

Chicago School Readiness Project
Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment (PSRA) Latency Approach
Report for Measures Section of Codebook

Your Name: Radiah Smith-Donald

Today's Date: 1/17/06

3-5 sentence description of measure (drawn from original): There are two ways that the PSRA can be aggregated and coded. This codebook is for a "latency" approach. This is a new direct assessment measure of preschoolers' self-regulation. 10 tasks were adapted from the executive control, compliance, emotion regulation, impulse control, and effortful control literatures to be administered in the field.

Citations:

1. balance beam ← WALIS (Murray & Kochanska, 2002; Maccoby, 196*)
2. pencil tap ← Luria's peg-tapping task (Blair, 2002; Diamond & Taylor, 1996)
3. tower turns ← (Murray & Kochanska, 2002)
4. tower cleanup ← no specific citation; clean up tasks used throughout compliance literature (e.g., Brumfield & Roberts, 1998)
5. toy sort ← same as above
6. toy wrap – peek ← (Murray & Kochanska, 2002)
7. toy wrap – wait ← (Murray & Kochanska, 2002)
8. toy return ←
9. snack delay ← (Murray & Kochanska, 2002)
10. tongue ← (Murray & Kochanska, 2002)

CSRP modifications from original measure (also include the item # on the original scale and the CSRP measure):

All tasks were adapted for field administration including appropriate changes in the script and coding methods. In addition, the tasks were arranged to fit into one, smooth assessment.

Other changes:

1. peg-tapping task adapted to use standard unsharpened #2 pencils
2. tower turns – coded on an all, some, none basis rather than a continuum of % shared
3. Kochanska's gift wrap renamed to toy wrap b/c toy is not given to the child to keep
4. gift wrap (wait) adapted so that assessor remains in the room with the child, although "looks busy"
5. snack delay – coding simplified
6. tongue task – trial lengths slightly different

of items:

10 tasks

For each task: refuse, defiant, ignores, engages examiner were also coded (see below)

Some tasks include 1-2 task-specific items (e.g., tower turns includes 'knocked down tower', and tongue task includes 'dropped m&m')

Metric of scale (e.g., scale of 1 to 4): varied

Task#

1. beam: continuous (seconds)
2. pencil: continuous (percent correct out of 16)

3. turns: 0 to 2
4. tower clean: continuous (seconds)
5. sort: continuous (seconds)
6. peek: continuous (seconds); 0-2
7. wait: continuous (seconds); 0-2
8. return: continuous (seconds)
9. snack: 0-3; 0/1
10. tongue: seconds (0-end of trial, never)

*In addition, for each task assessors coded 0/1 for the following behaviors: refused task, defiant, ignores/noncompliant, engages examiner.

Anchor points (e.g., 1 = never and 4 = always):

1. beam: 0 or more
2. pencil: 0-100% (= all wrong to all correct)
3. turns: 0 = never shared, 1 = shared some turns, 2 = shared perfectly
4. tower clean: latency; 120.5s = never started/completed clean up
5. sort: latency; 120.5s = never started/completed clean up
6. peek: latency; 60.5s = never peeked; 0 = never peeked, 1 = peeked once, 2 = peeked more than once
7. wait: latency; 60.5s = never touched; 0 = never touched, 1 = touched once, 2 = touched more than once
8. return: latency; 60.5s = never returned toy
9. snack: 0 = ate m&m, 1 = touched m&m, 2 = touched cup, 3 = waited without touching
0 = hands not flat, 1 = kept hands flat throughout
10. tongue: latency; 40.5s/60.5s = waited to eat m&m

2 examples of items:

Task 5: Toy sort – Assessor dumps out a lot of small toys and says, “Oh no, these toys are all a mess. We don’t have time to play with them now. Please clean them up and put them where they go.” Assessor indicates a separate bin for each category as s/he speaks, “The little cars go here, the bugs go here, the beads go here and the dinosaurs go here.” Child is given 2 minutes to clean up toys. If child has not begun cleaning after 60 seconds, assessors repeats, “Please clean up the toys and put them where they go”. Assessor records amount of time child takes to start cleaning and to complete clean up.

Task 6: Toy wrap (peek) - Assessor says, “Please turn around in your chair and don’t look while I wrap this surprise”. Assessor turns child’s chair around. “Remember, no peeking”. Assessor noisily wraps toy for 60 seconds. Assessor records time when the child first peeks as well as number of times child peeks.

How items should be aggregated (e.g., Did original authors sum or average items? Did they standardize variables before aggregation?)

Individual behavior codes (e.g., engages examiner, defiant) which were assessed for each task were aggregated by taking the mean across all 10 tasks to provide average defiance, average engagement, etc.

Raw performance scores were standardized and we conducted factor analyses with the pilot data from spring 2004 (n = 63). Two factors were found: 1. Impulse Control and 2. Executive Control/Compliance. The score for each construct was calculated by finding the mean across all

tasks within that factor (using standardized scores). (The other three tasks – tower turns, toy return, and tongue task – were too skewed or had insufficient reliability to be included in analyses.)

In August of 2008 Christine made standardized aggregates based on a conversation with Cybele. These aggregates are used in data analyses. To create standardized aggregates of effortful control and executive functioning, Christine first created aggregates of each task that were “means” (Snack Delay only has 3 trials to match fall and spring aggregates). Then Christine created z-scored standard aggregates of each task and then aggregated those to include Executive Functioning: Balance Beam + Pencil Tap. And Effortful Control: Toy Wait (peek and touch zscored) + Tongue Task + Snack Delay (3 trials meaned). For Syntax please go to: Y:\CSRP\MOAD\Final Full Year Datasets\PSRA\PSRA raw and agg - 2008 recodes - data syntax output\july 2008 - eff control alphas\check_alpha_effortful control

Did they reverse code any items? Which ones?

No reverse codes

Which items, indicated by variable name, belong to which subscales (e.g., items 4, 5, 6 should be used to create externalizing subscale of BPI):

Preliminary factor analysis (from pilot data, spring 2004) suggests the following factor structure:

- a. Toy wrap – peek, toy wrap – wait, snack delay → impulse control factor
- b. Balance beam, pencil tap, tower cleanup, toy sort → compliance/executive control factor

In August of 2008 Christine created the following standardized aggregates:

- a. Effortful Control: Toy Peek, Toy Wait, Snack Delay (3 trials Meaned), Tongue Task.
- b. Executive Functioning: Balance beam (difference between 2 trials) and Pencil Tap (% correct from 16 trials).

Year of participation and Month/Season when measure was administered (e.g., Head Start Year, Sept.):

Pilot year – Spring, 2004 (Apr-May)

Cohort 1 – Fall, 2004 (Sept-Oct) AND Spring 2005 (Apr-May)

Cohort 2 – Fall, 2005 (Sept-Oct) AND Spring 2006 (Apr-May)

Differences between CSRP measure at different time points (e.g., Fall and Spring):

For Pilot year and Cohort 1 – Fall the longest tongue trial was 40sec.

For Cohort 1 – Spring, and Cohort 2 – Fall & Spring, another trial was added to tongue task = 60sec.

Information regarding national norms, if available (e.g., elevated or clinical cutoff scores; major studies that used the measure (e.g., NICHD, ECLS-K, Three-City Study, NLSY, FACES)):

NA

Anything else?

NA

Please attach the following:

Original version of the measure
CSRP adaptation of measure(s)
Cited article(s)