IJTARP
International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research & Practice

11 (2), 14-24
https://doi.org/10.29044/v11i2p14

Evaluation and Measurement of Ego States: The Psychometric Properties of the Italian Translation of the Revised version of the Ego State Questionnaire (ESQ-R-I)

© 2020 Fiorenzo Laghi, Giuseppe Crea, Claudia Filipponi, and Giorgio Cavallero

Abstract

As a response to the need for more objectivity, Loffredo, Harrington, Munoz & Knowles (2004) developed a 40-item version of the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R), which was the readjustment of the original 60-items version (Loffredo & Omizo, 1997). The present study evaluates an Italian version of the ESQ-R scale, completed by a sample of 483 subjects (204 males, and 279 females) and demonstrates acceptable construct validity and reliability in its five subscales of Critical Parent, Nurturing Parent, Adult, Free Child, and Adapted Child. Exploratory factor analyses suggested five factors as referred to in the original ESQ-R scale; items loaded at .30 or below were excluded and additional study showed an Italian version ESQ-R-I with 33-items to have a good construct validity as an objective measure of the five ego states entities according to transactional analysis theory. Implications for future research are included.

Keywords

ego states; transactional analysis; Ego State Questionnaire-Revised; Ego State Questionnaire-Revised - Italian; validation.

Introduction

Transactional analysis theory provides both a structural model of personality and a functional or behavioural model (Berne, 1961, 1966). In the structural model the personality is based on the recognition of three ego states, called the Parent, the Adult, and the Child (Berne, 1961). The structural analysis is referred to as the observation of the executive ego state involved in a specific transaction (Berne, 1963).

On the other hand, functional ego states are categories in which we make behavioural diagnoses of ego states (Berne, 1961; Joines, 1976). The functional model is based on both the individual's and social behaviour, and divides the ego states into five distinct entities: the Critical and Nurturing Parent (CP and NP), the Free and Adapted Child (FC and AC) and the Adult ego state (Woollams & Brown, 1978).

Different authors made attempts to measure ego states in a systematic and quantifiable manner, through the development of instruments which empirically measure ego state functions (Heyer, 1979; Thorne & Faro, 1980; Doelker & Griffiths, 1984).

Heyer (1987) for instance, having used his questionnaire with samples of 806 and 715 across a variety of groups, confirmed five ego states and even suggested that Adapted Child had "at least two principal functional modes: Conforming and Demonstrative." (p. 292). In his study he concluded that the advantage of using an objective measure was to improve the creation of a standardised measure which can be used to compare groups and individuals.

As a response to the need for more objectivity, in the present work we evaluate the measurement properties of the Italian translation of the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R, Loffredo, Harrington & Okech, 2002), providing some empirical evidence of the ego states functional model by showing that they are distinct and measurable entities drawn from individuals' behaviour.

The development of objective methods for the assessment of ego states questionnaire

The differentiated expression of the ego states can be accessible to the consciousness of people through their experience, and this learned behaviour "gives rise to the appearance of enduring character traits that are commonly termed 'personality'" (Heyer, 1979, p. 10). These persistent differential traits of personality can be considered as distinct and measurable entities (Heyer, 1987), and may be defined as "habitual response patterns, providing consistency of response to objects, persons, and situations" (Loffredo & Harrington, 2008, p. 2).

In Berne's definition, each ego state is a directly observable phenomenon corresponding to observable behaviours, as it is "a consistent pattern of feeling and experience directly related to a corresponding consistent pattern of behaviour" (Berne, 1966, p. 364).

To respond to what is occurring in life, all use and choose the available ego state, which is potentially accessible to the consciousness of the individual and is also observable by others as distinct and measurable entities (Heyer, 1987, p 286).

The measurement of the ego states as observable response patterns has been the target of many studies in defining the measurement of ego states and also to help locate transactional analysis theory within a scientific paradigm (Williams & Williams, 1980).

Several published studies have attempted to identify ego states with different methods, either at an intuitive level, assessing the behavioural and linguistic indicators (Klein, 1980; Solomon, 2003; Steere, Tucker & Worth, 1981), or with projective instruments (Turner, 1988).

An important contribution to the need for the assessment of ego states is Dusay's egogram, an instrument which can provide a subjective representation of the distribution of psychic energy among these dimensions (Dusay, 1972). This instrument focused on the importance of individual judgment to recognise the different ego states, but at the same time showed the limit of poor reliability when the subjective perception is influenced by different external experiences (Dusay, 1977, pp. 61-65).

