecological framework is depicted in Table 26.2.

Each Student Rating Scale has 20 items that are answered as either true or false. Representative SRS:H items include "I don't listen to my parents when they are talking to me" and "I have lots of nightmares and bad dreams." SRS:S items include "My teachers give me work that I cannot do" and "I can't seem to stay in my desk at school." SRS:P items include "Other children are always picking on me" and "I seem to get into a lot of fights."

The Teacher Rating Scale has 30 items that include statements about the student's school behavior. These statements are negatively oriented and are rated on a 4-point scale (1, very much like the student; 2, like the student; 3, not much like the student; 4, not at all like the student). Examples of items from the TRS include "Swears in class" and "Tattles on classmates."
The PRS contains 30 negatively worded items describing behaviors that may be observed at home. These are rated on the same 4-point scale as the TRS. Examples of the PRS items include "Is verbally aggressive to parents" and "Violates curfew."

The Sociogram uses a peer-nomination technique to get peer perceptions of the target student. Pairs of stimulus questions selected from the manual or devised by the examiner are given to the students—for example, "Which students in your class would you like most to have as a class officer?" and "Which students would you least like to have as a class officer?" Students then nominate three of their peers whom they would "like most" and "like least." The examiner then rank-orders students based on their acceptance and rejection rates.

**Scores**

All five scales of the BRP-2 yield raw scores, standard scores, and percentile ranks. Scoring of the rating scales is straightforward; however, scoring the Sociogram involves a more complex six-step computation and ranking procedure. Standard error of measurement (SEM) data are complicated. An SEM of 1 is printed on the BRP-2 profile form for all scales. However, SEMs actually vary by subtest and grade level from 0.4 to 1.6. Thus, the example of how to use the SEM provided in the manual is not easy to follow.

**Norms**
Three norm samples (L. Brown & Hammill, 1978, 1983, 1989) have been integrated for the BRP-2. A total of 2,682 students ages 6–6 to 18–6 from 26 states are included in the complete group. Data to support the representativeness of the norm sample are provided. Students at the anchor points (ages 6 and 18 years) are underrepresented, and the educational attainment of students' parents is biased toward the high end. A notable exclusionary practice of the BRP-2 is the authors' decision not to assess students with social–emotional disturbances (SEDs) in the normative process. We consider it inappropriate to exclude students with particular characteristics from the norm group of a test designed to help identify them. Readers are cautioned that in using the BRP-2, they will be making normative comparisons to a sample presumably less prone to behavior problems.

Norm data for the PRS were gathered from 1,948 parents in 19 states. Procedures for gathering parent data included sending BRP-2 scales home, asking those attending Parent–Teacher Association meetings to fill out the scales, and asking parents at school conferences to complete the instrument. Again, no students with SED were rated in these processes.

For the TRS, data are available from 1,452 teachers from 26 states. Teachers were asked to rate every fifth student on their class rosters, except students with SED. Overall demographics for the PRS and TRS appear to closely match national averages.

No norm sample data on the Sociogram are presented because the target student's own classmates serve as the normative comparison. Normative scoring information for the Sociogram was prepared by examining normalized distributions of student ranks for different class sizes.
Reliability

Two types of reliability data are offered to support the BRP-2: internal consistency using coefficient alpha and test–retest stability. Reliability coefficients are reported for five grade levels for the five rating scales. Each scale's internal consistency was calculated for a sample size of about 200 across these grade levels. Coefficients ranged from .77 to .98 and are adequate for the test's intended purpose as a screening device. Internal-consistency estimates with special populations (elementary students with emotional disturbance and secondary students with learning disabilities) ranged from .76 to .97. Overall, these also are of adequate magnitude for the BRP-2's intended use.

