

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

LAURA ALENI SESTITO, MARIA DOMENICA COZZOLINO,
PALMA MENNA, GIANCARLO RAGOZINI
& LUIGIA SIMONA SICA

*Contribution to the validation of the Italian version
of the Self Perception Profile for Adolescents by Susan Harter*

*Contributo alla validazione del Self Perception Profile
per Adolescenti di Susan Harter*

Introduction

In self development theories that focus in particular on cognitive and evaluation factors, Harter (1990) emphasizes the functional role of self-representations, understood as self-related cognitive structures, and exercises an important influence on the affective, motivational and behavioral systems. The different theoretical models on which this interpretation is based (Bandura, 1978; Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Harter 1986; Higgins, 1987), while suggesting different assessments about the nature of those representations, consider them as essential mediators for understanding, predicting or modifying human behaviour (and possibly, through clinical intervention). Some authors interpret this self-representation especially as the perceptions and evaluations that the subject develops in relation to specific aspects of the self in the course of his/her own development. Others interpret it more as the outcome of a process of "ascertaining" the global self worth and self effectiveness while others perceive it as a result of processes of attribution. Self-representations are subject to continuous changes during the individual's life span, depending on factors that affect both normally developmental changes and inter-individual variation changes. The latter stem from events or experiences

that can generate different levels of perception of their competence or suitability in subjects of the same age.

A wide range of research works, developed in the cognitive-developmental perspective, has highlighted in the self-representations the nature of changes (during development) (Damon & Hart, 1992; Harter, 1982, 1988; Rosenberg, 1979), thus underscoring in particular the transformations involved from early first adolescence onwards, in relation to the acquisition of formal operations (Piaget, 1952, 1954). It is precisely these achievements that allow the adolescent to integrate different and apparently conflicting aspects of self-perception within a higher abstraction level beyond that of making inferences on hidden and / or not easily observable self characteristics. Harter (1990) also underlines how an important evolutionary trajectory concerns the bases on which each person makes his/her own self-assessments and, more specifically, the ability to use information from social comparison for the personal self-assessment. This capacity, which is acquired from the second stage of childhood onwards, makes the individual not only progressively more sensitive but also more vulnerable to the others' opinions and views, especially those of significant others. For the purpose of self-evaluation the importance of comparison

with the other (i.e. social comparison) has already been highlighted by theories that in other contexts had explored the processes through which the subject gradually incorporates the perception attributed to significant others in his self-representation and assessment (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934).

Harter explicitly acknowledges the contribution provided by theoretical models of symbolic interactionism, wherein the social processes are an integral part of self-development processes (Bracken, 1992; Harter, 1998). The significant others represent a social mirror which everyone looks into to determine the opinions that others have of him, and then take these views to form his own opinion of himself (Harter, 1988). The relationship between social support, defined as a recognition and an enhancing view of the other and the global self worth, that we find in numerous empirical research works (Harter, 1986, 1987), shows the key role that the perception of others' judgments has with respect to the individual's self-construction.

Starting from an analysis of these theoretical models in a developmental perspective (Harter, 1986; Rosenberg, 1979; Selman, 1980), developmental trajectories of processes have been highlighted; through these the subject takes, develops and possibly reflects the significant others' opinions. Furthermore, the studies conducted focus on important developmental changes that affect the increasing ability to differentiate one's own self in its many aspects which in turn are related both to self-description and self evaluation. In particular, as regards self-evaluation, Harter points out that this is gradually differentiated so that the number of "domains of the self" increases systematically with age.

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

According to Harter (1990), the progressive differentiation of self representation in a variety of domains reflects not only age-related cognitive achievements, but also the pressures arising from the socialization process that, starting in adolescence, requires the subject to interpret the different social roles and to respond to different expectations that significant others have of him. Therefore, the specific task of the adolescent will be to integrate all aspects and any discrepancies of the self (Higgins, 1987) resulting from comparison with others, in a unified and consistent way. Harter suggests a multi-dimensional interpretation of the self concept (Harter, 1985, 1986; Marsh, 1985, 1990) that substantiates a new theoretical approach called domain-specific, based on the differentiation of self-representation of the self in multiple domains and critically compared with previous formulations (and the measurement procedures) that, conversely, postulate the nature of the Self (Coopersmith, 1967). The multi-dimensional hypothesis has been confirmed in numerous research works of the life-span theory (Demo & Savin-Williams, 1992; Harter, 1990). Within this domain-specific conceptualization and, in accordance with the assumptions which consider the self a synthesis of self-evaluation processes but also of the self-evaluation that the subject gives to others, Harter also introduces a unique conceptualization of the global self-worth. The latter is seen as being distinct from the personal value and competence attributed to the self in specific areas or domains. In other words, it is seen as a form of global self assessment in its entirety and complexity rather than as an aggregate of individual parts that comprise and define it.

