Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)

Wake Forest University • Clinical Mental Health • CNS-736 Assignment 6.1 • Nichole Vollertsen

Understanding a Child Beyond One Behavior

A child who argues at home may cooperate at school. Another child may earn good grades while privately experiencing considerable worry. These differences make assessment more complicated than deciding whether a child behaves well. The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) organizes a caregiver's observations of emotional and behavioral concerns so that a counselor can identify patterns, ask focused questions, and plan further assessment. Its strongest use is as one part of a comprehensive evaluation, rather than as a stand-alone diagnosis.

Hays (2023) places assessment within the counseling process and emphasizes integrating test findings with other information about the client. Applied to the CBCL, this approach means that a profile should inform a conversation about the child's life, relationships, functioning, and strengths. A number becomes clinically useful when its meaning is connected to the experiences of the child and family. This newsletter examines the instrument's structure, psychometric evidence, population considerations, and responsible use.



Two Forms for Different Developmental Periods

The CBCL belongs to the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA). Parents or other caregivers complete the checklist; the counselor interprets the results. The preschool form covers ages 1½–5, whereas the school-age form covers ages 6–18. The preschool form has 99 specified problem items and an opportunity to describe additional problems. Its reporting period is the previous two months (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966). The school-age form uses a six-month reporting period and includes information about activities, social relationships, and school functioning. Its companion instruments are the Teacher's Report Form (TRF), for ages 6–18, and the Youth Self-Report (YSR), for ages 11–18. These are separate instruments with their own respondents and norms, not interchangeable versions of a parent's report (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).

Problem responses use a three-point scale indicating that a description is not true, somewhat or sometimes true, or very true or often true. Completion does not require the caregiver to understand diagnostic terminology. Interpretation does require professional knowledge of the selected form, scoring procedures, and limits of the evidence (Pandolfi et al., 2009).

What the Profile Organizes



For school-age children, the eight syndrome scales are Anxious/Depressed, Withdrawn/Depressed, Somatic Complaints, Social Problems, Thought Problems, Attention Problems, Rule-Breaking Behavior, and Aggressive Behavior. Broader Internalizing, Externalizing, and Total Problems scores summarize aspects of the problem profile. Current school-age DSM-oriented scales provide an additional perspective using categories such as Depressive Problems and Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).

The scale names organize reported concerns; they do not establish causes. An attention elevation, for example, creates a reason to explore when difficulty occurs, what demands are present, and which additional assessments are needed. A counselor should also ask what helps the child succeed. This keeps the assessment connected to practical support instead of allowing a problem label to become the entire description of the child.

Reading the Scores Carefully



Raw Scores and Comparison Groups

Raw scores summarize endorsed problems. Standardized profiles convert them into scores that compare the child with the selected reference group. T scores use a conventional mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10, although ASEBA's normalized profiles and score floors mean that the displayed values should be interpreted through the official scoring system. Higher problem scores indicate more reported concerns. Competence scores run in the opposite direction: lower scores can indicate difficulty (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966). For the school-age broad problem scales, T scores of 60–63 fall in the borderline range and scores of 64 or higher fall in the clinical range. Syndrome and DSM-oriented problem scales generally use 65–69 for borderline and 70 or higher for clinical elevations. These thresholds do not apply to competence scales. The profile and manual for the actual form and norm group should always guide interpretation (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966). An elevation indicates that follow-up is warranted. It does not mean that a child has a particular disorder, and a score below a cutoff cannot guarantee the absence of a clinically important concern. A clinician should examine the specific concerns, associated impairment, and circumstances of the report.

Reliability means consistency

Internal consistency concerns how strongly items within a scale relate to one another. Test–retest reliability concerns consistency when the same measure is repeated over a short interval. The school-age manual reports Total Problems internal consistency of α = .97 and test–retest reliability of r = .94. These are strong coefficients, but they are estimates from the manual's samples, not guarantees about every population or individual assessment (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966). Nakamura et al. (2009) studied DSM-oriented scales in a clinical sample of 673 youths, pooling data from older and newer CBCL forms. Reported alpha coefficients ranged from .71 to .89 across scales and form-specific analyses. These results support consistency while showing why a counselor should identify the particular scale and version instead of saying that the entire CBCL has one reliability value.

A high alpha does not prove that a scale measures only one construct. It also does not establish diagnostic accuracy. Reliability provides a foundation for interpretation, but validity asks whether the proposed interpretation is supported.