Other studies have demonstrated that ego states can be measured through an objective questionnaire, either by paper-and-pencil test, or adapting existing instruments such as the Adjective Check List (Schaefer, 1976; Thorne & Faro, 1980; Williams & Williams, 1980) or developing specific tests (Price 1975; Brennan & McClenaghan, 1978; Doelker & Griffiths, 1984).

Among the several attempts that contributed in different ways to the construction of objective measures based on transactional analysis ego state theory, we can mention the following:

- Price (1975) developed the Psychic Energy Profile (PEP) relating to distribution of energy; a questionable instrument because of its low reliability coefficient.
- Turner (1988) developed two specific projective instruments, the Parent-Adult-Child Drawing Task (PAC-D), and the Transactional Analysis Sentence Completion Form (TASC): there is no information on reliability and validity for these.
- Heyer (1979) developed the Ego State Profile Questionnaire, a standardised measure which can be used to compare groups and individuals. From the psychometric point of view this scale has a good convergent construct validity as it has a good correlation with the psychological construct of self-esteem of Rosenberg (1965), and with the dogmatism scale of Troldahl and Powell (1965). In Heyer's (1979) study differences between the genders have been identified: the Critical Parent (CP) ego state was found to be consistently higher among men than among women.
- Based on Heyer's Ego State Profile (1979), Doelker and Griffiths (1984) worked out another instrument, The Ego State Inventory (ESI), based on the items of Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom 1964), and of Cattell's 16PF (Cattell, Eber & Tatsuoka, 1970).
- Thorne and Faro (1980) suggested that the advantage of using an objective measure is to improve its relationship with clinical application. Therefore, they developed the Ego State Scale (ESS) to measure the ego states and to examine the relationship between ego states and pathological issues such as depression, schizophrenia and hysteria.
- The Transactional Behavior Questionnaire (TBQ) of Brennan and McClenaghan (1978) is an instrument that measures, besides the ego states, the transactional analysis domains of existential positions, stroking behaviours and intimacy. Levels of reliability were rather low.
- Williams and Williams (1980) based their work on the Adjective Checklist (ACL, Gough & Heilbrun, 1965), from which they identified 65 items that were strongly associated with the ego states. Although stable individual differences were found, their research with young college students indicated no differences between males and females, and high correlation among ego states.

Most of these foregoing studies had as their purpose the identification of the ego state by different methods of measurement. Furthermore, the findings from the specific studies by Heyer (1979) and by Brennan and McClenaghan (1978) suggest that individual differences in ego states, replicable in a variety of different conditions, can be recognised by self-report questionnaires.

The development of the Ego State Questionnaire (ESQ)

As part of an empirical study aimed at identifying differences relative to personality dimensions in a group of undergraduate college students, Loffredo and Omizo (1997) used a new instrument to measure ego state, the Ego State Questionnaire (ESQ). In this first research, the reliability of the ESQ utilising Cronbach's alpha was reported to be .61.

In a later study, the construct validity of the Ego State Questionnaire was verified through a factor analysis using the Varimax factor rotation (Loffredo, Harrington & Okech, 2002). The results show five factors corresponding to the five functional ego states. However, factor analysis revealed poor construct validity for the Critical Parent and Free Child ego states, while it was good as a measure of the Nurturing Parent, Adapted Child, and Adult ego states.

In order to improve the construct validity of the instrument, new items were added on all scales. At the end the authors obtained a 60-item version which revealed the five primary factors corresponding to the five functional ego states. Based on a factor analysis on this version, a selection of the 8 highest factor loaded items for each ego state gave rise to the ESQ-R made of 40-items (Loffredo, Harrington & Okech, 2002). In this final version, seventeen items derived from the original ESQ, as the results of the original factor analysis was fairly good. For the new items added into the 40-items questionnaire, seventeen were based on adjectives identified by Williams and Williams (1980), and were found to be strongly associated with specific functional ego states. Four new items were based on some words identified by Woollams, Brown & Huige (1976) and indicative of specific functional ego states. Two items were completely new.

In a more recent research Loffredo (Loffredo, Harrington, Munoz & Knowles, 2004) confirmed the reliability of the ESQ-R, utilizing the split-half method. The results obtained for each of the five subscales ranged from .69 to .83, and for the entire ESQ-R was .80. In this work they used two factor analysis: the first one was used to identify the patterns of the five factors represented by the 60-items version, and accounted for 36.11% of the item variance; the second one was used to identify the five factors represented by the 40-items version, and accounted for 43.6% of the item variance.