Harter *Self Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA, 1988)* is part of a series of scales developed by the Author (1985, 1988, 1992) to study the different components of self-representation in children and adolescents. Within the wide range of questionnaires available for this purpose, this scale lies particularly in self-conceptualization understood as a synthesis (and not just as a sum/addition) of diverse evaluation and plans. Therefore Harter's scale assumes a specific importance because it provides an independent assessment of global self worth, perceived by the subject in various domains, in addition to separate measures of competence or adequacy. It seems an appropriate instrument for providing a richer and differentiated representation compared to other scales which provide only a single score (i.e. *Self-Esteem Inventory*, Coopersmith, 1967; *Self-Esteem Scale*, Rosenberg, 1965).

The results found in numerous contributions (Harter, 1982, 1985, 1986, 1999) supporting this theoretical approach show how different levels of adequacy measured in different domains may emerge from each subscale. This enables important discrimination made by adolescents when judging their own sense of competence or adequacy in different domains of their lives to be understood.

Moreover, the presence of a specific subscale to tap the global self-worth that, apart from self-assessments relating to specific capacity and performance, assumes particular importance and aims to investigate the perception of the self's worth as a person. Harter's scale is especially useful to investigate both the global self worth and each aspect of self perception because it contains and reflects Self complexity.

Description of the original scale

Harter's *Self Perception Profile for Adolescent (SPPA, 1988)* springs from an extension of the *Self Perception Profile for Children* and has been developed in particular for adolescents from the eighth to eleventh grades of school. On account of its properties it has been widely used in the American context. There are also numerous translations and validations that enable its use in different countries and populations: Canadian (Shapka & Keating, 2005), African-American (Thomson & Zand, 2002), French-Canadian (Bouffard et al., 2002), French (Bariaud, 2006), Chinese (Chan, 1997), Norwegian (Wichstrom, 1995). In the Italian context, the SPP for children has been validated by Pedrabissi, Santinello & Scarpazza (1988) and in the version for adolescents it has been used in previous studies by Forzi & Not (2000, 2003).

The original instrument is a self-report questionnaire, consisting of 9 subscales of 5 items each, corresponding to the domains identified by the Author as constituents of the representation of self (*Scholastic Competence, Job Competence, Social Acceptance, Romantic Appeal, Physical Appearance, Behavioral Conduct, Athletic Competence, Close Friendship, Global Self-worth*).

The *Scholastic Competence* subscale taps the subject's perception of his/her competence or ability within the domain of scholastic performance. (e.g. "Some teenagers do very well at their classwork, but other teenagers don't do very well at their classwork").

The *Social Acceptance* subscale taps the degree to which the subject feels accepted by peers (e.g. "Some teenagers are very hard to like, but other teenagers are really easy to like").

The *Athletic Competence* subscale taps the adolescent's perceptions of his/her athletic ability and competence at sports (e.g. "Some teenagers feel that they are better at sports than others their age, but other teenagers don't feel they can play as well").

The *Physical Appearance* subscale taps the degree to which the adolescent is happy with the way he/she looks (e.g. "Some teenagers wish their body was different, but other teenagers like their body the way it is").

The *Job Competence* subscale taps the extent to which the adolescent feels that he/she has job skills, is ready to do well at part-time jobs, and feels that they are doing well at the job he/she has (e.g. "Some teenagers feel they are old enough to get and keep a paid job, but other teenagers do not feel they are old enough yet to really handle a job well").

The *Romantic Appeal* subscale taps the subject's perception that he/she is romantically attractive to those in whom they are interested (e.g. "Some teenagers feel that people their age will be romantically attracted to them, but other teenagers worry about whether people their age will be attracted to them").

The *Behavioral Conduct* subscale taps the degree to which the individual likes the way he/she behaves, acts the way he/she is supposed to (e.g. "Some teenagers often get into trouble for the things they do, but other teenagers usually don't do things that get them into trouble").

The *Close Friendship* subscale taps the perception of one's ability to make close friends they can share personal thoughts and secrets with (e.g. "Some teenagers have a close friend they can share their secrets with, but other teenagers do not have a really close friend they can share secrets with").

The *Global Self-worth* subscale

taps the extent to which the adolescent likes him/herself as a person, is happy the way he/she is leading one's life, and is generally happy with the way he/she is (e.g. "Some teenagers are very happy being the way they are, but other teenagers wish they were different"). The Global Self-worth constitutes a global judgment about the Self rather than domain-specific competence or adequacy. On account of its specific features this scale, together with related items, is not included in our factorial analysis, in accordance with Harter's procedure (1988).

The format of each item which reflects the format used by the Author in the *Perceived Competence Scale for Children* (Harter, 1982) provides an alternative format by which the subject is asked to choose between two statements, the one perceived as the most appropriate for themselves (see Appendix). In Harter's opinion the effectiveness of this lies in the fact that both choices are presented as legitimate, thereby reducing the effects associated with social desirability. The possibility of choosing between the two proposals and indicating the degree of greater or lesser suitability allows each answer to be placed on an ordinal scale from 1 to 4, where a score of 4 represents the highest level of perceived competence and a score of 1 reflects the lowest. The items included in each subscale are worded such that the left part reflects the higher scores and the right part reflects the lower scores.

