

Title: Validity and Reliability of the Executive Function Scale (UEF-1) in Cuban University
Students

Authors: Diego D. Díaz-Guerra¹, Marena de la C. Hernández-Lugo², Carlos Ramos-Galarza³ & Yunier Broche-Pérez⁴

¹ Psychology Department, Universidad Central “Marta Abreu” de Las Villas

Villa Clara, Cuba. Email: ddguerra@uclv.cu diegod.diazg@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0001-5169-838X

² Psychology Department, Universidad Central “Marta Abreu” de Las Villas

Villa Clara, Cuba. Email: mhlugo@uclv.cu ORCID: 0000-0001-9036-3953

³ Faculty of Psychology, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador. Email:

caramos@puce.edu.ec, ORCID: 0000-0001-5614-1994

⁴ Prisma Behavioral Center, Florida, USA. Email: yunierbroche@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-

0002-3450-7374

Corresponding author information: Prof. Diego D. Díaz-Guerra

Psychology Department, Universidad Central “Marta Abreu” de Las Villas

Km 5 ½, Santa Clara, Villa Clara, Cuba, 54 830

Email: diegod.diazg@gmail.com; ddguerra@uclv.cu

Title: Validity and Reliability of the Executive Function Scale (UEF-1) in Cuban University Students

Abstracts

Introduction: Executive functions are higher cognitive skills involved in planning, organization, decision-making, impulse control, and working memory. It is essential to have tools that allow for the accurate and reliable assessment of this construct in university students. This study aims to evaluate the validity and reliability of the Executive Functions Scale for University Students (UEF-1) in the Cuban population. **Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted in which an online survey was administered to 1092 Cuban university students representing 14 of the country's 16 provinces. Descriptive analyses, confirmatory factor analyses, and Pearson correlation analyses were used to assess the psychometric properties of the scale. **Results:** Significant correlations were obtained between the scale factors, and the original seven-factor structure was confirmed. The scale demonstrated good internal consistency and overall reliability ($\alpha = .91$, $\omega = .91$). **Conclusions:** The study provided evidence that the UEF-1 is a reliable and valid tool for assessing executive functions in Cuban university students. This measure provides a comprehensive understanding of the cognitive abilities and functioning of Cuban university students, allowing for the identification of specific areas of executive functioning that may benefit from additional support or intervention.

Keywords: executive functions; Cuban university students; UEF-1; validity; reliability

Introduction

Executive functions play a central role in academic performance, problem-solving, decision-making, and success in daily life (Drigas & Karyotaki, 2019; Ramos-Galarza et al., 2020; Reynolds et al., 2019; Zelazo & Carison, 2020). These higher cognitive skills enable individuals to regulate their behavior, maintain attention, inhibit automatic responses, switch tasks, and plan future actions (Cristofori et al., 2019; Doebel, 2020; Ramos-Galarza et al., 2022).

In the university context, where students are undergoing a period of significant transition and personal development, executive functions are especially relevant (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2020; Salas-Gomez et al., 2020). To successfully address the demands of the university environment, students need to have adequate executive functioning, allowing them to efficiently plan and organize tasks, maintain concentration and motivation, regulate their emotions, and adapt to new and changing situations (Cartwright et al., 2019; Hilton et al., 2022; Ramos-Galarza et al., 2020; Salas-Gomez et al., 2020).

Previous research has shown that students with better executive functioning tend to achieve higher grades, have greater satisfaction with their university experience, and experience less stress and emotional difficulties. Conversely, students with deficiencies in executive functions may struggle to manage their academic workload, encounter difficulties in decision-making and planning, and experience challenges in stress management and self-regulation (Hilton et al., 2022; Moriña & Biagiotti, 2022; Nieto et al., 2020; Pinochet-Quiroz et al., 2022; Ramos-Galarza et al., 2020; Reynolds et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019).

Given the importance of executive functions in the university setting, it is essential to have a reliable and valid assessment tool to measure these skills in the student population (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2020; Romero-Galisteo et al., 2022; Rowe et al., 2021). In this context, the University Executive Function Scale (UEF-1) has been developed as a potentially useful tool

for assessing executive functioning in this population (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2023). This scale was designed and validated in Ecuadorian and Chilean populations where it demonstrated excellent validity and reliability results; however, no research has yet been reported on the evaluation of the psychometric properties of the UEF-1 in other Spanish-speaking contexts.