Aim of the present study

This study aimed to give an empirical contribution to the body of literature which describes the phenomenon of objective methods for the assessment of the functional ego states, confirming that reliable individual differences in individuals' behaviour drawn from ego state entities may be identified through self-report questionnaire.

In order to investigate the psychometric properties of the Italian version of the ESQ-R and to evaluate whether the distinction between the ESQ-R sub-factors is significant, we assessed the following points:

1. Construct validity, through an exploratory factor analysis of the ESQ-R scale to evaluate if the five-factor structure evident in the original version of the ESQ-R test is maintained in the Italian versions.
2. Internal consistency, to evaluate the degree to which all items on a particular scale measure the original concept.
3. Gender-related differences in ego states scales, to verify if, based on the previously reviewed literature, female participants are characterised by higher levels of Nurturing Parent (NP) compared to male participants (Loffredo & Omizo, 1997), and if male participants are higher in Critical Parent (CP) ego state (Williams & Williams, 1980).

To address these research points, these questions guided our work:

- Research Question 1: Does the Italian version of ESQ-R demonstrate factorial validity?
- Research Question 2: Are the derived factors internally consistent and stable?
- Research Question 3: Are there gender-related differences in ego states subscales?

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0) was used to conduct factorial analysis. The internal consistency of the subscales was measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

Method

Participants and procedure

The participants were 483 Italian adults (204 males, and 279 females), with a mean age of 36.91 (SD = 11.58) and a range from 18 to 66. The geographic distributions were: north of Italy 9%; centre 79%; south 12%. We used a non-random sampling method with snowball sampling. Data collection was conducted via paper and pencil questionnaires by trained inter-

viewers, as part of the training program of the School of Transactional Analysis (SIFP) in Rome. We used a cross-sectional study design with a unique data collection: the data were collected within 4 months from the beginning of the research.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to participation, all subjects provided informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards of the responsible committees on human experimentation and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration. Before the data collection started, the protocol was approved by the Ethics Commission of the School of Transactional Analysis (SIFP) in Rome.

Measures

The *Ego State Questionnaire Revised* (ESQ-R, Loffredo et al., 2004). The ESQ-R was translated from English into Italian following the procedure described by Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin, and Ferraz (2000), including forward and backward translation, and pilot testing. A five-point *Likert* scale was used (1 = *completely disagree*; 5 = *completely agree*), and scores on the eight items on each of the five subscales were summed. The five subscales of the functional ego states are: Critical Parent (CP) with statements reflecting critical, restrictive, parent characteristics (e.g. "I am critical of others"), Nurturing Parent (NP), with statements reflecting nurturing and growth-enhancing parent characteristics (e.g. "I enjoy nurturing others"), Adult (A), with statements reflecting the ability to perceive and utilise information for reality-testing (e.g. "I am a fair minded person"), Free Child (FC), with statements reflecting free and autonomous child ego state characteristics (e.g. "I am a pleasure seeking person"), and Adapted Child (AC), with statements reflecting either conforming or rebellious child ego state characteristics (e.g. "I generally conform to the wishes of others").

The original version of Loffredo at al (2004) obtained the following coefficient of reliability for the five subscales: Critical Parent (CP) was .78, Nurturing Parent (NP), was .83, Adult (A) was .69, Free Child (FC) was .76, and Adapted Child (AC) was .75 (p. 93).

Results

The first step in data analysis examined the factor structure of the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised: Italian (ESQ-R-I) to test the working hypothesis that the inventory reflected a five-factor structure, differentiating among the five ego states of Critical Parent, Nurturing Parent, Adult, Free Child, and Adapted Child. All variables were initially screened for missing data, distribution abnormalities, and outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Research Question 1

Given that exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a valuable heuristic strategy to model specification, a Principal Components Analysis was conducted on the total sample data to address Research Question 1.

The suitability of the intercorrelation matrix for factor analysis was demonstrated by high inter-item correlations, a strong KMO (.83), and a significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2[780] = 5997.504$, $p < .000$). After reviewing the scree plot, initial loading plots, percentage of variance accounted for by each extracted factor, we examined the factor structure of the ESQ-R-I to test the working hypothesis that the inventory reflected a five-factor structure, differentiating between Critical Parent, Nurturing Parent, Adult, Free Child, and Adapted Child.