The original factor pattern, resulting from the administration to 2000 U.S. participants (500 for each grade of schooling), identifies a solution of 8 factors corresponding to 8 domains considered, whereas the value of Global Self-worth, which the Author considered qualitatively different from each of the specific do-

main (Harter, 1986), is added to these domains. The factor loadings for each subscale (Exploratory Factor Analysis with oblique rotation for correlated factors) are significant, and there are no cross loadings greater than .30. Given the clarity and replicability in the pattern of these factors, the author concludes that the subscales define separate factors that provide a differentiated and meaningful assessment of adolescents' self-representation. The internal consistency reliability for the subscales tested using Cronbach's alpha is from .74 to .93.

Aim

Within a wider project of adaptation and validation of other instruments by the same Author (*Social Support Scale for Children*; Harter, 1985; Aleni Sestito, Cozzolino, Menna, Ragozini & Sica, 2008), the purpose of this work is to adapt and validate the *Self Perception Profile for Adolescents* for the Italian population, through a test of reliability of the subscales and the factorial pattern of the questionnaire version we translated. Unlike the indications concerning the age of the participants provided by the author, we also wanted to verify the possible use of a questionnaire for pre-adolescents, in particular for participants attending the last two years of lower secondary middle school, whose access to adolescence in the Italian context is earlier.

Method

Participants

The Italian version of the *Self Perception Profile* was administered to 1203 subjects of Italian secondary school (N = 449), the two-year cycle (the "biennio") N = 504 and three year cycle (the

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

“triennio”) N = 250 of high school. To observe possible effects of gender and geographical origin and education, the sample was designed to be balanced gender (53% male and 47% females) and different types of schools in two large cities were considered, one in Southern Italy (Naples, 55%) and the other in Northern Italy (Turin 45%).

Procedure

The original scale (Harter, 1988) was translated into Italian following the guidelines of the International Test Commission (Hambleton, 1994), by back version procedure (Brislin, 1980) and it was administered to 120 subjects in a pre-test. The findings emerged have suggested a number of linguistic adjustments, taking into account the cultural peculiarities of the Italian population, which led to the formulation of the Italian version of the scale administered during the validation. The administration took place during school hours, with the consent of participants and protecting their anonymity.

Data analysis

With a view to validating our translation, we first conducted an item analysis through simple statistics, computing frequencies, means and variances for each item. In order to check the item discrimination power, indices relating to the shape of the distribution, i.e. skewness and kurtosis were calculated.

The psychometric properties of the scale especially the internal consistency and validity of the subscales were analyzed in a preliminary way, using the SPSS software. The classical procedure of psychological testing, using Cronbach's alpha was used to assess internal consistency. To

compute the validity, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted, using the technique of Principal Axis Factoring, followed by a promax axes rotation (the promax rotation has been adapted to allow correlations among factors. Indeed, Harter's findings of 1988 already showed factor correlations due to the fact that the self perception domains are separated but belong to the same latent factor), initially without constraint factors, and subsequently imposing a number of factors (the method of extraction of factors known as Principal Axis Factor is a procedure used as an alternative to the method of maximum likelihood in the case of non-normal distribution of data, as in our case) (Costelo & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999).

In other words, with regard to the factor number we performed an unconstrained and a constrained exploratory factor analysis. We recall that in this structure factor analysis were included the items for all subscales, except those related to sub-scale of global self-worth (item 9, 18, 27, 36, 45). Following Harter's suggestions, this scale is considered to be related to a dimension of the Self that is qualitatively different from the others (Harter, 1988). Indeed, global Self-worth can be considered a domain at a different level, apart from the others but also as a sort of synthesis of the others.

Some critical issues emerging from our exploratory factor analysis and internal consistency have led us to use a new Exploratory Factor Analysis (using the same methods), dropping all the items related to the *Job Competence* scale as well as items 25 and 33. Hence, the new reliability analysis performed better than the first preliminary, and the unconstrained exploratory factor analysis revealed 7 factors with

proper item factor loadings on each factor.

Furthermore, a confirmatory factor analysis – through the LISREL software (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1985) – had been used in order to verify the goodness of such factorial structure. This kind of statistical model allowed us to obtain estimates for the factorial structure parameters and to evaluate the goodness of fit through a set of proper indices for the psychometric model we specified.

Before estimating the factorial model, we checked the normality of each item and multivariate normality that are – as is well known – the distributional assumptions required for the method of maximum likelihood when estimating parameters.