Furthermore, in the Cuban university population, there are no specific assessment tools for executive functions available. Instead, generic tests designed for other purposes but allowing clinical-level evaluation of executive functions have been used (e.g., Jiménez-Puig et al., 2019).

Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the psychometric properties of the *University Executive Function Scale* for university students in the Cuban population. This research will provide valuable information about the executive functioning of Cuban students and contribute to the development of specific interventions and support programs to enhance these skills in this population.

Materials and methods

Study Design and Participants

This research was based on a cross-sectional study. An online survey was conducted using Google Forms® from January to March 2024, which was distributed through WhatsApp groups, Facebook, email lists, and websites. No incentives were offered for participation. All Cuban citizens over 18 years old who were pursuing university studies within the country were eligible to participate. A total of 1092 students (660 females and 432 males) with a mean age of 20.5 participated. The study included representation from 14 out of the 16 Cuban provinces.

Measures

Demographic Information: Demographic variables explored included age, gender, and province where university studies were being pursued.

University Executive Function Scale (UEF-1): This scale was designed and validated for Spanish-speaking participants by Ramos-Galarza et al. (2023) in a sample of 1373 Chilean and Ecuadorian students. It consists of 31 items and measures 7 executive functions. The subscales it assesses are: Conscious Monitoring of Responsibilities (F1 items 2, 8, 9, 15, and 27), Supervisory Attention System (F2 items 10, 14, 22, 28, and 13), Conscious Regulation of Behavior (F3 items 3, 11, 16, 17, 18, and 19); Behavior Verification for Learning (F4 items 20, 23, 24, and 30); Decision Making (F5 items 5, 12, and 21), Conscious Regulation of Emotions (F6 items 4, 25, 29, and 31), and Task-solving Element Management (F7 items 1, 6, 7, and 26). Responses are provided on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

The original version of the scale was aimed at Spanish-speaking students, so it was not necessary to translate the items. However, following the recommendations of Fenn et al. (2020) for the adaptation and translation of questionnaires, the original version of the technique was examined by three linguistics specialists affiliated with the Department of Linguistics at the Universidad Central "Marta Abreu" de Las Villas. The experts concluded that the linguistic and grammatical structure of the scale was suitable for the Cuban context, therefore, no modifications were necessary in the scale. A pilot study was carried out, involving a sample of 50 students, to assess the suitability of the questions in relation to the language used within the Cuban context. The findings of the pilot study confirmed the recommendations put forth by the linguistic experts. These results support the use of the questionnaire in the Cuban population without the need for additional linguistic or grammatical modifications.

Procedure and Data Analysis

Informed consent was obtained from all participants included in the study. The ethics committee of the Department of Psychology of the Universidad Central "Marta Abreu" de Las

Villas approved the study protocol. All procedures performed in this study were following the ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki Declaration.

The data were processed using the statistical software JASP version 0.18.3.0. Descriptive analyses were employed to understand the characteristics of the participants, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate the factorial structure of the UEF-1. Pearson correlation analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between the executive functions comprising the instrument, with correlation indices of $r \leq .10$ considered small, $r = .20$ considered moderate, and $r \geq .30$ considered large (Funder & Ozer, 2019).

Acceptable values for the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) were assumed to be between .90 and .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). As for the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), values below .10 were considered acceptable (Xia & Yang, 2019). Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω were used to evaluate reliability, with values equal to or greater than .70 indicating good internal consistency (Dunn et al., 2013; Kelley, 2018; Shrestha, 2021).

To assess normality, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed. The p-values obtained were less than .05, indicating that the items of the UEF-1 were not normally distributed. Additionally, the analysis of skewness and kurtosis revealed values exceeding ± 1 , providing conclusive evidence that the data does not adhere to a normal distribution (Mishra et al., 2019). Considering the lack of normality in the sample, the weighted least squares mean, and variance adjusted estimator (WLSMV) were used for CFA (Xia & Yang, 2019).

Results

Characteristics of the sample

The sample consisted of 1092 university students, of which 39.6% were male and the remaining 60.4% were female, aged between 18 and 25 years old. Most participants belonged to the central region of the country (93%), particularly in the province of Villa Clara (76.8%) (Table 1).

