# Exploring Engagement in Adulthood: Application of the Day Reconstruction Method

Jeanine M. Parisi and Elizabeth A. L. Stine-Morrow

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

METHOD

## RATIONALE

While several studies suggest that sustained engagement would help to maintain or enhance cognitive functioning (e.g., Hultsch et al., 1999), other research has failed to demonstrate this relationship (e.g., Salthouse et al., 2002). Inconsistencies in findings may be attributed in part to how engagement has been measured, deriving from a lack of consensus about what the construct, "an engaged or active lifestyle" actually entails. As previous studies have generally measured the frequency or number of activities performed, a greater understanding of an active lifestyle may be achieved through Knowledge of the context and stbiggtiorernanging that through an explicit intervent methodological approach, the Day Reconstruction Method.

Sexamine how activity, affect and a



#### Table 2. Mean Affective Ratings for Activities

ACTIVITIES	Intellectual Challenge	Positive	Effort	Competent	Proportion of Sample Reporting
Eating	1.35	4.01	2.14	3.85	0.98
Watching TV	1.79	3.68	2.98	3.40	0.87
Reading	2.32	3.90	3.47	3.78	0.80
Self-care	0.79	3.30	3.04	3.91	0.79
Preparing Food	1.16	3.83	3.33	4.05	0.72
Socializing	2.07	4.66	3.80	3.84	0.72
Housework	1.06	3.36	3.51	4.06	0.56
Talking on Phone	1.78	4.15	3.71	3.88	0.51
Nap/Resting	0.91	3.38	1.88	2.94	0.49
Computer/Internet	3.11	3.82	4.25	4.12	0.48
Shopping	1.12	3.82	3.68	4.18	0.47
Commuting	1.02	3.66	3.52	4.14	0.46
Exercising	1.07	4.24	4.74	4.36	0.39
Writing/E-mail	2.62	3.84	4.09	4.30	0.35
Working	2.45	3.81	4.44	4.49	0.35
Games	3.83	4.17	4.23	4.18	0.34
Praying/Mediating	1.83	4.26	3.77	3.97	0.21
Hobbies	2.74	4.57	4.32	4.30	0.18
Volunteering	1.90	4.52	4.54	4.44	0.16
Clubs/Organizations	3.73	4.65	4.43	4.59	0.11
Gardening	1.00	3.99	3.94	4.30	0.11
Intimate Relations	0.67	5.00	3.42	3.00	0.03
Care of Children	2.70	4.99	4.55	4.50	0.03

#### REFERENCES

- Bodner, T. E., & Langer, E. (2001, June 15). Individual differences in mindfulness: The Mindfulness/Mindlessness Scale. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Ekstrom, R. B., French, J. W., & Harmon, H. H. (1976). Manual for the kit of factorreferenced cognitive tests. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Hultsch, D. F., Small, B. J., Hertzog, C., & Dixon, R.A. (1999). Use it or lose it: Engaged lifestyle as a buffer of cognitive decline in aging? *Psychology and Aging*, 14, 245-263.
- Kahneman, D., et al. (2004). A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The Day Reconstruction Method. *Science*, 306, 1776-1780.
- Lachman, M., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). The Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) personality scales: Scale construction and scoring (Tech. Rep. No.1). Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, Department of Psychology.
- though T A Derich D E & Miles I D (2002) The role of

## WIE I III

#### (The Day Reconstruction Method (DRM; Kahneman et al., 2004)

Community-dwelling adults at least 60 years of age (N = 192, M = 72 years) constructed diary entries consisting of a series of episodes evoking the context (i.e., activities and experiences) of the preceding day. Although participants were not required to turn in their diaries, a review of these notes was encouraged to help support accurate retrieval of specific episodes on a structured response form. Participants reported the approximate times at which the episode began and ended and what they were for each episode, participants rated how they felt on a 7-point scale (0 = Not at all; 6 = Very Much) (see Table 1).