In our case, since the item scores are reported on ordinal scales with four levels, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Massey, 1951) and Shapiro-Wilk (1965) tests have led us to increasingly reject the hypothesis of univariate and, consequently, also multivariate normality. Therefore, the maximum likelihood method was inadequate for the estimation of parameters and it was necessary to use a distribution-free method. We have chosen the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) method, from the matrix of asymptotic variance and covariance for ordinal data (asymptotically distribution free, ADF), which allows the limits outlined by Muthén (1993) to be overcome. Muthén says, in fact, that “the asymptotic properties of ADF does not seem to be properly implemented for the models usually used and when the sample sizes are small. The method is effective but in the presence of many variables, this means that the ADF analysis is theoretically optimal, but is not an method of easy application, in the absence of a large sample”. (Muthén,

1993, p. 227). We used this method because our sample is quite large ($N = 1203$ subjects). Many contributions also show the best performance of the ADF estimators in the case of non-normality (Benson & Fleishman, 1994; Browne, 1984; Satorra, 1990; Lei & Lomax, 2005). Therefore, in order to verify the good of fitness of the model, we considered as fit statistics the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI; Bentler et al., 1980; Tucker & Lewis, 1973), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR; Hu & Bentler, 1998) and the Incremental Fit Index (IFI; Hu & Bentler, 1999). In addition to complete our information we considered the more commonly used in the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1989; Steiger & Lind, 1980) and the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1985). Finally, we look at chi square variations, not to test the goodness model but to evaluate the effects on the model when adding new parameters on the base of modification indices (Bollen, 1989). These are measures associated to parameters not yet included in the model. For each parameter, there is a measure the change of chi square variation when adding that parameter to the model, and the improvement of goodness-of-fit measures due to the parameter. In order to provide the first descriptive results obtained on the Italian population we conducted a descriptive analysis (sample mean and standard deviation). The gender effect had been evaluated by means of a classical t test to compare the means, while the school level effect (level 1: the last two years of middle school; level 2 = first two years of high school; level 3 = last three years of high school) had been

verified through the one way analysis of variance followed by the Tukey post hoc test.

Results

The results from the exploratory analysis of the frequency scores distributions and the observation of central tendency and dispersion values demonstrate that the average scores range from 2.24 to 3.07; the standard deviations range from .90 to 1.2, showing a not large variability of each item. In order to verify the discriminative skill of each item forms of distribution indexes were calculated, namely skewness and kurtosis. The values of skewness and kurtosis ranged between 0 and 1 for all the items, so item with scarce discriminative power have not been identified.

From a preliminary analysis conducted on the internal consistency of each subscale, the Cronbach's alpha scores (Table 1) show a substantial internal consistency and an appropriate role provided by each item.

Item 25 (which belongs to the *Behavioural Conduct* subscale) has to be considered an exception. This item's elimination produces an improvement in the internal consistency of the subscale. We also decided for the elimination of the whole subscale of *Job Competence*. This subscale shows a low Cronbach's alpha value (.54). This data can be read in the light of peculiarities within the Italian context, in which very rarely does it happen that young students also have a job, even part-time, at the same time they are studying. Therefore, it was decided to remove this subscale from the following analyses.

The factorial structure emerging from the first exploratory analysis, without constraint of factors, shows 8 factors. The first six factors are in accordance with those

present in the original structure: *Physical Appearance*, *Athletic Competence*, *Social Acceptance*, *Close Friendship*, *Behavioural Conduct*, *Scholastic Competence*, sorted according to the eigenvalue. In the seventh and eighth factors are distributed the belonging to item subscale *Romantic Appeal*, even with low saturation.

Moreover, the eighth factor absorbs less than 3% of total variance, similar to the eigenvalue, which is slightly higher than one. A new exploratory analysis was therefore conducted with a constraint of factors equal to 7. In this case the factorial structure shows the following factors listed according to the eigenvalue: *Physical Appearance*, *Social Acceptance*, *Athletic competence*, *Close Friendship*, *Behavioural Conduct*, *Scholastic Competence* and *Romantic Appeal*. Only item 33, which originally belonged to the subscale *Romantic Appeal*, loaded on *Social Acceptance*, listed as a second factor. We decided to delete item 33, and we then conducted a new exploratory factorial analysis without bond of factors, from which a 7-factor structure emerged. This solution absorbs 56.3% of the total variance and it reproduces the factorial structure of the original instrument, with a broadly appropriate loading of the items on different factors for the seven subscales considered by the author (see Table 2).

The factorial structure, although quite distinct, shows in a different form from the original work, in other words cross loadings above .30 for some items. The results are nevertheless very satisfactory.

In relation to factorial extraction, it is important to note that in each of the factorial structures considered, *Physical Appearance* consistently emerges as the first factor as well as the most important, thereby explaining 21% of total variance. *Athletic Compe-*

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

Table 1
Alpha Cronbach's scores

<i>Subscales</i>	
Scholastic Competence	.703
Social Acceptance	.747
Athletic Competence	.806
Physical Appearance	.862
Job Competence	.541
Romantic Appeal	.676
Behavioral Conduct	.703
Close Friendship	.787
Global Self-worth	.768

tence, which is also connected to the perception of physical characteristics, emerges as the second factor. Other relevant factors are *Close Friendship* and *Social Acceptance*, which are referred more to the relational dimension.