(Please, Insert Table 1 Here)

Table 2 displays the values corresponding to the analysis of means, standard deviation, correlations between the total items, and their loadings. The items showed above-average approval rates and considerable variation.

(Please, Insert Table 2 Here)

It was observed that all item-total correlations were acceptable. Similarly, all loadings were significant ($p < .001$). Furthermore, statistically significant correlations of moderate and large magnitudes between the factors of the scale were found (Table 3).

(Please, Insert Table 3 Here)

The expected seven-factor solution showed satisfactory fit indices, $\chi^2(413) = 1823.68$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .056, 90% CI [.053, .059], $p < .001$; CFI = .981; TLI = .979 (Figure 1). Thus, the initial solution of the seven proposed factors in the original scale is confirmed. It was not considered necessary to test a second-order model, considering a central factor of executive functions, as in the original validation of the scale, it was found that it does not present an acceptable fit.

(Please, Insert Figure 1 Here)

Additionally, reliability estimates were high for the total score ($\alpha = .91$, $\omega = .91$).

Regarding factor analysis, there were predominantly medium values in conscious monitoring of responsibilities ($\alpha = .76$, $\omega = .77$), supervisory attention system ($\alpha = .83$, $\omega = .83$), behavior verification for learning ($\alpha = .76$, $\omega = .76$), decision making ($\alpha = .70$, $\omega = .70$), conscious regulation of emotions ($\alpha = .82$, $\omega = .82$), and task-solving element management ($\alpha = .76$, $\omega = .76$). There were medium-low values for the conscious regulation of behavior dimension ($\alpha = .65$, $\omega = .65$).

Additionally, normative scores for the executive function scale for the Cuban university population (UEF-C; Table 4) were calculated. These scores allow for contextualizing and better understanding of individual results by comparing them with the average performance of Cuban university students.

(Table 4)

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the psychometric properties of the UEF-1 in Cuban university students. The results obtained confirm the factorial structure of the original version composed of seven executive functions (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2023).

This research found an adequate fit of the seven-factor model originally proposed by Ramos-Galarza et al. (2023). The indicators found by these authors (CFI = 0.91, SRMR = 0.04, and RMSEA = 0.04) resemble those obtained in the Cuban validation (RMSEA = .056, CFI = .981; TLI = .979). These fit measures provide evidence of the validity of the model and the

scale's quality in terms of its structure and ability to measure the desired constructs (Finch, 2020; Hox, 2021; Koran, 2020; McNeish & Wolf, 2023).

Similarly to the initial design of the scale, in this research, statistically significant and directly proportional correlations of large magnitudes were found between the evaluated executive functions ($r = .30$ to $.61$ in the Cuban population and $r = .41$ to $.70$ in the Ecuadorian and Chilean population) (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2023). These scores imply that responses to the different items composing each factor are similar to each other. This suggests that the items are consistently measuring the same construct or dimension (Schober et al., 2018; Tavakol & Wetzel, 2020).

The total reliability estimates of the original scale were similar to those obtained in the Cuban university population. However, the factor estimates in Cuban students showed slightly lower values than those obtained in the original scale (Ramos-Galarza et al., 2023). The main difference was observed in the dimension of conscious regulation of behavior ($\alpha = .65$, $\omega = .65$) compared to the original sample ($\alpha = 0.76$ and $\omega = 0.74$). However, all values are within the acceptable range of reliability (Edwards et al., 2021; Fu et al., 2022).

The results obtained in this research are consistent with those obtained by other authors who evaluated executive functions in students (Escolano-Pérez et al., 2022; Kamradt et al., 2019; Prosen & Vitulic, 2014; Ramos-Galarza et al., 2023). All these authors agree that to improve students' academic performance, daily functioning, and future job prospects, university programs must promote the development of executive functioning skills. This involves providing students with knowledge about these skills and supporting their efficient use.

