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Background and Objective
• The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF) family of products captures perceptions of an individual’s executive functioning in their everyday environment.
• Two self-report forms span late adolescence into early adulthood: the BRIEF, Second Edition (BRIEF2; ages 11–18 years) and the BRIEF–Adult Version (BRIEF-A; ages 18–90 years). They share six clinical scales and one composite, though items differ somewhat per scale.
• Research may include adolescents and adults, and long-term follow-up of a pediatric patient may extend into adulthood, so it is important to understand the relationship between self-report ratings on the BRIEF2 and the BRIEF-A.
• The current study is the first to evaluate mean differences and correlations between comparable scales on the BRIEF2 and the BRIEF-A in a sample of young adults.

Method (continued)
• Mean raw scores were computed for each scale for all students.
• Age-based T scores were computed for the subsample of 18-year-olds.

Analyses
• Outcomes were raw scores and T scores on the six shared clinical scales (Inhibit, Self-Monitor, Shift, Emotional Control, Working Memory, Plan/Organize) and the Global Executive Composite (GEC; see Table 2).
• Statistical significance and effect sizes were calculated for each analysis.
• Total sample:
  a. MANOVA to evaluate differences in mean raw scores
  b. Correlations of mean raw scores
• Subsample of 18-year-olds:
  a. MANOVA to evaluate differences in T scores
  b. Correlations of T scores

Results (continued)
Subsample of 18-year-olds (see Table 4):
  c. T-score analyses yielded significant differences on the Emotional Control (d = 0.53) and Plan/Organize (d = -0.47) scales. Other effect sizes were < |0.30|.
  d. Correlations were similarly strong (r = .58–.84, p < .001).

Conclusions
• Results indicate good correspondence between self-report on the BRIEF2 and the BRIEF-A in young adults, with few group-level differences and generally small effect sizes.
• Differences in mean ratings and T scores are likely related to the different items that comprise each scale, either in content or in how the items apply to college students.
• Despite strong relationships between the scales, statistical corrections should be employed if merging datasets using both the BRIEF2 and the BRIEF-A, or when examining changes in individuals followed from adolescence into adulthood using the two forms of the BRIEF.
• Future research should involve larger samples that include young adults who are not in college and clinically referred samples (e.g., diagnoses of ADHD, autism, and neurocognitive disorders associated with medical conditions), with both cross-sectional and longitudinal components.
• Future research should also evaluate similarities between ratings on the BRIEF2 Parent and the BRIEF-A Informant forms.

Participants
• Study included 77 college students without psychiatric or serious medical conditions (see Table 1).

Measures
• The BRIEF2 Self-Report Form (Gioia et al., 2015)
• The BRIEF-A Self-Report Form (Roth et al., 2005)

Procedures
• Students completed the BRIEF2 and the BRIEF-A Self-Report Forms in counterbalanced order.
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