Although the factors are clear and distinct from each other in a unambiguous manner and refer to different dimensions of Self-representation, even our results reveal significant correlations between the factors, in according to the results obtained by Harter (1988) and her theoretical model. Each subscale measures different domains of Self-evaluation as individual parts of the same unitary concept.

The 7-factor model, tested by confirmatory analysis (CFA), shows indices that make a model's goodness-of-fit; the CFI, GFI and NNFI are equal or greater than .95, and the RMSEA and SRMR were also satisfactory (see Table 3).

Table 4 shows the estimated factor loadings with their standard errors and *t-value*: the first weight factor in each subscale is equal to 1, as is required by the practice, to fix the measurement unit of the factor.

From Table 4 we can see that the item saturations in the respective

factors were similarly high and all of them were significant ($p < .05$). The factor correlations were also high and significant. When analyzing standardized solutions, not reported for brevity, we note that the factor weights for each factor are fairly balanced and homogeneous, indicating that all the items considered contribute to the factor definition and there is no item that prevails particularly in guiding the factor they belong to.

With regards to the correlations between factors, as shown in Table 5, the highest (ranging between .53 and 0.71) correlations can be observed between the following factors: *Physical Appearance*, *Social Acceptance*, *Athletic Competence* and *Romantic Appeal*. These four factors, guided by *Physical Appearance*, seem to us to be a sort of core and stable topic in Self representation. These results confirm in principle the findings from exploratory factorial analysis.

We also repeated the internal consistency analysis of subscales based on the results of factorial analyses. Cronbach's alpha value for the two scales that have been modified – *Romantic Appeal* and *Behavioral Conduct* – is equal to .651 and .723, respectively.

Having investigated the factorial structure scale and validated it, we report here the results of our descriptive analysis on the considered sample. The values, around 2.8, are slightly less than the American sample (which is around 3), yet they converge with those found on the Italian population using the scale for children (Pedrabissi & Santinello, 1992). The mean differences for gender is significant for *Social Acceptance*, *Athletic Competence*, *Physical appearance* and *Global self-worth* subscales, in which the highest average scores are reported by males, and in the subscale *Behavioural Conduct*, in which the average scores are higher for females (Table 6).

The means and standard deviations subscales for the schooling range are presented in Table 7. There are significant differences in *Athletic Competence*, *Physical Appearance*, *Close Friendship*, *Romantic Appeal* and *Scholastic Competence* subscales. In *Athletic Competence* and in *Physical Appearance* subscales the scores of adolescents belonging to the first segment of schooling were the highest, in *Close Friendship* subscale the scores of adolescents belonging to the second segment of schooling were the highest, while in *Romantic Appeal* and *Scholastic Competence* subscales the scores of adolescents belonging to the third segment were the highest.

Discussion

The results of our analysis show that the Italian version of the factorial pattern of scale almost entirely overlaps with the original version of factorial pattern, except for the *Job Competence* subscale. Compared with the original values after the removal of two items (25 and 33), the reliability of subscales was confirmed.

Table 2
Exploratory Factor Analysis: factor loadings

	<i>Physical Appearance</i>	<i>Athletic Competence</i>	<i>Close Friendship</i>	<i>Social Acceptance</i>	<i>Behavioral Conduct</i>	<i>Scholastic Competence</i>	<i>Romantic Appeal</i>
<i>Item 4</i>	.724						
<i>Item 13</i>	.792						
<i>Item 22</i>	.861						
<i>Item 31</i>	.642						
<i>Item 40</i>	.745						
<i>Item 3</i>		.771					
<i>Item 12</i>		.701					
<i>Item 21</i>		.668					
<i>Item 30</i>		.567					
<i>Item 39</i>		.648					
<i>Item 8</i>			.514				
<i>Item 17</i>			.656				
<i>Item 26</i>			.652				
<i>Item 35</i>			.680				
<i>Item 44</i>			.741				
<i>Item 2</i>				.572			
<i>Item 11</i>				.699			
<i>Item 20</i>				.609			
<i>Item 29</i>				.569			
<i>Item 38</i>				.649			
<i>Item 7</i>					.635		
<i>Item 16</i>					.689		
<i>Item 34</i>					.710		
<i>Item 43</i>					.465		
<i>Item 1</i>						.524	
<i>Item 10</i>						.472	
<i>Item 19</i>						.555	
<i>Item 28</i>						.609	
<i>Item 37</i>						.720	
<i>Item 6</i>							.448
<i>Item 15</i>							.715
<i>Item 24</i>							.502
<i>Item 42</i>							.682

Table 3
Fit indices of the estimated model

<i>CFI</i>	<i>GFI</i>	<i>NNFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>SRMR</i>	<i>IFI</i>
.99	.99	.98	.034	.06	.99