Test–retest reliability is presented from several studies. For a group of 36 high school students, their teachers, and their parents, reliability coefficients ranged from .78 to .91 across a two-week interval. The TRS was the most stable scale. Another study of 198 students in grades 1 through 12, including 212 parents and 176 teachers, yielded test–retest reliability ranging from .43 to .96. Coefficients for grades 1 and 2 were lowest (SRS:H = .43, SRS:S = .58, SRS:P = .52, PRS = .69, TRS = .94). No explanation for or speculation about these coefficients is provided; however, the capriciousness of self-reports by young children and their reading difficulties may be partial explanations. Ninety-seven secondary students with emotional disturbances, their parents, and their teachers provided test–retest data on the BRP-2 scales. Coefficients for these subjects ranged from .76 to .82.
Information on an important type of reliability data for rating scales, interrater reliability, is missing from the BRP-2 technical manual. The authors' discussion of interpretation of scores from an ecological perspective includes issues of multiple raters and possible discrepancies among their scores. Still, some indication of interrater agreement can be gleaned from their discussion of patterns across student, teacher, and parent ratings. Students tend to give themselves the highest scores, whereas parents usually assign the lowest scores. Omission of direct interrater reliability data, however, weakens the overall data support for the instrument.

Validity

The authors believe validity is not easily discussed along traditional lines of content, criterion-related, and construct validity data. Evidence of overall validity is provided for "more punctilious readers" (L. Brown & Hammill, 1990, p. 48) in sections devoted to relationships among BRP-2 items or scales and other variables or criteria.

Content validation was approached through the authors' examination of the professional literature, existing checklists, rating scales (such as Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist, Quay–Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist), and other assessments. Parents of students with emotional and learning problems provided written input about behavior concerns. Longer, experimental versions of the BRP scales were reduced to a more manageable length through empirical item analyses.

Criterion-related, concurrent, and construct validity data are supplied in several sections describing the relationship of BRP-2 scales to measures of achievement,
aptitude, and affect. Correlations with tests of achievement and aptitude produce low (near-zero) coefficients, as was expected by the authors. Stronger correlations between the BRP-2 and measures of affect were expected as evidence that these criterion variables were measuring the same construct.

The strongest evidence for validity rests on data from a study conducted on 108 students in Kansas (27 in each of four groups: normal, learning disabled, public school socially/emotionally disturbed, and institutionalized socially/emotionally disturbed). All BRP-2 scales except the Sociogram were correlated with the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist, the Quay–Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist, and the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. Inspection of the data shows that 64 of 72 resulting correlations were significant and exceeded their target magnitude of .35. The results were weakest for the students with SED who received services in the public schools. There is some confusion, however, in the reporting of these data. The authors' explanations of the data account for only 60 of the 72 reported correlations, and this research is not discussed in sufficient detail.

Other studies correlate BRP-2 scales with the Test of Early Socioemotional Development, the Behavior Evaluation Scale, the Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale II, the Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale, and the Index of Children's Personality Characteristics. These data support the concurrent and construct validity of the BRP-2 as a measure of overall behavior and social adjustment.

Support for the discriminative validity of the BRP-2 scales (except the Sociogram) is provided in a section listing 15 studies reporting BRP-2 scores for different student groups. (Some of the studies were conducted by the authors.) As a whole, these
studies reveal the expected differences in group means. Students with social/emotional disturbance and mental retardation score lower than students with learning disabilities and nondisabled students, who tend to receive average scores. Gifted students tend to score higher than all other groups. Several of the studies are described in some detail. The statistical significance of the findings in these studies, however, is not detailed.

Summary

The BRP-2 is designed to assess students' behavior in different ecologies and is intended to identify students with emotional, behavioral, and social adjustment problems. The device is made up of five rating scales and a Sociogram. The rating scales require true–false responses of the students and Likert-type ratings from teachers and parents. Norms for the BRP-2 exclude students with SED but otherwise appear well defined. Users of the BRP-2 must recognize this design characteristic and adjust their interpretations accordingly. Reliability for the scales is supported by adequate internal-consistency and test–retest data. No interrater reliability data are provided. Content validity of the BRP-2 scales was ensured by a well-planned development process. The tests appear to have high criterion-related, concurrent, and construct validity. There is some question of the instrument's ability to discriminate between students with learning problems and students with behavior problems. The BRP-2 should be used with confidence as a screening tool but should not be used as the primary data source for classification or diagnostic decisions.