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The first edition of the Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales and the Reynolds Intellectual Screening Test was published in 2003 (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2003). The Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales-2 and the Reynolds Intellectual Screening Test-2 (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2015) continues to provide an efficacious measure of “g” across the developmental spectrum from age 3 to age 94.

The format of the Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales—Second Edition (RIAS-2) will be familiar to users of the original RIAS as it retains the primary Verbal Intelligence Index, Nonverbal Intelligence Index, Composite Intelligence Index, and Composite Memory Index. New to the RIAS-2 is the Speeded Processing Index that is comprised of two new measures: Speeded Naming Task and Speeded Picture Search. The Speeded Naming Task involves the ability to differentiate and recognize simple stimuli verbally under time constraints, while the Speeded Picture Search requires the ability to differentiate stimuli visually under time constraints. Each of the tasks in the Speeded Processing Index has different requirements for children ages 3 to 5 years. From age 6 onwards, the requirements are the same. It is important to note that neither the Speeded Processing Index nor its subtests, the Speeded Naming Task or the Speeded Picture Search, are used in the computation of any of the intellectual indexes so as to keep motor-related factors out of the Intelligence Indexes. Rather, the Speeded Processing Index like the Composite Memory Index is a separate component of the RIAS-2.

The RIAS-2 norms were based upon a population-proportionate, stratified sample of 2154 individuals. All subtest scores were scaled to a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10, while the indexes were scaled to a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15, as is common in many intellectual assessment instruments. The index scores were all age-corrected using a continuous norming process. The dependence upon speed of performance and motor skills has been reduced or eliminated as these variables confound measures of “g.” The basal and ceiling levels for the RIAS-2, where applicable, have been standardized. The basal level has been set at two consecutive correct responses and the ceiling level, informed by users of the RIAS, has been set at four consecutive scores of zero. For serial evaluations with the RIAS-2, there is an appendix that contains reliable change scores by age groups across four significance levels. A welcome addition is the Fast Guide that contains administration and scoring guidelines in a separate concise 51-page spiral bound booklet (5 in. × 7 in.) that is ideal for administration and scoring purposes. The entire RIAS-2 can be administered in 40 to 45 min.

The RIAS-2 is not dependent upon reading ability and is comparable to lengthier intellectual test batteries in the prediction of academic achievement based upon comparison with the Academic Achievement Battery (Messer, 2014). The Professional Manual contains sections on the rationale behind the RIAS-2, administration and scoring guidelines, interpretation of scores, details of the development, standardization, and normative procedures, along with test score reliability and validity of test score interpretation.
The Reynolds Intellectual Screening Test, Second Edition (RIST-2) uses two subtests from the RIAS-2 (Guess What and Odd-Item Out) to provide a single component estimate of “g” for screening or research purposes. The RIST-2 can be administered in approximately 10 min and since it uses two subtests from the RIAS-2, there is no additional cost to the clinician or researcher.

From the perspective of a scientist-practitioner who has utilized the RIAS, the RIAS-2 has a number of advantages over other intellectual assessment instruments: (1) it provides for continuity of measurement of intellectual functioning across the life span, (2) it has been developed based upon solid evidence-based practice guidelines, (3) the authors have been responsive to feedback from users in the field, (4) it is efficient in terms of administration and scoring time, and (5) the overall direct costs to the clinician/researcher are substantially less than other intellectual assessment instruments.
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