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

Table 4
Lx, standard deviation and t-value of the tested model

<i>Schol. Comp.</i>	Λ_x	<i>Social Accep.</i>	Λ_x	<i>Athletic Comp.</i>	Λ_x	<i>Physcal Appeal</i>	Λ_x	<i>Romantic Appeal</i>	Λ_x	<i>Behav. Conduct</i>	Λ_x	<i>Close Friendsh.</i>	Λ_x
Item 1	1.00	Item 2	1.00	Item 3	1.00	Item 4	1.00	Item 6	1.00	Item 7	1.00	Item 8	1.00
Item 10	1.18	Item 11	1.30	Item 12	.92	Item 13	1.00	Item 15	.93	Item 16	1.32	Item 17	.63
	(.08)		(.04)		(.02)		(.02)		(.05)		(.06)		(.05)
	14.77		3.16		37.42		41.46		18.89		23.07		13.34
Item 19	1.40	Item 20	.79	Item 21	.88	Item 22	1.09	Item 24	1.12	Item 34	1.08	Item 26	1.10
	(.10)		(.03)		(.03)		(.02)		(.04)		(.04)		(.06)
	14.68		29.56		33.13		47.34		26.66		3.15		17.27
Item 28	1.31	Item 29	.73	Item 30	.73	Item 31	.98	Item 42	.90	Item 43	.72	Item 35	.70
	(.09)		(.03)		(.02)		(.03)		(.05)		(.04)		(.03)
	15.29		25.93		29.62		38.12		17.78		19.84		21.91
Item 37	1.90	Item 38	1.08	Item 39	.93	Item 40	.91	Item 44	.61				
	(.09)		(.04)		(.04)		(.02)		(.03)				
	21.55		28.89		23.99		36.6		17.55				

Table 5
Correlations between the factors

	<i>Scholastic Competence</i>	<i>Social Acceptance</i>	<i>Athletic Competence</i>	<i>Physical Appearance</i>	<i>Romantic Appeal</i>	<i>Behavioral Conduct</i>	<i>Close Friendship</i>
<i>Schol. Comp.</i>	1.00						
<i>Social Acceptance</i>	.45	1.00					
<i>Athletic Comp.</i>	.37	.58	1.00				
<i>Physcal Appearance</i>	.53	.64	.56	1.00			
<i>Romantic Appeal</i>	.47	.71	.53	.68	1.00		
<i>Behaviour Conduct</i>	.39	.03	.08	.20	.09	1.00	
<i>Close Friendship</i>	.22	.38	.20	.26	.26	.11	1.00

It is to be noted that the internal consistency coefficients we obtained are higher than those obtained by Harter.

The model tested by CFA shows a good fit and clearly identifies the seven subscales related to different domains of self-evaluation. All the items (except the two deleted) adequately saturate on latent factors and thus contribute to the identification of each spe-

cific subscale. The *Global Self-worth* subscale, which is on a different level compared to other dimensions of self-representation, has good reliability indexes too. Further research will provide a deeper analysis of the relationship between self dimensions and, in particular, the relationship between global Self-worth and each other dimension, in order to explore the role of glob-

al Self-worth on all the other domains.

With respect to the adaptation and validation of the *Self Perception Profile for Adolescents*, the results highlight the substantial validity and reliability of the Italian version we tested and of its dimensions, even when assuming the extension, in the Italian sample, of its use with pre-adolescent subjects.

Table 6
Means and standard deviations for gender

	Sex	M	DS	t	Sig.
<i>Scholastic Competence</i>	M	2.87	.66	3.57	.656
	F	2.73	.64		
<i>Social Acceptance</i>	M	3.06	.61	5.90	.002
	F	2.84	.68		
<i>Athletic Competence</i>	M	2.88	.66	10.33	.008
	F	2.45	.73		
<i>Physical Appearance</i>	M	2.79	.71	8.17	.000
	F	2.43	.81		
<i>Romantic Appeal</i>	M	2.63	.67	2.43	.062
	F	2.53	.70		
<i>Behavioral Conduct</i>	M	2.75	.57	-2.21	.103
	F	2.83	.61		
<i>Close Friendship</i>	M	3.05	.73	.016	.018
	F	3.05	.80		
<i>Global Self-worth</i>	M	3.07	.62	7.09	.001
	F	2.79	.70		

Table 7
Means and standard deviations for schooling range

	School	M	DS	F	Sig.
<i>Scholastic Competence</i>	1	2.74	.709	4.484	.011
	2	2.82	.641		
	3	2.87	.605		
<i>Social Acceptance</i>	1	2.99	.660	1.374	.254
	2	2.96	.660		
	3	2.92	.658		
<i>Athletic Competence</i>	1	2.76	.722	4.857	.008
	2	2.62	.748		
	3	2.63	.721		
<i>Physical Appearance</i>	1	2.67	.828	3.395	.034
	2	2.53	.780		
	3	2.64	.743		
<i>Romantic Appeal</i>	1	2.46	.694	16.935	.000
	2	2.57	.711		
	3	2.73	.644		
<i>Behavioral Conduct</i>	1	2.75	.766	1.891	.151
	2	2.78	.606		
	3	2.83	.563		
<i>Close Friendship</i>	1	2.95	.788	5.951	.003
	2	3.14	.753		
	3	3.07	.759		
<i>Global Self-worth</i>	1	2.99	.692	2.521	.081
	2	2.88	.689		
	3	2.94	.641		

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

Therefore, our research permits us to propose the use of the Italian version of the questionnaire we tested.

