**MEASURE NAME:** Sutter-Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory-Revised  
**Acronym:** SESBI-R

### Basic Description

| **Author(s):** | Eyberg, Sheila, Ph.D., & Pincus, Donna, M.A. |
| **Author Contact:** | Sheila Eyberg  
Dept. of Clinical & Health Psychology  
Box 100165  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32610-0165  
Phone: (352) 273-6145  
FAX: (352) 273-6156 |
| **Author Email:** | seyberg@hp.ufl.edu |
| **To Obtain:** | Psychology Assessment Resources, Inc.  
16204 N. Florida Avenue  
Lutz, FL 33549  
(phone) 800.331.8378 |
| **E-mail:** | custserv@parinc.com |
| **Website:** | www.parinc.com |
| **Cost per copy (in US $):** | $1.24 |
| **Copyright:** | Yes |
| **Description:** | The SESBI-R is a reacher-report measure used to assess conduct problems in youth ages 2-16. It contains 38 items that are rated on both Intensity and Problem scales. Teachers are able to indicate the current frequency of behavior problems and determine whether or not they find the behaviors to be problematic. The SESBI-R can be used in conjunction with the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI). |
| **Theoretical Orientation Summary:** | Unknown |
| **Domains Assessed:** | 1. Externalizing Symptoms (child) |
| | 2. |
| | 3. |
| | 4. |
| | 5. |
| | 6. |
| **Languages Available:** | Chinese, English, German, Swedish |
**Age Range:** 2.00 - 16.0  
**# of Items:** 38  
**Time to Complete (min):** 5  
**Time to Score (min):** 5  
**Periodicity:** Unknown  
**Response Format:** Consists of 2 response formats:  
1. Problem Scale: Yes or No  
2. Intensity Scale: 7-Point Likert-type Scale: 1= Never Exhibits Behavior to 7=Always Exhibits Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Needed: (check all that apply)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Paper and pencil</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Testing stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Physiological equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Video equipment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material Notes:** The following items are available (as of 7/05) on the website.  
1. SESBI Test Sheets (pkg/25): $31 (Pricing is based on purchase of this item.)  
2. ECBI/SESBI-R Professional Manual: $43  
3. CBI/SESBI-R Introductory Kit: $159 (Includes ECBI/SESBI-R Professional Manual, 50 ECBI Test Sheets, and 50 SESBI-R Test Sheets.)

**Sample Items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Behaviors</td>
<td>Problem Scale</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity Scale</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes (additional scales and domains):**  
In a factor analysis of the SESBI-R (Rayfield, Eyberg, & Foote, 1998) identified two factors, one assessing oppositional behaviors and the other assessing attentional difficulties. The authors computed scales based on these factors. Details regarding the items comprising the factors can be found in the article and under “Construct Validity” (in this review).

**Information Provided: (check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Provided:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic information DSM-III</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Standard Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic information DSM-IV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Graph (e.g., of elevated scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of concerns/risks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dichotomous assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clinical friendly output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous assessment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Written feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Scores</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training to Administer: None
(check all that apply) Yes Via manual/video Training by experienced clinician (<4 hours)
Prior experience psych testing & interpretation Training by experienced clinician (≥4 hours)

Training to Interpret: None
(check all that apply) Yes Via manual/video Training by experienced clinician (<4 hours)
Prior experience psych testing & interpretation Training by experienced clinician (≥4 hours)

Training Notes: Requires:
1. Interpretation by mental health professionals with knowledge about conduct problems in children and adolescents.
2. Appropriate clinical training and experience according to the guidelines established by the American Psychological Association’s Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests.

Parallel or Alternate Forms
Parallel Forms? No
Alternate Forms: No
Forms for Different Ages: No
If so, are forms comparable: Yes
Any Altered Versions of Measure: Yes
Describe: 1. This form is a revision of the original SESBI. The SESBI-R differs from the SESBI in that 8 of the SESBI items that were rated infrequently were deleted. Ten items that, when tested, occurred frequently were added. These symptoms were derived from DSM-IV disruptive behavior categories.
2. The SESBI-R can be used in conjunction with the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI), a parent-report measure of disruptive child behavior, which is also reviewed in this database.

Population Used to Develop Measure
From Eyberg & Pincus (1999):
The original sample consisted of 55 non-referred lower-middle SES preschool children. Psychometric properties of the SESBI-R were established with 415 elementary school students from 11 schools in Gainesville, Florida.

Of the 52 teachers that rated the children, 8 were African American and 48 were Caucasian.

Distribution of grade levels were as follows: 8 kindergarten teachers, 7 first-grade teachers, 9 second-grade teachers, 8 third-grade teachers, 6 fourth-grade teachers, 8 fifth-grade teachers, and 6 teachers teaching classes with various grade levels.
314 children were in mainstream classes and 101 were in classes for behavioral or emotional problems.