Table 1 is the structure matrix, which demonstrates how all of the items are related to the other five factors, and Table 2 presents the Varimax rotated solution that clearly differentiates between the five factors. This clear factor structure, however, required the deletion of the items that loaded at .30 or below of the hypothesised constructs, because in applied research only factor loadings greater than or equal to .30 are generally interpreted as salient (Brown, 2015, p. 27; Kline, 1986, p. 189). Two items dropped from the subscale of the Adapted Child ego states, two from the Free Child ego states, and one from Critical Parent. In the final solution 33 items loaded significantly (i.e., factor loadings >.30).

From Table 2 it will be seen that on an overall basis in the total sample, 33 of the 40 items (82.5%) were allocated by the factor analysis process to factors whose item content identified them with the previously hypothesised constructs of the five major ego states. The lowest levels of successful prediction were found in the Free Child ego state (75% success) and in the Adapted Child ego states (50%). These five factors accounted for 42.36% of the variance.

The first factor, accounting for 11.32% of the variance, had an eigenvalue of 4.53 and eight items loaded at .30 or above on the Nurturing Parent (NP) ego state. The second factor, explaining 8.79% of the variance, had an eigenvalue of 3.51 and seven items loaded at .30 or above on the Critical Parent (CP) ego state. The third factor, explaining 8.55% of the variance, had an eigenvalue of 3.42 and six items loaded at .30 or above on the Free Child (FC) ego state. The fourth factor, explaining 8.31% of the variance, had an eigenvalue of 3.33 and eight items loaded at .30 or above on the Adult (A) ego state. Finally, the fifth factor, with the 5.39% of the variance explained, had an eigenvalue of 2.16 and four items loaded at .30 or above on Adapted Child (FC) the ego state.

This finding replicates previous research results (Loffredo, 1998, Loffredo et al., 2004), as good construct validity as measures of Nurturing Parent, Controlling Parent, and Adult, but from acceptable to

	Critical Parent	Nurturing Parent	Adult	Adapted Child	Free Child
ESQ_2	.608	-.164	-.113	.161	.026
ESQ_10	.406	-.263	.070	.122	-.043
ESQ_13	.646	-.165	.003	.245	.043
ESQ_18	.691	.002	.174	-.072	-.003
ESQ_20	.237	.462	-.048	.115	.222
ESQ_24	.726	.003	.162	.136	.043
ESQ_33	.514	-.057	-.232	.218	.209
ESQ_38	.576	.100	.272	-.133	-.074
ESQ_5	-.072	.755	.179	.117	-.180
ESQ_7	-.047	.739	.153	-.003	-.177
ESQ_15	.007	.419	-.013	.060	-.127
ESQ_19	-.076	.627	.194	.055	-.271
ESQ_23	-.063	.696	.241	.179	-.217
ESQ_29	-.078	.728	.210	.135	-.142
ESQ_32	-.158	.480	.267	.398	-.169
ESQ_36	-.181	.482	.314	.372	-.200
ESQ_3	.008	-.111	.298	-.091	-.172
ESQ_8	.051	.071	.697	-.114	-.326
ESQ_12	.139	.151	.590	-.015	-.065
ESQ_25	.126	.005	.601	.120	-.141
ESQ_28	-.011	.149	.709	.022	-.093
ESQ_31	.224	.210	.460	.226	-.356
ESQ_34	-.035	.296	.607	.103	.022
ESQ_37	-.203	.228	.621	.142	-.329
ESQ_1	.185	-.135	-.165	.112	.569
ESQ_4	.118	-.082	.029	.426	.085
ESQ_9	.053	.032	-.070	.653	.050
ESQ_16	.140	-.126	-.131	.148	.637
ESQ_21	.286	.106	-.081	.622	.138
ESQ_26	.094	.150	.120	.678	.049
ESQ_30	.487	.079	-.160	.297	.299
ESQ_39	.341	.158	-.207	.311	.339
ESQ_6	.002	.585	.187	-.124	-.320
ESQ_11	-.026	.217	.076	-.024	-.744
ESQ_14	.168	-.054	.203	-.117	-.470
ESQ_17	-.003	.264	.069	.077	-.710
ESQ_22	-.020	.392	.400	-.093	-.562
ESQ_27	-.016	.460	.288	.024	-.576
ESQ_35	.382	.265	.015	.102	-.166
ESQ_40	.262	.212	.375	-.003	-.503