References

- ALENI SESTITO, L., COZZOLINO, M.D., MENNA, P., RAGOZINI, G., SICA, L.S. (2008). Contributo alla validazione della versione italiana della scala del Social Support di Susan Harter. *Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata*, 254, 33-43.
- BANDURA, A. (1978). The self-system in reciprocal determinism. *American Psychologist*, 33, 344-358.
- BARIAUD, F. (2006). Le self-perception profile for adolescents (S.P.P.A.) de S. Harter: Un questionnaire multidimensionnel d'évaluation de soi. *Orientation Scolaire et Professionnelle*, 35 (2), 282-295.
- BENSON, J. & FLEISHMAN, J.A. (1994). The robustness of maximum likelihood and distribution-free estimators to non-normality in confirmatory factor analysis. *Quality and Quantity*, 28, 117-136.
- BENTLER, P.M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- BENTLER, P.M., BONETT, D. & DOUGLAS, G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 588-606.
- BOLLEN, K. A. (1989). *Lam structural equation with latent variables*. New York: John Wiley.
- BOUFFARD, T., SEIDAH, A., MCINTYRE, M., BOIVIN, M., VEZEAU, C. & CANTIN, S. (2002). Measuring adolescent self-esteem: A French-Canadian version of Harter's Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des Sciences du comportement*, 34 (3), 158-162.
- BRISLIN, R.W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H.C. Triandis & J.W. Berry (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, 2. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- BROWNE, M.W. (1984). Asymptotic distribution free methods in the analysis of covariance structures. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 37, 127-141.
- CHAN, D. (1997). Self-concept domains and global self-worth among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Personality and Individual Differences* 22, 511-520.
- COOLEY, C.H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.
- COOPERSMITH, S.A. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- COSTELO, A.B. & OSBORNE, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10 (7), 1-9.
- DAMON, W. & HART, D. (1992). Self-understanding, and its role in social and moral development. In H. Bornstein & M.E. Lamb (eds.), *Developmental psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- DEMO, D.H. & SAVIN-WILLIAMS, R.C. (1992). Self concept stability and change during adolescence. In R.P. Lipka & T.M. Brinhaus (eds.), *Self perspectives across the life span (Vol. 4)*. Albany State University of New York Press.
- DWECK, C. & ELLIOT, E.S. (1983). Achievement motivation in E.M. Hetherington (ed.). *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development (Vol. 4)*. New York: Wiley.
- FABRIGAR, L.R., WEGENER, D.T., MACCALLUM, R.C. & STRAHAN, E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- FORZI, M. & NOT, E. (2000). Domini di competenza, autostima e orientamenti motivazionali nel contest scolastico. *Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata*, 232, 25-38.
- FORZI, M. & NOT, E. (2003). Correlati dell'autostima in relazione ad età e sesso. *Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata*, 241, 27-37.
- HAMBLETON, R.K. (1994). Guidelines for adapting educational and psychological tests: A progress report. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 10, 229-244.
- HARTER, S. (1982). Perceived competence scale for children. *Child Development*, 53, 87-97.
- HARTER, S. (1985). *Social Support Scale*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.
- HARTER, S. (1986). Processes underlying the construction, maintenance and enhancement of the self-concept in children. In J. Suls & A. Greenwald (eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self (Vol. 3)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- HARTER, S. (1987). The determinants and functional role of the self-worth. In N. Eisenberg (ed.) *Contemporary Topics in Developmental Psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- HARTER, S. (1988). *Manual for the Self Perception Profile for Adolescents*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.
- HARTER, S. (1990). Developmental differences in the nature of Self-representation: Implications for the understanding, assessment, and treatment of maladaptive behavior. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14 (2), 113-142.
- HARTER, S. (1999). *The construction of the self. A developmental perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.
- HARTER, S. & MONSOUR, A. (1992). Developmental analysis of conflict caused by opposing attributes in the adolescent self-portrait. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 251-260.
- HIGGINS, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319-340.