Ethnicity: 206 Caucasian, 205 African-American, 2 Latino, and 2 Mixed Ethnic Background.

Gender: 223 boys, 192 girls.

SES: 16% of sample fell below poverty level on annual income.

The SESBI was later revised (Rayfield, Eyberg, & Foote, 1998) with a sample of 726 students (grades 5-12); 50% female; 36.8% African American, 62.7% White, and <1% Asian or Hispanic.

Of the 38 teachers who completed the forms: female (89%), male (11%); Caucasian (79%) and African American (21%).

**Psychometrics**

**Global Rating (scale based on Hudall Stamm, 1996):**

- Psychometrically matured, used in multiple peer reviewed articles by different people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For separate age groups:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For clinical populations:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate for men and women:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other demographic groups:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Normative data were gathered from 2 samples of children in the Southeast (Eyberg & Pincus, 1999; Rayfield, 1998).

  - Sample 1: 62.7% White, 36.8% African American children in the 5th-12 grade. Described under “Population Used To Develop Measure” (Rayfield, 1998)
  - Sample 2: 49.6% White, 49.5% African American children in kindergarten through 5th grade receiving services for emotional or behavioral disorders. Described under “Population Used To Develop Measure” (Eyberg & Pincus, 1999).

**Clinical Cutoffs:**

- Yes

**Specify Cutoffs:**

- Intensity Score: T >=60, Problem Score: T >=60

**Used in Major Studies:**

- Yes

**Specify Studies:**

- Rayfield et al. (1998).
Reliability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-Retest-# days:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Consistency:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Rater:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel/Alternate Forms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Data reported above and below are for the SESBI-R (Querido & Eyberg, 2003).

TEST-REST (1-week correlation)
Intensity (.81, n=52), Problem (.84, n=50)

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY (alpha)
Intensity (.98), Problem (.93)

Rayfield et al. (1998)
Intensity (.98), Problem (.96)

INTER-RATER (weighted means for Intensity are provided in table. Problem scores are expected to vary, given that they are dependent on the rater's perception of a problem.
Intensity, calculated for 8 pairs of teachers (range .43-.84, weighted mean=.68, n=72)
Problem, calculated for 5 pairs of teachers (range -.02-.22, weighted mean=-.04)

Content Validity:
The original SESBI was developed as a companion to the Eyberg Child Behavior Checklist: 11 items are identical; 12 items had slightly altered wording to be consistent with classroom tasks and behaviors; and 13 items were selected from "a chart review of problem behaviors most frequently reported by teachers of children referred for treatment of behavior problems" (Querido & Eyberg, 2003).

Items added during the development of the SESBI-R were derived from DSM-IV disruptive behavior categories.

Construct Validity: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity Type</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Not found</th>
<th>Nonclinical Samples</th>
<th>Clinical Samples</th>
<th>Diverse Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergent/Concurrent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal/Maturation Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Theoretically Distinct Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The SESBI-R is considerably different from the original SESBI, with 8 of the items deleted and 10 new items added. However, it would be expected that the
SESBI would share similar psychometric properties as the original SESBI. Convergent and discriminant validity data from the original SESBI, as well as evidence of sensitivity to treatment effects, are presented below separately for the SESBI and SESBI-R. Results of factor analysis are presented only for the SESBI-R. However, the tables reflect only data found using the SESBI-R.

Numerous studies have examined the validity and reliability of the original SESBI (see manual for a full description).

1. The SESBI has been found to correlate with other teacher-rated measures of disruptive behavior (e.g., Funderburk, Eyberg, Rich, & Behar, 2003) and with observations of disruptive behavior (Jacobs, Boggs, Eyberg, Edwards, Durning, & Querido, et al., 2000; Teegarden & Burns, 1993).


3. McNeil, Eyberg, Eisenstadt, Newcomb, & Funderburk (1991) found that although SESBI and ECBI scores were not correlated at either pre- or post-treatment, change scores revealed a significant correlation (r=.78), suggesting that relative improvements reported by teachers and parents using these scales are related.

4. The SESBI was also found to discriminate between different groups of children, including clinic and non-referred samples and children with a learning disability (Floyd, Rayfield, Eyberg, Riley, 2004).

5. In a large rural sample of 726 children (37% African American), significant gender effects were reported, with boys showing higher intensity scores than girls (gender effects also found by Burns & Owen, 1990; Lumley, McNeil, Herschell, & Bahl, 2002). There was also a race x grade effect, with African American children receiving higher intensity scores than did White children in middle school and junior high but similar scores (although statistically different) in high school.

SESBI-R
From Querido and Eyberg (2003)
The SESBI-R has been found to correlate with another teacher-rating scale of disruptive behavior, the Conners Teacher Rating Scale-Revised (SESBI and Conner’s Global Index: r=.74). The Intensity score correlated with all Conners subscales; and the Problem scale was significantly correlated with all scales except Perfectionism and Social Problems.