Table 1: Structure Matrix of the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised dimensions for the five dimensions (N = 483)

	Critical Parent	Nurturing Parent	Adult	Free Child	Adapted Child
	ESQ2 **.60**	ESQ5 **.75**	ESQ3 **.30**	ESQ6 .25	ESQ1 .07
	ESQ10 **.39**	ESQ7 **.74**	ESQ8 **.67**	ESQ11 **.74**	ESQ4 **.43**
	ESQ13 **.63**	ESQ15 **.42**	ESQ12 **.59**	ESQ14 **.47**	ESQ9 **.66**
	ESQ18 **.69**	ESQ19 **.61**	ESQ25 **.60**	ESQ17 **.71**	ESQ16 .11
	ESQ20 .25	ESQ23 **.68**	ESQ28 **.71**	ESQ22 **.49**	ESQ21 **.59**
	ESQ24 **.72**	ESQ29 **.72**	ESQ31 **.41**	ESQ27 **.52**	ESQ26 **.66**
	ESQ33 **.51**	ESQ32 **.46**	ESQ34 **.60**	ESQ35 .16	ESQ30 .26
	ESQ38 **.58**	ESQ36 **.45**	ESQ37 **.58**	ESQ40 **.46**	ESQ39 .24
Eigenvalues	3.51	4.53	3.33	3.42	2.16
% explained variance	8.79	11.32	8.31	8.55	5.39
Cronbach' alpha	.74	.82	.73	.75	.57
Items tested	8	8	8	8	8
Items consistent with prediction*	7	8	8	6	4
% consistent	87.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0
All Ego States	Total items tested: 40; consistent with prediction*: 33; % consistent: 82.5				

*Highest factor loading was in hypothesised ego state factor

Table 2: Rotated factor loadings of the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised dimensions and Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the five dimensions (N = 483)

	Alpha	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Critical Parent (CP)	.74	17.36	5.00	7.00	32.00
Nurturing Parent (NP)	.82	32.39	4.70	14.00	40.00
Adult (A)	.73	29.02	4.91	12.00	40.00
Adapted Child (AC)	.57	11.70	3.01	4.00	20.00
Free Child (FC)	.75	21.36	4.11	8.00	30.00

Table 3: Scale properties

low construct validity as measures of Free Child and Adapted Child.

The 33 items represented all portions of the conceptual model of Loffredo et al. (2004), although some items of the original version (namely two items belonging to the Free Child, four items of Adapted Child, and one item of the Critical Parent) loaded lower with the previously hypothesised respective subscales.

The strength of factors and the conceptual parsimony of the 33 items that loaded at .30 and above on the 5-factors led us to select these items for the final revised scale. The Italian version of the Ego State Questionnaire can be considered the renewed culturally adapted version of the original Ego State Questionnaire revised by Loffredo et al. (2004).

Research Question 2

The second step in data analysis (addressing Research Question 2) examined the psychometric properties of these revised and shortened subscales in terms of coefficient alpha. All reliability coefficients obtained were above the threshold of acceptability proposed by DeVellis (2003).

For each of the five factors the mean (M), standard deviation (SD), minimum and maximum were calculated as shown in Table 3.

We reported the following coefficients of reliability for the five subscales: Critical Parent (CP) was .74, Nurturing Parent (NP), was .82, Adult (A) was .73, Adapted Child (AC) was .57, Free Child (FC) was .75.

Research Question 3

The third and final step addresses the third research question. It involved examining gender-related differences in ego states subscales. Results yielded from ANOVA revealed gender-related differences only for Nurturing Parent ego states, $F(1,481) = 22.51$, $p = .000$, where females showed higher scores ($M = 33.24$; SD 4.23) than males (M 31.23; SD 5.06), and for Free Child ego states, $F(1,481) = 4.50$, $p = .034$, where females showed higher scores ($M = 21.70$; SD 3.98) than males (M 20.90; SD 4.23).

Discussion

The present studies contributed to the measurement of functional ego states by developing and testing the Italian version of the ESQ-R scale (Loffredo et al., 2004). In this research we examined three questions in a sample of adults who had voluntarily accepted to take part to this study.

The first question was: does the ESQ-R-I demonstrate factorial validity?

