The Brief Resilience Scale

Contact: Bruce W. Smith, bwsmith@unm.edu, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, U.S.A

_____

Instructions: Use the following scale and **<u>circle</u>** one number for each statement to indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the statements.

   1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Neutral   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

_____

1. I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times…………………….	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have a hard time making it through stressful events……………..	1	2	3	4	5
3. It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event………...	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens……...	1	2	3	4	5
5. I usually come through difficult times with little trouble..………...	1	2	3	4	5
6. I tend to take a long time to get over set-backs in my life………...	1	2	3	4	5

_____

Scoring: The BRS is scored by first reverse coding items 2, 4, and 6 and then taking the mean of the all the items. Since the items are scored between 1 and 5, the mean you obtain would be between 1 and 5.

Original Validation Study:

Smith, B.W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the Ability to Bounce Back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15,* 194–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972

Additional Validation Studies:

Chmitorz A, Wenzel M, Stieglitz R-D, Kunzler A, Bagusat C, Helmreich I, et al. (2018) Population-based validation of a German version of the Brief Resilience Scale,. *PLoS ONE 13*(2): e0192761. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192761

Leontjevas, R., de Beek, W. O., Lataster, J., & Jacobs, N. (2014). Resilience to affective disorders: A comparative validation of two resilience scales. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *168*, 262–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.07.010

Rodríguez-Rey, R., Alonso-Tapia, J., & Hernansaiz-Garrido, H. (2016). Reliability and validity of the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) Spanish Version. *Psychological Assessment*, *28*(5), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000191

High and Low Resilience Cut-Off Scores for the Brief Resilience Scale

Table 1. Cut-offs for Classifying BRS Scores into Categories of Low Resilience (bottom 25%), Medium Resilience (middle 25%), and High Resilience (top 25%).

	Mean	SD	Low Cut-Off	High Cut-Off
Adults	3.47	.77	2.95 ≤	≥ 3.99
Males	3.54	.77	3.03 ≤	≥ 4.07
Females	3.40	.77	2.87 ≤	≥ 3.91
Adolescents	3.26	.72	2.77 ≤	≥ 3.75
Males	3.34	.72	2.85 ≤	≥ 3.83
Females	3.18	.72	2.69 ≤	≥ 3.66

Note. The scores are for the overall mean of BRS when it is administered on the original 1-5 scale.

Method for Establishing the Cut-Offs for the Brief Resilience Scale:

We recently reviewed 20 studies conducted between 2014 and 2017 of the general population that used the Brief Resilience Scale to develop cut-off scores for high and low resilience. There were 15 studies with adults (n = 22,050) in the United States, Australia, China, Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, and Turkey and 5 studies with adolescents (n = 2,186) in the United States, China, India, and Japan. We used the means and standard deviations from these studies to come up with a mean for adults (M = 3.47, SD = .77) and adolescents (M = 3.26, SD = .72). We then used six studies that gave the means and standard deviations for both males and females (males had a mean that was .16 higher) to come up with the difference to add/subtract from the means/standard deviations from the original samples.

Next, we determined the distance from these means for the cut-off scores. Although some clinical measures use cut-offs of 1.00 standard deviation from the mean to identify "cases," this would leave only 31.74% of the total sample to be classified as either high or low resilience. Instead, we thought it would be more useful to classify people into the bottom and top quartiles which would leave the other 50% in the middle of the distribution. Thus, the lowest 25% of the BRS scores would be classified as "low resilience," the middle 50% as "medium resilience," and the top 25% as "high resilience." To get the cut-offs, we multiplied the standard deviations we obtained for the adult and adolescent norm samples (SD = .77 and .72, respectively) by the z score that would mark the top and bottom 25% of a normal distribution (z = .67448) to obtain the distance from the mean for cut-off scores. This left us with distances from the means of .52 for the adult and .49 for the adolescent samples. Although there is often a small negative skew in the samples that we have examined because the mean is greater than 3.00, we have generally found that these cut-offs based on the same distance from the mean do well in dividing samples into the lower 25%, middle 50%, and top 24%.

Table 1 above displays the cut-offs scores that we established using this method along with the means and standard deviations that we began with in computing them. As you may notice, **the low, medium, and high resilience groups for a sample of adults can be easily classified by just knowing the initial number of the BRS score. That is, any score that begins with a 3 would be "medium resilience," any score that begins with 1 or 2 would be "low resilience," and any score that beginning with a 4 or 5 would be "high resilience."** Thus, when not also considering gender, for an adult completing the full six items of the BRS, scores of 3.00, 3.17, 3.33, 3.50, 3.67, and 3.83 would indicate medium resilience and any score below or above these would be low or high resilience.

Please also note that you may want to create your own cut-offs for high and low resilience if you think that you have a unique sample. You could do this by finding the mean and the standard deviation for the whole sample, multiplying the standard deviation by .67448 (see above) and then add that number to the mean for a cut-off for the high resilience group (top 25% of your sample) and subtract that number for a low resilience group (bottom 25% of your sample). Of course whether you do this depends on whether you wanted to classify people by what is high and low for your particular sample or for a larger world sample such as the people that we developed our cut-offs from.