Validity Depends on the Question

Construct validity concerns whether a scale reflects the pattern it is intended to measure. Ivanova et al. (2007) tested the school-age eight-syndrome structure using caregiver reports for 58,051 children across 30 societies. Their confirmatory factor analyses supported that structure in each society. This is substantial evidence that the syndromes have relevance across diverse settings. That finding does not establish equal diagnostic accuracy across every subgroup. Factor structure, classification accuracy, and sensitivity to treatment change answer different questions. Evidence supporting one purpose should not automatically be treated as evidence supporting another. A counselor selecting the CBCL should therefore begin with the referral question and identify the evidence most relevant to the intended decision.

What the Research Can and Cannot Establish

DSM Oriented Does Not Mean Diagnostic

Nakamura et al. (2009) found support for convergent validity and discrimination between youths with and without relevant diagnoses. Some findings about divergence from unrelated constructs were more mixed. Their use of both CBCL/4–18 and CBCL/6–18 data also limits treating the study as evidence exclusively about the current school-age form.

Ebesutani et al. (2010) examined 476 clinic-referred youths and compared DSM-oriented scales with syndrome scales against diagnoses obtained from parent-based structured interviews. Several DSM-oriented scales corresponded with relevant diagnoses. However, only the Anxiety Problems scale demonstrated significantly better diagnostic correspondence than its syndrome counterpart. This finding supports their supplementary usefulness while challenging the assumption that DSM-oriented scales are consistently superior.

Both studies assessed earlier DSM-IV-oriented scales. Current ASEBA school-age profiles use DSM-5-oriented



labels and item groupings. The older evidence remains informative, but its applicability should be considered alongside current documentation rather than treated as a direct validation of every contemporary revision (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).



Screening Accuracy is Conditional

Sensitivity describes how often a screening method identifies people who have the target condition. Specificity describes how often it correctly classifies people who do not. Warnick et al. (2008) reviewed screening studies of the CBCL and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. Their review included 29 CBCL studies and supported its usefulness for screening, with performance varying across assessed domains and study conditions.

There is no single sensitivity or specificity percentage that describes every CBCL application. The selected cutoff, population, and diagnostic comparison all matter. Predictive value also changes with how common the target condition is in the setting. A positive screen in a specialty clinic may have a different meaning from a positive screen in a community sample.

For practice, the appropriate question is whether the instrument offers useful information for this child and this decision. A broad checklist may help identify areas requiring a focused interview. It may be less suitable when the immediate question requires a specialized measure of a narrowly defined concern.



Disagreement Can Contain Useful Information

De Los Reyes et al. (2015) synthesized 341 studies of child mental health assessment. Mean agreement across informants was modest: r = .25 for internalizing concerns, r = .30 for externalizing concerns, and r = .28 overall. These are findings about multi-informant child assessment broadly, not CBCL-specific reliability coefficients.
Different reports can reflect different settings, access to information, or perspectives.

A caregiver may observe bedtime worry, while a teacher sees sustained classroom participation. Neither report automatically invalidates the other. The counselor should investigate discrepancies instead of averaging away their meaning or selecting whichever informant confirms an initial impression.

Consider a hypothetical child whose caregiver describes distress during homework but whose teacher reports few attention concerns.

Follow-up could examine task difficulty, fatigue, family interactions, and differences in classroom support. The discrepancy helps identify what to observe next; it does not independently establish an attention disorder or a parenting problem.

Matching Assessment to Child and Family

Age and Development Presentation

The preschool and school-age forms have different content and structures. Younger children depend heavily on adults to describe their functioning, while adolescents can provide information that caregivers may not observe. Form selection should follow chronological age and official instructions; developmental differences should inform interpretation and additional assessment rather than lead to an undocumented switch to an out-of-range form. Pandolfi et al. (2009) examined the preschool CBCL in 128 children with autism spectrum disorders. Their results supported the internalizing and externalizing structure, but did not support a single underlying factor for the Sleep Problems scale. The same was predominantly White and male, which limits generalization. The study illustrates that favorable overall evidence can coexist with limitations for an individual scale or subgroup.

For an autistic child or a child with communication differences, an endorsed behavior may have several possible meanings. Withdrawal could relate to communication demands, sensory overload, or distress. The counselor should explore context and changes from the child's usual functioning while assessing possible co-occurring concerns. A general behavior profile should not replace a specialized developmental evaluation.