Paralleling previous studies (Loffredo et al., 2004), this measurement research employing exploratory analyses revealed support for the five-correlated factors model postulated by Berne (1961). The VARIMAX rotation factor analysis revealed the predicted pattern of five factors represented by the ESQ as in the original version. The first four factors showed strong pattern matching, with between 6 to 8 items in the scale loading on the factors. The fifth factors were somewhat weak, with only 4 of the items loading on the factors.

In the final solution of the subscales, we ignored variables with loadings lower than .30. We obtained a version of 33 items distributed in the five factors of Critical Parent, Nurturing Parent, Adult, Adapted Child, and Free Child, as in the original version. These factors showed adequate proportion of variance accounted by the common factors and factor loadings, as they accounted for 42.36 of the item variance with a significant improvement over previous results (Loffredo et al., 2002; Loffredo et al., 2004).

At the same time, in line with the conclusions of Williams and Williams (1980) and Loffredo (1998), these findings suggest that the theoretical constructs may need to be re-evaluated to define the psychometric characteristics of the ego states as non-independent subscales.

The second question was: are the derived factors internally consistent and stable?

Reliability results for the five ego states subscales suggest that the ESQ-R-I shows from good to acceptable construct validity as a measure of all functional ego states, although with varying accuracy. Therefore, the transformation of the ESQ-R scale into a shorter version of 33 items has a clearer factorial structure but also a more internal consistent value. Therefore, we can answer positively to the second question.

The third question was: are there gender-related differences in ego states subscales?

This hypothesis is partially confirmed by the results. Data from ANOVA showed that female reported higher tendencies in Nurturing Parent and Free Child ego states, compared to their male counterparts, and this difference was significant; while no significant differences were found between males and females in the other ego states.

The identified gender differences found may be related to other research suggesting that female subjects showed more provident nurturing state than men (Loffredo & Omizo, 1997; Alipieva, 2017; Heyer, 1979), while males show higher levels in the critical, restrictive, parent characteristics (Williams & Williams, 1980).

Limitations

Although this study has provided insight into the development of an objective measure of ego states, some limitations should be considered.

First, the factor analysis has shown a good structure of the test, although it needs to be administered to several samples and factor analysed again to confirm its validity. For this reason, this research represents only a first step in understanding the factorial structure of functional ego states as distinct and measurable entities drawn from individuals' behaviour.

Second, all data were collected using a self-report questionnaire. Studies using observational data and other-report methodologies to assess both the individual's and social behaviour could be useful for this aim.

Finally, as the study is limited only to non-clinical subjects, it would be important to extend the research to a clinical sample, in order to see how mental health factors may influence ego states and the way they are measured. Therefore, further research to confirm the functional model based on individual and social behaviour, and how it may be divided into the five distinct entities of the ego states, is recommended.

Conclusions

In summary, we have provided preliminary results about the Italian adaptation and validation of Ego State- R, which has been found to be valid, reliable, and rapid to administer.

Due to numerous requests by researchers, Donald Loffredo & Rick Harrington (2012) published the ESQ-R in *Transactional Analysis Journal*.

Following their lead, we include as Appendix 1 the ESQ-R-I and invite others to use it.

The authors will appreciate information about any investigations in which the measure is used.

Fiorenzo Laghi is Full Professor of Developmental Psychology, Department of Developmental and Social Psychology, Faculty of Medicine and Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, and can be contacted at fiorenzo.laghi@uniroma1.it

Giuseppe Crea is Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, Pontifical Salesian University of Rome, and can be contacted at crea@unisal.it

Claudia Filipponi is Director of the Post Graduate School of Transactional Analysis SIFP of Rome and can be contacted at claudiafilipponi@tiscali.it

Giorgio C. Cavallero is Director of the training program of Post Graduate School of Transactional Analysis SIFP of Rome. and can be contacted at g.c.cavallero@gmail.com

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the clinical psychologists of the training program of the School of Transactional Analysis (SIFT) in Rome who collaborated for collecting data. We dedicate this article in memoriam to Dr Giovanni Greco who very much encouraged us to pursue this study.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

Alipieva, D. (2017). The impact of ego states of parent, adult and child on the professional choice of teachers. *Journal of Education Culture and Society, 2*(8), 177-192. https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs20172.177.192

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F. & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186-3191. https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014

Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional Analysis in psychotherapy: A systematic individual and social psychiatry*. New York: Grove Press. https://doi.org/10.1037/11495-000

Berne, E. (1963). *The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups*. Montreal: J. B. Lippincott.

