SELF-BELIEFS INTERVIEW

References
Higgins, E. T., Bond, R. N., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1986). Self-discrepancies and emotional vulnerability: How magnitude, accessibility, and type of discrepancy influence affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 5-15.

Manian, N., Papadakis, A. A., Strauman, T. J., & Essex, M. J. (2006). The development of children's ideal and ought self-guides: Parenting, temperament, and individual differences in guide strength. *Journal of Personality, 74*(6), 1619-1646.

Secondary Reference
Anderson, N. H. (1968). Likableness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9*(3), 272-279.

General Description
The *Self-Beliefs Interview* is an adaptation of the *Selves Questionnaire* (Higgins et al., 1986), a measure of self-discrepancies developed for use with adult populations. The *Selves Questionnaire* asks the respondent to name the traits or attributes that he or she believes he/she *actually* has, and the attributes he/she would *ideally* like to have and *ought* to have. These attribute lists represent actual, ideal, and ought self-beliefs, respectively. Ideal and ought self-beliefs are construed as self-guides for behavior. Discrepancies between the actual and ideal selves are hypothesized to be associated with depressive affect, whereas discrepancies between the actual and ought selves are believed to be associated with feelings of anxiety.

Administration
Different versions of the *Self-Beliefs Interview* were administered to <u>children</u> as part of the site-specific battery during a site-specific home visit at the end of Grade 1 (*n* = 101), and during the common protocol lab visit at 15 years (*n* =99). The Grade 1 administrations were videotaped.

GRADE 1

Companion Document
Self-Beliefs Interview Scoring Instructions Grade 1

Description
In Grade 1 (*n* = 101), the *Self-Beliefs Interview* included questions to tap actual, ideal, and ought self-beliefs from the child's own standpoint or perspective, and the child's beliefs about how his/her mother, father, and classroom teacher view him/her ("other" standpoints). The child was asked to identify the kind of kid he or she is (actual/own self), what would make him/her the best he/she could be (ideal self), and the kind of kid he or she is supposed to be to stay out of trouble (ought self). Then, the child was asked to identify the traits or attributes that describe the kind of kid that mother (actual/mother), father (actual/father), and teacher (actual/teacher) think he/she is. From the lists of attributes provided by the child, several scores can be generated to represent actual/own, ideal/own, and ought/own belief discrepancies, and actual/other discrepancies.

Scoring
Responses to the Grade 1 *Self-Beliefs Interview* were scored by comparing the attributes of the actual self with the attributes of the ideal self and ought self. This scoring is based on a system (Higgins et al., 1986) in which lists of self-beliefs are compared for *matches* (e.g., actual

"friendly" vs. ideal "friendly"), *mismatches of degree* (e.g., actual "smart" vs. ideal "brilliant"), and *antonymous mismatches* (e.g., actual "shy" vs. ideal "outgoing"). Also refer to the companion document, *Self-Beliefs Interview Scoring Instructions Grade 1*.

Prior to scoring the interview, repetitions (words that are exactly the same), antonyms (words that are exactly opposite), and synonyms or varying degrees of a trait (e.g., "nice" and "very nice") <u>within each list of attributes</u> are deleted. For antonyms and synonyms/varying degrees, the first attribute listed is retained. For example, if the actual/own attributes include "good kid" and "bad kid", then "bad kid" is deleted; if the actual/own attributes include "nice" and "very nice", then "very nice" is deleted. We also deleted nonsense answers (e.g., one child's actual/own list included the following: red butterfly, yellow butterfly, blue butterfly, etc.).

After the repetitions, antonyms, and varying degree words are deleted, the number of responses on each list is counted. Then, the number of negative attributes on the actual/own list is counted. The number of negative attributes also could be counted for the actual/mother, actual/father, and actual/teacher lists. Traits and attributes that appear after #251 (likableness rating less than 311) on the list generated by Anderson (1968) are defined as negative for this task (Nanmathi Manian, personal communication, January 26, 1999).

To score the interview, the attributes on the actual self list are compared to those on the ideal self and ought self lists. Each attribute on the ideal and ought lists is compared to the list of actual self attributes to determine if they are matches, mismatches of degree, or antonyms. Attributes on the actual self-mother, actual self-father, and actual self-teacher lists are compared to the actual self (from one's own perspective) attributes in the same manner.