The present study has relevant implications regarding the assessment of executive functions in real-life situations of Cuban university students. First, the availability of the UEF-C as a reliable and valid instrument for the Cuban context provides a valuable tool for assessing executive functions in real-life situations of Cuban university students. This instrument can facilitate the profiling of performance, inform the development of tailored neuropsychological interventions, and contribute to enhancing students' executive function skills, ultimately improving their academic and daily functioning. Additionally, our study replicates the findings from the original study, a critical aspect of ensuring that (neuro)psychological measures are applicable and meaningful across different cultural contexts. In this sense, our results play a crucial role in advancing our knowledge of cross-cultural variations in psychological constructs and ensuring the validity of psychological measures across diverse populations.

Despite the contributions of this study, several limitations warrant consideration. The exclusive use of self-reported data, the reliance on predominantly student samples, and the use of snowball sampling for participant recruitment may limit the generalizability of our findings. Future research should aim to address these limitations by incorporating diverse samples, employing objective measures of executive functions, and exploring the nomological validity and temporal stability of the UEF-1 scores over time.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the psychometric properties of the UEF-1 in Cuban university students, confirming its validity and reliability as a measure of executive functions in this population. By advancing our understanding of executive functions and their assessment in diverse cultural contexts, this research contributes to the broader field of

neuropsychological assessment and intervention, highlighting the importance of promoting executive function skills to support student's academic success and daily functioning.

References

- Cartwright, K. B., Lee, S. A., Taboada Barber, A., DeWyngaert, L. U., Lane, A. B., & Singleton, T. (2019). Contributions of Executive Function and Cognitive Intrinsic Motivation to University Students' Reading Comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(3), 345-369. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.273>
- Cristofori, I., Cohen-Zimmerman, S., & Grafman, J. (2019). Chapter 11 - Executive functions. In Elsevier (Ed.), *Handbook of Clinical Neurology* (Vol. 163, pp. 197-219). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804281-6.00011-2>
- Doebel, S. (2020). Rethinking Executive Function and Its Development. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(4), 942-956. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620904771>
- Drigas, A., & Karyotaki, M. (2019). Executive Functioning and Problem Solving: A Bidirectional Relation. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)*, 9(3), 76-98. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v9i3.10186>
- Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsdon, V. (2013). From alpha to omega: A practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology*, 105(3), 399-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12046>
- Edwards, A. A., Joyner, K. J., & Schatschneider, C. (2021). A Simulation Study on the Performance of Different Reliability Estimation Methods. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 81(6), 1089-1117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164421994184>
- Escolano-Pérez, E., Romero-Galisteo, R., Rodríguez-Medina, J., & Gálvez-Ruíz, P. (2022). Executive function assessment: Adaptation of the Amsterdam executive function

inventory using Spanish first-year university students from two knowledge areas. *PLoS ONE*, 17(8), e0272802. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0272802>

Fenn, J., Tan, C.-S., & George, S. (2020). Development, validation and translation of psychological tests. *BJPsych Advances*, 26(5), 306-315. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bja.2020.33>

Finch, W. H. (2020). Using Fit Statistic Differences to Determine the Optimal Number of Factors to Retain in an Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 80(2), 217-241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164419865769>

Fu, Y., Wen, Z., & Wang, Y. (2022). A Comparison of Reliability Estimation Based on Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Exploratory Structural Equation Models. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 82(2), 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131644211008953>

Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2(2), 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245919847202>

Hilton, D. C., Canu, W. H., & Jarrett, M. A. (2022). The importance of executive functioning for social skills in college students: a relative weights analysis. *Journal of American College Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2022.2109038>

Hox, J. J. (2021). Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In J. C. Barnes & D. R. Forde (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Research Methods in Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119111931.ch158>

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>

Jiménez-Puig, E., Broche-Pérez, Y., Hernández-Caro, A. A., & Díaz-Falcón, D. (2019).

Funciones ejecutivas, cronotipo y rendimiento académico en estudiantes universitarios.

Revista Cubana de Educación Superior, 38(2).

http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0257-43142019000200015

Kamradt, J., Nikolas, M., Burns, G., Garner, A., Jarrett, M., Luebbe, A., Becker, S., & Becker, S.