and chided and what th	Episodes were rated along	g several dimensions:	= Not at all, $0 = $ very Much) (see Table 1	).	
Procedures	Positive Affect: happy Effortful Allocation: a Competence: compete	, warm/friendly, enjoying myself, rewarding experience ( $\alpha$ = ttention was focused, put forth effort ( $\alpha$ = .80) nt/capable, in control ( $\alpha$ = .87) was considered separately.			
MAILE	ED MATERIALS	LABORATORY SESSION	ACTIVITY		0.0
Engagement •DRM		Cognitive Measures •Verbal Ability: Extended Range	Number of Episodes Time Spent in Activities (hours) Number of Activities	12.96 14.50 22.24	1.90
Personality Measures •Personality Attributes Reflecting		•Processing Speed: Letter and Pattern Comparison ( $\alpha = .72$ )	AFFECT	1 77	1.10
	gement (PACE; $\alpha = .82$ )	<ul> <li>Working Memory: Letter-Number</li> </ul>	Intellectual Challenge Positive Affect		1.19 1.19
<ul> <li>Mindfulnes</li> </ul>	SS	Sequencing	Effortful Allocation		1.16
<ul><li>Need for C</li><li>Openness t</li></ul>	0	•Inductive Reasoning: Letter Sets, Figure Classification ( $\alpha = .41$ )	Competence	3.98	1.38

# Neuroticism RESULTS Visual Spatial Processing: Card Rotation, •Extraversion Hidden Patterns (α = .67) Table 3. Interrelationships Among Activity, Affuerfcy: FAS, Word Association (α = .62) AFFECT

Personality, and Cognition		AGE	Duration	Frequency	Intellectual	Positive	Effort	Competent	PACE	Ν	Е
	Age		-0.07	-0.04	-0.05	-0.15 *	-0.14 †	-0.21 **	-0.08	-0.02	-0.06
	Cognition										
	Verbal Ability	-0.04	0.16 *	0.20 **	0.29 **	-0.04	0.14	0.04	0.25 **	-0.07	-0.18 *
	Processing Speed	-0.42 **	0.25 *	0.16	0.17	0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.25 **	0.01	-0.01
	Working Memory	-0.21 **	0.20 *	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.16 *	0.01	-0.10
	Inductive Reasoning	-0.37 **	0.23 *	0.18	0.24 **	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.24 *	0.16	-0.09
	Visual-Spatial	-0.32 **	0.36 **	0.15	0.17	0.03	0.07	0.14	0.21 *	0.14	-0.12
	Fluency	-0.16 *	0.17 *	0.20 **	0.05	-0.11	-0.02	-0.03	0.27 **	-0.02	0.08
	Fluid Ability Composite	-0.41 **	0.33 **	0.22 **	0.21 **	0.02	0.07	0.11	0.32 **	0.09	-0.06

Note. Personality Attributes Reflecting Cognitive Engagement (PACE); Neuroticism (N); Extraversion (E).

\*\*p < .01, \*p < .05, †p < .10 after Bonferroni corrections were applied.

#### Table 4. Regression Analyses

	Fluid Abili	ty Com	posite		
Model 1	Age	0.17		-0.41	-6.16 **
Model 2	Personality	0.14			
	PACE			0.38	5.09 **
	Extroversion			-0.19	-2.42 *
	Activity	0.21	0.07	0.27	3.83 **
	Age	0.36	0.14	-0.39	-6.06 **

Model 1	Verba	al Ability 0.00	y	-0.04	-0 55 ns
WIGGET 1	Age	0.00		-0.04	-0.55 hs
Model 2	Personality	0.13			
	PACE			0.29	3.88 **
	Extroversion			-0.30	-3.86 **
	Affect	0.23	0.09		
	IC			0.27	3.33 **
	Age	0.23	0.00	-0.05	-0.77 ns
Note. **p	<.01, *p<.05	0.25	0.00	-0.05	-0

We are grateful from support from the the National Institute on Aging (R03 AG024551), NIA Roybal Center for Healthy Minds (P30 AG023101), and through dissertation research awards granted by the American Psychological Association and the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois. Contract Information: imnaris@uiuc.edu

#### FINDINGS

The most frequently reported activities were essential daily activities (e.g., eating, selfcare), watching television, and reading. Moderate to high levels of positive affect and competence were reported for majority of activities, thus suggesting that individuals select activities that are enjoyable and match their level of skill and ability (Table 2).

• Overall, greater participation in activities was related to several cognitive measures. Additionally, an initial predisposition towards cognitive engagement, as well as continued participation in intellectual challenge were associated with performance on cognitive tasks (Table 3).

#### Regression analysis demonstrated that age remained a significant predictor of fluid ability performance after accounting for both personality and activity, indicating that ageassociated differences could not be completely slipping the by these contextual variables (Table 4).

This preliminary study shows that the DRM has potential to provide a more nuanced portrait of activity-personality-cognition relationships in adulthood than has been considered. However, as this research appears to suggest that greater participation in intellectual activities may contribute to cognitive performance, it also may be that initial cognitive ability or a predisposition towards cognitive endeavors enables an individual to anigm and anagene in these activities.