Two attributes are **MATCHES** if:
1. They are the exact same word.
2. Are synonymous as per a thesaurus. Consult only the first degree synonyms. Example of frequently used words:
   - Synonyms for 'bad' are 'evil', 'wicked', 'immoral'. Antonym is 'good'.
   - Synonyms for 'nice' are 'friendly', 'sympathetic', 'kind'. Antonyms are 'unfriendly', 'unkind', 'mean'.
   - Synonyms for 'good' are 'dutiful', 'obedient', 'proper'. Antonyms are 'bad', 'improper', 'ill-mannered'.
   - Corollaries of the above:
       'nice' and 'good' are not synonyms.
       'nice' and 'bad' are not antonyms.
3. One attribute is a negated opposite of the other. 'Not good' is a synonym of 'bad' since 'good' is an opposite for 'bad'.
4. The child likes something and wants to be the best in it. 'Likes to find fossils' and 'the best person who could find fossils'.

Two attributes are **MISMATCHES OF DEGREE** if:
1. One attribute is the comparative or superlative of the other ('smart' and 'smarter', 'smart' and 'smartest').
2. Differ in extent ('smart' and 'very smart', 'smart' and 'really smart').
3. Differ in frequency ('sometimes good' and 'always good').
4. Differ in magnitude ('play with friends' and 'play with everybody').

Two attributes are **MISMATCHES** if:

1. One attribute is a negation of the other ('kind' and 'unkind'; 'kind' and 'not kind').
2. Are antonyms of the first degree as per a thesaurus.

Weights are assigned to the comparisons as follows: matches = -1, mismatches of degree = 1, antonymous mismatches = 2. Actual-ideal (AI) and actual-ought (AO) <u>discrepancy scores</u> are calculated by summing the weights for the matches and mismatches between the actual self and each self-guide (ideal self, ought self); higher scores represent larger discrepancies.

The strength of ideal and ought self-guides can be measured by <u>response latency</u> (Manian et al., 2006). According to regulatory focus theory, the strength of the guides in turn is a measure of goal accessibility; therefore, response latency is an indicator of the accessibility of actual, ideal, and ought constructs. Shorter latencies represent greater guide strength.

Nanmathi Manian and Kim Pierce scored the Grade 1 interviews. The interview administrations were videotaped so that response latencies could be determined. The number of seconds from the time the interviewer finished asking each question until the child began his/her response was determined from the videotape by two research staff members, who then reached consensus on the response latency times (see appended Response Latency form).

Self-Discrepancies
We scored actual-ideal and actual-ought discrepancy scores from the standpoint of the self only (child's own standpoint). In some cases, the actual-ideal score could not be computed because the child was not able to list any actual and/or ideal attributes. In other cases, the actual-ought score could not be computed because the child did not list any actual and/or ought attributes.

Actual-own/ideal discrepancy = **CHG1AID**
N = 90, M = -0.12, SD = 1.75, range = -6.00 to 7.00

Actual-own/ought discrepancy = **CHG1AOD**
N = 92, M = -0.28, SD = 1.32, range = -4.00 to 3.00

Discrepancies between the "other" standpoints of mother, father, and teacher about the child's actual attributes, and the child's beliefs about his/her ideal and ought attributes, have not been computed.

Response Latencies
We recorded response latencies for all six questions in the *Self-Beliefs Interview*. Three of the latencies were entered into the raw data set, as follows.

Actual/own latency, in seconds = **CHG1AORL**
N = 93, M = 6.48, SD = 7.47, range = 1-30

Ideal/own latency, in seconds = **CHG1IORL**
N = 95, M = 7.04, SD = 7.88, range = 1-30

Ought/own latency, in seconds = **CHG1OORL**
N = 96, M = 4.41, SD = 4.71, range = 1-30

Interrater Reliability
The coders double-scored 18 of the *Self-Beliefs Interviews* for purposes of computing interrater reliability. These 18 cases represent 20% of the interviews from which self-discrepancy scores

could be computed. For the actual-own/ideal discrepancy score, the Pearson product-moment correlation for the two coders was .95; for the actual-own/ought discrepancy score, $r = .98$. The complete set of reliability computations (provided by Nanmathi) is appended to this document.