Cultural Relevance Requires More Than Translation

Ivanova et al. (2007) provide strong cross-society evidence for the school-age syndrome structure. Their findings support broad relevance, but a similar factor structure does not prove that every item has identical meaning or that a single cutoff produces equally fair decisions across all groups. Within-society diversity also matters: national norms do not fully describe every family's language, community, or lived experience.

ASEBA offers multicultural norm options, including groups reflecting relatively low, intermediate, and high reported problem levels. The counselor should choose the appropriate reference information using the publisher's guidance and document the rationale. The availability of these options improves comparison possibilities without removing the need for individualized cultural inquiry (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).

For example, a hypothetical caregiver may view quietness as respectful, while a school professional views it as social difficulty. Follow-up should examine whether the child experiences distress, exclusion, or impaired participation. The meaning of the behavior cannot be determined solely from how closely it resembles an assessor's expectations.

Access and Identity affect Interpretation

Language preference, reading comfort, disability, and access to technology can affect participation. Authorized translations and appropriate assistance should be used where available. Any departure from standardized administration should be documented, with its possible effect on interpretation considered. The ACA Code of Ethics specifically requires attention to cultural and demographic influences and caution when applying norms developed for other populations (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014).

Gender norms also require care. ASEBA's gender-inclusive guidance explains options for scoring against female norms, male norms, or both when a respondent selects another gender identification. These options should be discussed respectfully and documented; they do not create a separate nonbinary normative sample (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).

Counselors should also ask about discrimination, housing instability, family transitions, and available supports. In a hypothetical family experiencing repeated moves, a behavior profile can help identify distress while interviews clarify environmental demands. Cultural responsiveness involves understanding what a score leaves unexplained as well as what it helps organize.

Using the CBCL Responsibly

Consent Competence and Understandable

Before administration, the counselor should explain the assessment's purpose, who will complete it, how findings will be used, and the limits of confidentiality. Appropriate permission must be established for the minor's circumstances, and developmentally suitable assent should be sought. Caregiver participation should not leave the child excluded from an understandable explanation of the process. The ACA Code of Ethics addresses competence, appropriate instrument selection, informed consent, and communication of results. Applied to the CBCL, these responsibilities require training in the selected form and a clear explanation of what its scores support. If circumstances weaken validity, that limitation belongs in the report (ACA, 2014). Feedback should describe reported, patterns acknowledge strengths, and invite clarification. A family can be told that the checklist identifies areas for closer discussion and helps guide support. Explaining an elevation as evidence of more reported concerns than in a reference group is more accurate than announcing that the test has identified a disorder.

Privacy Follows the Setting

CBCL forms and reports contain sensitive information about a child and family. Access should be restricted, electronic records protected, and disclosures handled under the rules governing the actual setting. In the United States, student health information held by a FERPA-covered school or a provider acting on its behalf generally falls under FERPA. Records held by an outside health provider may instead be governed by HIPAA when that provider is covered. The setting and record custodian determine the applicable framework (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.).



For an IDEA evaluation, federal regulations prohibit using one assessment as the sole criterion for disability identification or educational programming. Thus, a CBCL elevation cannot independently establish special education eligibility. School evaluations must use multiple sources and sufficiently comprehensive procedures (34 C.F.R. § 300.304, 2026).

Clinicians should verify legal authority for consent and access when custody or guardianship is relevant. A caregiver rating should not be treated as proof of abuse, parental fitness, or the cause of a child's behavior. Those conclusions require evidence appropriate to the question and the professional's role.

Limits That Matter in Everyday Practice



The CBCL depends on what the caregiver observes, remembers, understands, and chooses to report. Limited contact, family conflict, or different expectations may affect responses. Follow-up interviews should explore these possibilities without assuming that a discrepant caregiver is inaccurate or dishonest (De Los Reyes et al., 2015).

Its broad coverage is a strength when concerns overlap, but may be insufficient for a narrowly defined clinical question. Administration, scoring, and interpretive work also require time and access to authorized materials. ASEBA provides sample forms for review while prohibiting unauthorized reproduction; the checklist should not be copied into a newsletter or redistributed as a free worksheet (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966).

The reporting window is another constraint. ASEBA advises against administering the school-age CBCL more often than every six months when its standard instructions are unchanged. If a shorter interval is used, the instructions and resulting interpretation require explicit attention. For frequent monitoring, the publisher offers the Brief Problem Monitor as an alternative designed for that purpose (Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A., 1966)

Turning Findings Into a Counseling Plan

An illustrative case

The following fictional example demonstrates clinical reasoning; it is not a diagnostic rule. A nine-year-old is referred because of arguments during homework and frequent stomach complaints before school. The caregiver's CBCL profile shows elevated internalizing concerns and attention difficulties. The counselor first checks the selected form, completion quality, reference group, and the caregiver's comments. Individual concerns receive follow-up even if a broader score is below a cutoff.