(2019). Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale (BDEFS): Validation in a Large

Multisite College Sample. *Assessment*, 28(3), 964-976.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191119869823>

Kelley, K. (2018). *The MBESS R package (version 4.4.3)*. <http://cran.r-project.org>

Koran, J. (2020). Indicators per Factor in Confirmatory Factor Analysis: More is not Always

Better. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 27(5), 756-772.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2019.1706527>

McNeish, D., & Wolf, M. G. (2023). Dynamic fit index cutoffs for confirmatory factor analysis

models. *Psychological Methods*, 28(1), 61-88. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000425>

Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive

statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of cardiac anaesthesia*, 22(1), 67–

72. https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18

Moriña, A., & Biagiotti, G. (2022). Academic success factors in university students with

disabilities: a systematic review. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37(5),

729-746. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1940007>

Nieto, M., Romero, D., Ros, L., Zabala, C., Martínez, M., Ricarte, J. J., Serrano, J. P., & Latorre,

J. M. (2020). Differences in Coping Strategies Between Young and Older Adults: The

Role of Executive Functions. *The International Journal of Aging and Human*

Development, 90(1), 28-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415018822040>

- Pinochet-Quiroz, P., Lepe-Martínez, N., Gálvez-Gamboa, F., Ramos-Galarza, C., del-Valle-Tapia, M., & Acosta-Rodas, P. (2022). Relationship between cold executive functions and self-regulated learning management in college students. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 43, 93-113. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.43.005>
- Prosen, S., & Vitulic, H. (2014). Executive function in different groups of university students. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 21. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-00133-005>
- Ramos-Galarza, C., Acosta-Rodas, P., Bolaños-Pasquel, M., & Lepe-Martínez, N. (2020). The role of executive functions in academic performance and behaviour of university students. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(3), 444-455. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-10-2018-0221>
- Ramos-Galarza, C., Cruz-Cárdenas, J., & Ramos, V. (2022). Interactive Model of Executive Functions to Understand Error Correction. *Emerging Science Journal*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.28991/ESJ-2022-06-02-011>
- Ramos-Galarza, C., Ramos, V., Del Valle, M., Lepe-Martínez, N., Cruz-Cárdenas, J., Acosta-Rodas, P., & Bolaños-Pasquel, M. (2023). Executive functions scale for university students: UEF-1. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1060178. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1060178>
- Reynolds, B. W., Basso, M. R., Miller, A. K., Whiteside, D. M., & Combs, D. (2019). Executive function, impulsivity, and risky behaviors in young adults. *Neuropsychology*, 33(2), 212-221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000510>
- Romero-Galisteo, P., Rodríguez-Medina, J., & Gálvez-Ruiz, P. (2022). Executive function assessment: Adaptation of the Amsterdam executive function inventory using Spanish first-year university students from two knowledge areas. *PLoS ONE*, 17(8), e0272802. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0272802>

- Rowe, K., Duta, M., Demeyere, N., Wagner, R., Pettifor, A., Kahn, K., Tollman, S., Scerif, G., & Stein, A. (2021). Validation of Oxford Cognitive Screen: Executive Function (OCS-EF), a tablet-based executive function assessment tool amongst adolescent females in rural South Africa. *International Journal of Psychology*, *56*(6), 895-907. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12764>
- Salas-Gomez, D., Fernandez-Gorgojo, M., Pozueta, A., Diaz-Ceballos, I., Lamarain, M., Perez, C., Kazimierczak, M., & Sanchez-Juan, P. (2020). Physical Activity Is Associated With Better Executive Function in University Students. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *14*, 00011. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00011>
- Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. (2018). Correlation Coefficients: Appropriate Use and Interpretation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *126*(5), 1763-1768. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864>
- Shrestha, N. (2021). Factor Analysis as a Tool for Survey Analysis. *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, *9*(1), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2>
- Tavakol, M., & Wetzal, A. (2020). Factor Analysis: a means for theory and instrument development in support of construct validity. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *11*, 245-247. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.5f96.0f4a>
- Xia, Y., & Yang, Y. (2019). RMSEA, CFI, and TLI in structural equation modeling with ordered categorical data: The story they tell depends on the estimation methods. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*, 409-428. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1055-2>
- Zelazo, P. D., & Carison, S. M. (2020). The neurodevelopment of executive function skills: Implications for academic achievement gaps. *Psychology & Neuroscience*, *13*(3), 273-298. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pne0000208>

Zhang, Y., Zhang, X., Zhang, L., & Guo, C. (2019). Executive Function and Resilience as Mediators of Adolescents' Perceived Stressful Life Events and School Adjustment.

Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 00446. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00446>

Tables

Table 1. Participant demographic data (n=1092)

Demographic variable	Mean \pm SD or n (%)
Age	20.05 \pm 1.72
Gender	
Female	432 (39.6)
Male	660 (60.4)
Province	
Occidental Region	69 (6.4)
Pinar del Río	1 (0.1)
Artemisa	4 (0.4)
La Habana	61 (5.6)
Isla de la Juventud	1 (0.1)
Mayabeque	1 (0.1)
Matanzas	1 (0.1)
Central Region	1016 (93.0)
Cienfuegos	44 (4.0)
Villa Clara	839 (76.8)
Sancti Spíritus	38 (3.5)
Ciego de Ávila	23 (2.1)
Camagüey	72 (6.6)
Oriental Region	7 (0.7)
Las Tunas	4 (0.4)
Granma	2 (0.2)
Santiago de Cuba	1 (0.1)

Note. SE (Standard Deviation)

Table 2. Descriptive statistics, item-test correlations (r), and loadings of the UEF-1 items.

Items	M	SD	r	Loadings
F1 Conscious monitoring of responsibilities				
UEF2	4.01	1.04	.50	.70
UEF8	3.80	1.90	.43	.63
UEF9	4.17	.89	.55	.79
UEF15	4.14	.99	.41	.61
UEF27	4.07	1.03	.54	.77
F2 Supervisory Attention System				
UEF10	3.60	1.21	.60	.77
UEF14	3.96	1.07	.59	.74
UEF22	3.70	1.11	.63	.81
UEF28	3.47	1.26	.57	.73
UEF13	3.35	1.21	.59	.74
F3 Conscious regulation of behavior				
UEF3	3.87	1.17	.46	.56
UEF11	3.30	1.43	.42	.54
UEF16	4.53	.84	.47	.66
UEF17	4.01	1.07	.47	.59
UEF18	4.13	1.05	.38	.49
UEF19	3.95	1.04	.35	.46
F4 Verification of behavior to learn				
UEF20	4.12	1.08	.52	.81
UEF23	4.17	1.23	.39	.67
UEF24	4.06	1.22	.46	.71
UEF30	4.06	1.06	.56	.81
F5 Decision making				
UEF5	4.29	.95	.43	.64
UEF12	4.12	.96	.55	.80
UEF21	3.85	1.07	.51	.73
F6 Conscious regulation of emotions				
UEF4	3.65	1.17	.49	.77
UEF25	3.65	1.20	.45	.69
UEF29	3.66	1.29	.53	.82
UEF31	3.78	1.20	.50	.84
F7 Management of elements to solve tasks				
UEF1	4.01	1.11	.50	.75
UEF6	3.65	1.31	.51	.78
UEF7	3.94	1.25	.46	.71
UEF26	4.13	1.64	.41	.66

Note: M = mean, SD = standard deviation, r = correlation index.

Table 3. Correlation matrix between executive functions

	F 1		F 2		F 3		F 4		F 5		F 6		F 7
F 1	—												
F 2	0.614	***	—										
F 3	0.426	***	0.546	***	—								
F 4	0.511	***	0.559	***	0.427	***	—						
F 5	0.473	***	0.486	***	0.475	***	0.324	***	—				
F 6	0.300	***	0.443	***	0.558	***	0.235	***	0.508	***	—		
F 7	0.400	***	0.435	***	0.469	***	0.446	***	0.375	***	0.357	***	—

Note. F = Factor; *** = $p < .001$

Table 4. UEF-C scores

Dimensions	Scores		
	Deficient	Moderate	Excellent
Factor 1: Conscious monitoring of responsibilities	≤ 19	20 – 22	23 \geq
Factor 2: Supervisory attention system	≤ 16	17 – 20	21 \geq
Factor 3: Conscious regulation of behavior	≤ 22	23 – 26	27 \geq
Factor 4: Verification of behavior to learn	≤ 15	16 – 19	20 \geq
Factor 5: Decision making	≤ 11	12 – 14	15 \geq
Factor 6: Conscious regulation of emotions	≤ 13	14 – 17	18 \geq
Factor 7: Management of elements to solve tasks	≤ 14	15 – 18	19 \geq

Figures




Figure 1. Confirmatory F Analysis of the Executive Function Scale in Cuban University Students (UFE-C).