Analysis Data Set
SSG1

Raw Data Set
C1GSB (see list of variables appended to this document)

15 YEARS

Description
The 15-year version of the *Self-Beliefs Interview* ($n = 99$) was provided by Tim Strauman at Duke University. It includes questions to tap ideal and ought self-beliefs at school, at home, and with friends, from the child's own standpoint or perspective. The teen first identified up to four attributes or characteristics he or she wants to have (ideal) in each of the three settings. Then, the teen was asked to:

1. identify the three most important attributes he/she wants to be or have
2. rate the extent to which he or she actually has each attribute, on a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 10 (*completely*)
3. rate how successful he or she will be in the future at achieving the ideal qualities, on an 11-point scale (0 = *not at all*, 10 = *completely*)

This procedure was repeated for the attributes the teen believes he or she should have (ought) in the three settings.

A high success expectancy is expected to diminish any potential negative effects of existing discrepancies. High importance ratings are believed to increase the negative effects of discrepancies, if any significant discrepancies exist and if expectancies for success are low.

Scoring
Domain Self-Discrepancies
We calculated maximum and mean domain self-discrepancy scores for the school, home, and friends domains. First, we subtracted the <u>extent</u> rating for each attribute from 10 to create interim item discrepancy scores. The largest interim discrepancy score within a particular domain is the maximum discrepancy for that domain. Mean domain scores were computed from the interim discrepancy scores for all the items in that domain. Higher scores represent larger discrepancies. In some cases, discrepancy scores could not be computed because the teen was not able to identify any attributes in a particular domain.

> School Domain
>
> Maximum actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDSMX**
> $N = 99$, M = 4.06, $SD = 2.24$, range = 1-10
>
> Mean actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDSMN**
> $N = 99$, M = 2.97, $SD = 2.00$, range = 0.50-9.50
>
> Maximum actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODSMX**
> $N = 98$, M = 3.80, $SD = 2.28$, range = 0-10

Mean actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODSMN**
N = 98, M = 2.76, *SD* = 2.08, range = 0-10

Home Domain

Maximum actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDHMX**
N = 97, M = 4.40, *SD* = 2.37, range = 0-10

Mean actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDHMN**
N = 97, M = 3.30, *SD* = 2.17, range = 0-9.50

Maximum actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODHMX**
N = 98, M = 4.23, *SD* = 2.20, range = 0-10

Mean actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODHMN**
N = 98, M = 3.21, *SD* = 2.02, range = 0-10

Friends Domain

Maximum actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDFMX**
N = 95, M = 3.34, *SD* = 2.10, range = 0-10

Mean actual-ideal discrepancy = **Y15IDFMN**
N = 95, M = 2.37, *SD* = 1.94, range = 0-9.67

Maximum actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODFMX**
N = 98, M = 2.82, *SD* = 2.05, range = 0-10

Mean actual-ought discrepancy = **Y15ODFMN**
N = 98, M = 1.98, *SD* = 1.80, range = 0-9

Success Expectancy Ratings
Success expectancy ratings are the teen's ratings (0-10) of how successful he or she expects to be in the future at achieving the ideal or ought self-qualities that were identified for the three domains.

School Domain

Success expectancy for ideal beliefs = **Y15IBSSE**
N = 99, M = 8.15, *SD* = 1.67, range = 1-10

Success expectancy for ought beliefs = **Y15OBSSE**
N = 98, M = 8.11, *SD* = 1.69, range = 0-10

Home Domain

Success expectancy for ideal beliefs = **Y15IBHSE**
N = 97, M = 8.08, *SD* = 1.72, range = 0-10

Success expectancy for ought beliefs = **Y15OBHSE**
N = 98, M = 8.06, *SD* = 1.74, range = 0-10

Friends Domain

Success expectancy for ideal beliefs = **Y15IBFSE**
N = 95, M = 8.63, *SD* = 1.73, range = 1-10

Success expectancy for ought beliefs = **Y15OBFSE**
N = 98, M = 8.67, SD = 1.80, range = 0-10

Importance Rankings
The teen ranked the three most important ideal and ought attributes. These attributes could be in any of the three domains. The scores below are the item discrepancy scores for the attributes within each domain that were ranked as important. If none of the attributes in a particular domain had been identified as one of the three most important, there is no score for that domain's importance rankings.