The counselor interviews the child and caregiver about the timing of symptoms, school demands, peer relationships, sleep, and recent changes. With appropriate permission, a teacher completes the TRF. Medical consultation is considered for the physical complaints. A focused assessment may be selected if the interviews identify a specific question that the broad checklist cannot adequately answer.

Suppose the teacher reports few disruptive concerns but identifies difficulty during independent reading. The counselor would explore the relationship between task demands and distress rather than infer that the child is choosing to misbehave. The child's account could reveal embarrassment about reading aloud, while the caregiver describes frustration during lengthy assignments. Together, these reports help shape a more specific assessment plan.

From Hypothesis to Shared Goals

The profile can guide questions about patterns, but treatment goals should connect to meaningful functioning. For this fictional child, goals might include asking for help during difficult assignments, practicing a coping strategy before school, and reducing conflict during a structured homework routine. Progress would include the child's experience, caregiver observations, and school participation, rather than only movement in a standardized score.

This application follows Hays's (2023) emphasis on combining quantitative and qualitative information. It also reflects the multi-informant approach described by De Los Reyes et al. (2015): differences among reports can guide decisions about where support is most needed. Ebesutani et al. (2010) further support using DSM-oriented elevations to inform subsequent diagnostic inquiry instead of treating a profile as a completed diagnosis.

Documenting the Interpretation

The assessment report should identify the form, date, respondent, selected norms, significant findings, and limitations. Conclusions should distinguish what the caregiver reported from what the counselor inferred. If more information is needed, the report should state the remaining question and the proposed next step. These practices make the reasoning visible and allow another professional to understand how the assessment informed the plan.



Evaluating Change Without Overclaiming

A later CBCL assessment can contribute to reviewing broader change when the reporting window and administration are appropriate. Comparisons should consider whether the same caregiver participated, whether the same norms were used, and whether major contextual changes occurred. Changing forms as a child ages also changes the measurement context, so raw totals should not be treated as interchangeable.

A lower score may support an impression of improvement, but a small difference can reflect measurement variation. The counselor should examine whether daily functioning improved and use a justified method before declaring statistically reliable change. The CBCL offers a structured view of caregiver-reported concerns; its value grows when that view informs a collaborative, culturally responsive understanding of the child.

References

Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (1966). *Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA).* https://aseba.org/

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/ethics/2014-aca-code-of-ethics.pdf

De Los Reyes, A., Augenstein, T. M., Wang, M., Thomas, S. A., Drabick, D. A. G., Burgers, D. E., & Rabinowitz, J. (2015). The validity of the multi-informant approach to assessing child and adolescent mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(4), 858–900. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038498

Ebesutani, C., Bernstein, A., Nakamura, B.J. *et al.* Concurrent Validity of the Child Behavior Checklist DSM-Oriented Scales: Correspondence with DSM Diagnoses and Comparison to Syndrome Scales. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* **32**, 373–384 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-009-9174-9

Evaluation procedures, 34 C.F.R. § 300.304 (2026). https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/d/300.304

Hays, D. G. (2023). *Assessment in counseling: Procedures and practices* (7th ed.). American Counseling Association.

Ivanova, M. Y., Achenbach, T. M., Dumenci, L., Rescorla, L. A., Almqvist, F., Weintraub, S., … Verhulst, F. C. (2007). Testing the 8-Syndrome Structure of the Child Behavior Checklist in 30 Societies. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *36*(3), 405–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410701444363

Nakamura, B.J., Ebesutani, C., Bernstein, A. *et al.* A Psychometric Analysis of the Child Behavior Checklist DSM-Oriented Scales. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* **31**, 178–189 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-008-9119-8

Pandolfi, V., Magyar, C.I. & Dill, C.A. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Child Behavior Checklist 1.5–5 in a Sample of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *J Autism Dev Disord* **39**, 986–995 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-009-0716-5

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (n.d.). *Does FERPA or HIPAA apply to elementary or secondary school student health records maintained by a health care provider that is not employed by a school?* https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/faq/does-hipaa-apply-to-school-student-health-records/index.html

Warnick, E.M., Bracken, M.B. and Kasl, S. (2008), Screening Efficiency of the Child Behavior Checklist and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Systematic Review. Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 13: 140-147. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3588.2007.00461.x