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Purpose:
- Individually-administered, norm-referenced measure of adaptive behavior or “personal and social self-sufficiency,” for individuals ages birth-90 years (Teacher Rating Form covers ages 3-21).

Provides:
- Information regarding the individual’s performance of daily activities is gathered either through structured interview with parent/caregiver (Survey Interview Form, Expanded Interview Form) or independent completion of the record booklet (Parent/Caregiver Form, Teacher Rating Form). Completion of the individual forms yields an overall, “Adaptive Behavior Composite,” and performance scores for the following areas: Communication (Receptive, Expressive, Written), Daily Living Skills (Personal, Domestic, Community, Academic—Teacher Form only), Socialization (Interpersonal Relations, Play and Leisure Time, Coping Skills), Motor (Gross, Fine), and optional Maladaptive Behavior Index and indication of Maladaptive Critical Items.

Standardization Issues:
- The measure was well-standardized and included a sample of 3,687 individuals ages Birth-90 years, from 44 states (and District of Columbia), and matched to 2001 US demographics with regard to race/ethnicity, SES, geographic location, community size, and special education placement.

Reliability and Validity Issues:
- Reliability and validity information on the Vineland-II is quite extensive, and outlined within the manual(s). Results of these analyses showed good evidence of reliability including estimates of internal consistency (.80’s-.90’s), test-retest (.70’s-.90’s; with Motor Skills and the Maladaptive Index appearing “lowest” but acceptable), inter-interviewer (.70’s), and inter-rater (.70’s-.80’s). The manual substantiates the measure’s validity and outlines numerous sources addressing test content, structure, and concurrent-forms.
Additional Points:

- The Expanded Interview Form provides a more comprehensive (in-depth) assessment of skills and forms a structure for specific treatment planning activities.
- The teacher form includes a revision of subdomains and items more “relevant” to actual school functioning.
- Extensive efforts were made with the revision to examine items. Changes in items were done in response to updated examination for bias (ethnic diversity, gender, SES, geographic location, and community size) as well as to increase the overall sensitivity of the measure (particularly for higher-functioning, disabled individuals). Data at the item-level focused on examining developmental sequence, validity, clinical sensitivity, bias, and “redundancy.” Subdomains were then re-examined for internal reliability, intercorrelations and factor structure. Group differences (examining for bias) were found to be relatively small.
- Clinical populations included in the norm sample (and available for clinical profile comparisons) included ADHD, autism, EBD, hearing impairment, visual impairment, LD, and three-levels of cognitive impairment (mild, moderate, and severe/profound). Studies confirmed diagnostic accuracy between groups as well as, in the case of mental retardation, levels of severity within the clinical group. Chapter 5 in the manual provides score profiles for individuals with different diagnostic classifications and provides helpful clinical comparisons between groups such as High Functioning Autism and Asperger’s Syndrome, Autism and Mental Retardation, Normal and ADHD, Normal and Hearing Impaired, and Nonspecific Mental Retardation and Down Syndrome.
- Because of rapid changes in developmental growth and increasing-emphasis on early-identification, the norm sampling included larger pools of individuals ages Birth-5. The increased item focus at early ages increases the scale’s sensitivity and utility for this age group in particular.
- While still acceptable, interrater reliabilities were lowest on the Teacher Rating Form. This may be explained by varying perceptions, interpretations, and expectations of teachers. Likewise, correlations between teacher- and parent (Survey) forms were moderate at best—likely due to behavior being observed in significantly different environments. This is of course a potential issue with any measure which extends to multiple environments and/or includes different respondents. That said, larger score differences between teachers or teachers-parents bears further analysis by the examiner to explain for. Evaluations relying solely on indirect-methods (ratings, interviews) should also include some element of direct observation.
- Domain standard errors of measurement (SEM’s) were good, and found to be between 4.5-5.0 points on Survey/Parent forms and even smaller (2.6-4.0 points) on the teacher form.
- The Vineland-II may need to be supplemented with other measures/methods in evaluating for determination of special education
eligibility under Cognitive Disabilities in individuals ages 6-21. The factor structure (domains and subdomains) of the measure may not adequately cover/address the 10 adaptive behavior areas identified in Wisconsin eligibility criteria.

- Vineland-II’s new items better target autism-spectrum behaviors and mild cognitive impairments.
- The Interview format is recommended unless the examiner is confident in the respondent’s sufficient knowledgeability, honesty, literacy, and comprehension of directions in reliable completion of the independent third-part rating forms.
- Spanish forms are available.