School Domain

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15ISIM1**
N = 62, M = 2.97, SD = 2.12, range = 0-9

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15ISIM2**
N = 56, M = 2.50, SD = 2.31, range = 0-9

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15ISIM3**
N = 37, M = 2.65, SD = 2.28, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15OSIM1**
N = 67, M = 2.58, SD = 2.05, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15OSIM2**
N = 44, M = 2.52, SD = 1.91, range = 0-8

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15OSIM3**
N = 38, M = 2.26, SD = 2.60, range = 0-10

Home Domain

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15IHIM1**
N = 38, M = 2.53, SD = 1.93, range = 0-8

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15IHIM2**
N = 44, M = 2.36, SD = 1.94, range = 0-7

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15IHIM3**
N = 37, M = 3.00, SD = 2.60, range = 0-9

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15OHIM1**
N = 41, M = 2.80, SD = 2.19, range = 0-9

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15OHIM2**
N = 54, M = 2.91, SD = 2.40, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15OHIM3**
N = 38, M = 3.24, SD = 2.16, range = 0-10

Friends Domain

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15IFIM1**
N = 53, M = 2.11, SD = 1.97, range = 0-9

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15IFIM2**
N = 47, M = 2.21, SD = 2.26, range = 0-10

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15IFIM3**
N = 47, M = 2.36, SD = 2.27, range = 0-9

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15OFIM1**
N = 43, M = 1.79, SD = 2.05, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15OFIM2**
N = 37, M = 1.84, SD = 1.91, range = 0-9

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15OFIM3**
N = 65, M = 1.97, SD = 2.24, range = 0-10

We also computed scores for the three most important attributes irrespective of domain. In some cases, the ranked attributes were identified in more than one domain; in this case, we averaged the discrepancy scores for that attribute across domains.

Overall

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15IDIM1**
N = 99, M = 2.72, SD = 2.01, range = 0-9

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15IDIM2**
N = 97, M = 2.53, SD = 2.26, range = 0-10

Ideal beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15IDIM3**
N = 96, M = 2.78, SD = 2.39, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #1 = **Y15ODIM1**
N = 98, M = 2.57, SD = 2.12, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #2 = **Y15ODIM2**
N = 98, M = 2.69, SD = 2.27, range = 0-10

Ought beliefs, item discrepancy score for attribute ranked #3 = **Y15ODIM3**
N = 97, M = 2.56, SD = 2.29, range = 0-10

Analysis Data Set
SS15YEAR

Raw Data Set
CYR15SB (see list of variables appended to this document)

VARIABLES IN <u>C1GSB</u> RAW DATA SET

SELF-BELIEFS INTERVIEW
1st Grade Site-Specific Home Visit

NACO	number of actual/own responses
NNACO	number of negatives in actual/own
NIDO	number of ideal/own responses
NOUO	number of ought/own responses
NAIM	number of actual:ideal matches
NAIX	number of actual:ideal mismatches
NAID	number of actual:ideal mismatches of degree
AI	actual:ideal discrepancy
NAOM	number of actual:ought matches
NAOX	number of actual:ought mismatches
NAOD	number of actual:ought mismatches of degree
AO	actual:ought discrepancy
RL1ACO	response latency 1 for actual/own
RL1IDO	response latency 1 for ideal/own
RL1OUO	response latency 1 for ought/own

SELF-BELIEFS INTERVIEW
Grade 1 interrater reliability computations

Inter-rater Reliability for Tim, Kim, and Nanmathi

1. KNACO   number of actual/own responses
2. TNACO   number of actual/own responses
3. NACO   number of actual/own responses
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 12.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .9662

1. NNACO   num of negatives in actual/own
2. TNNACO   num of negatives in actual/own
3. KNNACO   num of negatives in actual/own
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 10.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .9954