Clinic-referred versus non-clinic referred children also differed on SESBI-R Intensity and Problem scores, providing evidence of discriminant validity. In regression analyses, predicting membership to referred or non-referred groups, the SESBI-R contributed variance above that accounted for the Connor’s Oppositional subscale and demographic variables.

Principal components factor analysis of the SESBI-R Intensity scale suggested a 2-factor solution based on the scree test. The first factor accounted for 60% of the variance and contained items related to oppositional behavior. The second factor accounted for 38% of the variance and contained items related to...
attentional difficulties (Rayfield et al., 1998).

Items and their factor loadings are listed in Rayfield et al. (1998). SESBI-R items included in factor 1 are: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38.

Items included in factor 2 are: 5, 8, 14, 17, 19, 32, 34, 37.

Criterion Validity: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures used as criterion:</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Not found</th>
<th>Nonclinical Samples</th>
<th>Clinical Samples</th>
<th>Diverse Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Validity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdictive Validity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Rate(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity Rate(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Predictive Power:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Predictive Power:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of Psychometrics and Other Comments Regarding Psychometrics:

1. While norms and some studies (e.g., Querido & Eyberg, 2003) have included a significant number of African Americans, the measure has not been examined with large numbers of other ethnic groups (e.g., Latinos and Asians); and norms do not include these populations.

2. Sensitivity and Specificity rates were not reported in the manual.

3. The majority of studies have involved the original version of the SESBI and not the SESBI-R.

Consumer Satisfaction

No quantitative data found.
### Use with Diverse Populations

#### USE WITH DIVERSE POPULATIONS RATING SCALE
1. Measure is known (personal communication, conference presentation) to have been used with members of this group.
2. Studies in peer-reviewed journals have included members of this group who have completed the measure.
3. Measures have been found to be reliable with this group.
4. Psychometric properties well established with this group.
5. Norms are available for this group (or norms include a significant proportion of individuals from this group)
6. Measure was developed specifically for this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Type</th>
<th>Degree of Usage: (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developmental disability</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lower socio-economic status</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes (including other diverse populations):
The original SESBI was used with rural and lower SES populations, children with developmental disabilities, and children with learning disabilities.

### Use with Trauma Populations

#### Populations for which measure has demonstrated evidence of reliability and validity:
- Physical abuse
- Sexual abuse
- Neglect
- Domestic Violence
- Community violence
- Medical trauma
- Natural disaster
- Accidents
- Imprisonment
- Witness death
- Assault
- War/combat
- Terrorism
- Immigration related trauma
- Kidnapping/hostage
- Traumatic loss (death)
- Other

### Languages Other than English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation Quality (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chinese</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. German</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Swedish</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation Quality:
- 1 = Has been translated
- 2 = Has been translated and back translated - translation appears good and valid.
- 3 = Measure has been found to be reliable with this language group.
- 4 = Psychometric properties overall appear to be good for this language group.
- 5 = Factor structure is similar for this language group as it is for the development group.
- 6 = Norms are available for this language group.
- 7 = Measure was developed for this language group.

---

Sutter-Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory-Revised
NCTSN Measure Review Database
www.NCTSN.org
Pros and Cons/Qualitative Impression

Pros:

1. Both the manual and the test administration are user friendly.
2. Scoring is quick and easy.
3. The scales derived from factor analysis may be helpful in providing more information for diagnoses.
4. Revised to improve validity and reliability.
5. The measure may be administered in conjunction with the Eyberg Child Behavior Checklist (ECBI) for cross informant data-gathering purposes.

Cons:

1. The revision needs further empirical study, given that there are only two published empirical studies (as of 7/05) that used the revised version.
2. This measure does not assess symptoms relevant to trauma-exposed children such as internalizing problems and PTSD symptomatology. It focuses primarily on externalizing symptoms.
3. Although the normative sample includes African Americans, it includes few Asians and Latinos, and caution should be used when applying the norms to those ethnic groups.
Published References:

The reference for the manual is:

A PsychInfo literature search of "Sutter Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory" or "SESBI" (6/05) anywhere revealed the measure has been referenced in 65 peer-reviewed journal articles.

Note: However, because many of these articles only used the ECBI, and the search was identifying citations of the manual, the search was limited to Sutter Eyberg as a keyword or measure. This resulted in 18 peer reviewed journal articles. Two (#15, #16) were identified as having used the SESBI-R as opposed to the original version. One did not cite the SESBI, but four other articles were identified while conducting the review. Given that the revised version most likely shares psychometric properties with the full version, the review was based on the 21 articles identified. A sampling is below.


PsychInfo literature search of "Sutter Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory" or "SESBI" (6/05) anywhere revealed the measure has been referenced in 3 conferences and 3 dissertations. Many of these involved the original SESBI and not the SESBI-R.


Family, Atlanta, GA.
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