- HU, L. & BENTLER, P.M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structural equation modeling: Sensitivity to under parameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 424-453.
- HU, L. & BENTLER, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- JAMES, W. (1892). *Psychology: The briefer course*. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- JORESBOG, K.G. & SORBOM, D. (1985). LISREL VI: An analysis of linear structural relationships by the method of maximum likelihood. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software.
- LEI, M. & LOMAX, R.G. (2005). The effect of varying degrees of non-normality in structural equation modelling. *Lem Structural Equation Modelling*, 12, 1-27.
- MARSH, H.W. (1985). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of preadolescent self-concept. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 37, 197-204.
- MARSH, H.W. (1990). A multidimensional, hierarchical model of self-concept: Theoretical and empirical justification. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2, 77-172.
- MASSEY, F.J. (1951). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for goodness of fit. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 46, 68-78.
- MEAD, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MUTHÉN, B.O. (1993). Goodness of fit with categorical and other non-normal variables. In K.A. Bollen & J.S. Long (eds.), *Testing structural equation models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- PEDRABISSI, L. & SANTINELLO, M. (1992). Il Self-Perception Profile for Children di Susan Harter. *Psicologia e Scuola*, 61, 3-15.
- PEDRABISSI, L., SANTINELLO, M. & SCARPAZZA, V. (1988). Contributo all'adattamento italiano del Self-Perception Profile di Susan Harter. *Bollettino di Psicologia applicata*, 185, 19-26.
- PIAGET, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York: International University Press (tr. it.: *La nascita dell'intelligenza nel bambino*. La Nuova Italia, Firenze, 1977).
- PIAGET, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New York: Basic Books (tr. it.: *La costruzione del reale nel bambino*. La Nuova Italia, Firenze, 1979).
- ROSENBERG, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ROSENBERG, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- SATORRA, A. (1990). Robustness issues in structural equation modelling: A review of recent developments. *Lem Quality & Quantity*, 24, 367-386.
- SELMAN, R. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analyses*. New York: Academic Press.
- SHAPIRO, S.S. & WILK, M.B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52, 591-611.
- SHAPKA, J.D. & KEATING D.P. (2005). Structure and change in self-concept during adolescence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des Sciences du-comportement*, 37 (2), 83-96.
- STEIGER, J.H. (1989). EZPATH: A supplementary module for SYSTAT and SYGRAPH. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT.
- STEIGER, J.H. & LIND, J.C. (1980). *Statistically-based tests for the number of common factors*. Paper presented at the annual Spring Meeting of the Psychometric Society in Iowa City.
- THOMSON, N.R. & ZAND DEBRA, H. (2002). The Harter Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents: Psychometrics for an early adolescent African American. *International Journal of Testing*, 2 (3-4), 297-310.
- TUCKER, L.R. & LEWIS, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38, 1-10.
- WICHSTROM, L. (1995). Harter's Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents: reliability, validity, and evaluation of the question format. *Journal of Personal Assessment*, 65 (1), 100-116.

SUMMARY. Introduction: In this paper we aim to propose an Italian version of the Self Perception Profile for Adolescents of Susan Harter (1988) and to explore its psychometric properties. *The Self Perception Profile for Adolescents allows to estimate the in different domains and different actions' assessment.* **Methods:** The Italian version was administered, 120 subjects in pre-test phase. **Results:** The results lead to some adaptations and this version was administered to a sample of 1203 subjects (11-18 years). The statistical analyses verified the internal consistency and the factorial structure of the Italian version, deleting the Job Competence subscale, that was not suitable for Italian context. It was performed a structural equations model configuration of factorial structure was similar to the original Harter's structure. **Conclusions:** These results seem to indicate the Self Perception Profile for Adolescents consisting validity and reliability in its dimensions also in Italian sample.

RIASSUNTO. Introduzione: Scopo del presente lavoro è proporre una versione italiana del Self Perception Profile for Adolescents di Susan Harter (1988) e di testarne le proprietà psicometriche. La scala permette di valutare la rappresentazione di sé considerando differenti dimensioni e piani di valutazione. **Metodo:** La versione italiana è stata somministrata, in fase di pre-test, a 120 soggetti. **Risultati:** I rilievi emersi hanno condotto ad alcuni adatta-

EXPERIENCES AND TOOLS

menti; la versione così ottenuta è stata somministrata ad un campione di 1203 soggetti (11-18 anni). Le analisi statistiche hanno consentito di verificare la consistenza interna e la struttura fattoriale della scala nella versione italiana, eliminando la scala della competenza lavorativa,

risultata poco applicabile al contesto italiano. È stato inoltre realizzato un modello di equazioni strutturali, al fine di verificare la presenza di una struttura fattoriale sovrapponibile a quella originaria proposta da Harter. **Conclusioni:** I rilievi emersi sembrano indicare la sostanziale validità e

affidabilità del Self Perception Profile e delle dimensioni che lo compongono anche all'interno del campione italiano.

Keywords: *Self Perception Questionnaire, Adolescence, Instrumental Study*

APPENDIX

An example of the alternative format for each item

"What I am like"

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Really true for me	Sort of true for me	Sort of true for me	Really true for me

Some teenagers feel that they are better at sports

but

other teenagers don't feel they can play as well

Laura Aleni Sestito, Maria Domenica Cozzolino, Palma Menna, Dept. of Relational Sciences "G.Iacono", Federico II University, Napoli, Italy.
Giancarlo Ragozini, Dept. of Sociology "G.Germani", Federico II University, Napoli, Italy.
Luigia Simona Sica, Dept. of Psychology, Department of Relational Sciences "G.Iacono", Federico II University, Napoli, Italy & University of Torino, Italy.