1. NIDO   number of ideal/own responses
2. TNIDO
3. KNIDO
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 12.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .9902

1. NOUO   number of ought/own responses
2. TNOUO
3. KNOUO
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 12.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .9801

1. AI   actual:ideal discrepancy
2. TAI   actual:ideal discrepancy
3. KAI   actual:ideal discrepancy
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 10.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .8977

1. AO   actual:ought discrepancy
2. TAO   actual:ought discrepancy
3. KAO   actual:ought discrepancy
    Reliability Coefficients
    N of Cases = 10.0   N of Items = 3
    Alpha = .9666

Inter-rater Reliability for Kim and Nanmathi

1. NACO   number of actual/own responses
2. KNACO   number of actual/own responses
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 20.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   .9915

1. NNACO   num of negatives in actual/own
2. KNNACO   num of negatives in actual/own
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 18.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   1.0000

1. NIDO   number of ideal/own responses
2. KNIDO
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 20.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   .9896

1. NOUO   number of ought/own responses
2. KNOUO
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 20.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   .9818

1. AI   actual:ideal discrepancy
2. KAI   actual:ideal discrepancy
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 18.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   .9480

1. AO   actual:ought discrepancy
2. KAO   actual:ought discrepancy
   Reliability Coefficients
   N of Cases = 18.0   N of Items = 2
   Alpha =   .9836

VARIABLES IN <u>CYR15SB</u> RAW DATA SET

SELF-BELIEFS INTERVIEW
Age 15 Lab Visit

<u>Ideal Beliefs</u>

SIDEALNO	number of attributes: ideal listed for school
SIDEAL1	rating for 1st attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL2	rating for 2nd attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL3	rating for 3rd attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL4	rating for 4th attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ideal at school
SIDEAL4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ideal at school
HIDEALNO	number of attributes: ideal listed for home
HIDEAL1	rating for 1st attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL2	rating for 2nd attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL3	rating for 3rd attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL4	rating for 4th attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ideal at home
HIDEAL4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ideal at home
FIDEALNO	number of attributes: ideal listed for friends
FIDEAL1	rating for 1st attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL2	rating for 2nd attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL3	rating for 3rd attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL4	rating for 4th attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ideal with friends
FIDEAL4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ideal with friends
SIDEALSU	rating of future success: ideal for school
HIDEALSU	rating of future success: ideal for home
FIDEALSU	rating of future success: ideal for friends

Ought Beliefs

SOUGHTNO	number of attributes: ought listed for school
SOUGHT1	rating for 1st attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT2	rating for 2nd attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT3	rating for 3rd attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT4	rating for 4th attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ought at school
SOUGHT4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ought at school
HOUGHTNO	number of attributes: ought listed for home
HOUGHT1	rating for 1st attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT2	rating for 2nd attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT3	rating for 3rd attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT4	rating for 4th attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ought at home
HOUGHT4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ought at home
FOUGHTNO	number of attributes: ought listed for friends
FOUGHT1	rating for 1st attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT2	rating for 2nd attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT3	rating for 3rd attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT4	rating for 4th attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT1I	importance ranking for 1st attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT2I	importance ranking for 2nd attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT3I	importance ranking for 3rd attribute: ought with friends
FOUGHT4I	importance ranking for 4th attribute: ought with friends
SOUGHTSU	rating of future success: ought for school
HOUGHTSU	rating of future success: ought for home
FOUGHTSU	rating of future success: ought for friends

SELF-BELIEFS RESPONSE LATENCY

Coder ID _____

Child ID

Date of Tape

	Q. 1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
1. Time (sec) of 1st response						
2. Time (sec) child says "Don't know"						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						
3. Time (sec) child doesn't understand						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						

Child ID

Date of Tape

	Q. 1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
1. Time (sec) of 1st response						
2. Time (sec) child says "Don't know"						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						
3. Time (sec) child doesn't understand						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						

Child ID

Date of Tape

	Q. 1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
1. Time (sec) of 1st response						
2. Time (sec) child says "Don't know"						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						
3. Time (sec) child doesn't understand						
Time (sec) of response after prompt						