Berne, E. (1966). *Principles of group treatment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brennan, T. & McClenaghan, J. C. (1978). The transactional behavior questionnaire. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 8*(1), 52-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377800800115

Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W. & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*. Illinois: IPAT.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.

Doelker, J. R., Richard E. & Griffiths, J. (1984). Developing an instrument to measure ego state functions. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 14*(2), 149-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378401400210

Dusay, J. M. (1972). Egograms and the constancy hypothesis. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 2*(3), 37-41. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377200200313

Dusay, J. M. (1977). *Egograms: how I see you and you see me.* New York: Harper and Row.

Gough, H. G. & Heilbrun. A. B. (1965). *Adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. https://doi.org/10.1037/t02310-000

Heyer, R. N. (1979). Development of a questionnaire to measure ego states with some applications to social and comparative psychiatry. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 9*(1), 9-19. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377900900103

Heyer, R. N. (1987). Empirical research on ego state theory. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 17*(1), 286-293. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378701700105

Joines, V. S. (1976). Differentiating structural and functional. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 6*(4), 377-380. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377600600404

Klein, M. (1980). Thoughts and feelings: A functional description of health, pathology, diagnosis and cure. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 10*(2), 96-100. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378001000203

Kline, P. (1986). *A Handbook of Test Construction Introduction to psychometric design*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Loffredo, D. A. (1998). The relationships among ego states, locus of control and dogmatism. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 28*(2), 171-173. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215379802800211

Loffredo, D. A. & Harrington, R. (2008). Ego state differences in university students by gender, race, and college major. *Journals of Psychiatry, Psychology and Mental Health, 2*(1), 1-8.

Loffredo, D. A. & Harrington, R. (2012). Letter to the Editor, *Transactional Analysis Journal*, *42*(1), 93-93.

Loffredo, D. A., Harrington, R. & Okech, A. P. (2002). Factor analysis of the ego state questionnaire. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 32*(1), 5-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215370203200104

Loffredo, D. A., Harrington, R., Munoz, M. K. & Knowles, L. R. (2004). The Ego State Questionnaire-Revised. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 34*(1), 90-95. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215370403400110

Loffredo, D. A. & Omizo, M. M. (1997). Differences in the ego states, locus of control, and dogmatism between African-American and Anglo-American undergraduate college students. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 27*(3), 168-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215379702700304

Price, D. A. (1975). A paper and pencil instrument to measure ego states. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 5*(3), 242-246. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377500500306

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876136

Schaefer, C. E. (1976). The development of a Transactional Analysis Scale for the Adjective Check List. *The Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 94*(1), 59-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1976.9921396

Shostrom, E. L. (1964). An inventory for the measurement of self-actualization. *Educational Psychology Measurement, 24*(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446402400203

Solomon, C. (2003). Transactional Analysis Theory: The basics. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 33*(1), 15-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215370303300103

Steere, D., Tucker, G. & Worth, A. (1981). Change in two settings. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 11*(3), 222-228. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378101100306

Tabachnick, B. G., &. Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.

Thorne, S. & Faro, S. (1980). The ego state scale: A measure of psychopathology. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 10*(1), 49-52. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378001000115

Troldahl, V. & Powell, F. (1965). A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. *Social Forces, 44*(2), 211-214. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/44.2.211

Turner. R. J. (1988). The Parent-Adult-Child Projective Drawing Task: A therapeutic tool in TA. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 18*(1), 60-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378801800110

Williams, K. B. & Williams, J. E. (1980). The assessment of Transactional Analysis ego states via the Adjective Checklist. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 44*(2), 120-129. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4402_2

Woollams, S. & Brown, M. (1978). *Transactional Analysis*., Dexter, MI: Huron Valley Press.

Woollams, S., Brown, M. & Huige, K. (1976). *Transactional analysis in brief*. Ann Arbor, MI: Huron Valley Institute.

..

Appendix 1: ESQ-R-I

Le affermazioni di questo questionario servono a misurare alcune caratteristiche che ti distinguono nella tua unicità come persona. Indica quanto ciascuna affermazione ti descrive, utilizzando la seguente scala:

1	2	3	4	5
Assolutamente in disaccordo	**In disaccordo**	**Né d'accordo né in disaccordo**	**D'Accordo**	**Assolutamente d'accordo**

Assicurarti di rispondere a tutte le affermazioni.

1	Non sono una persona che critica gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2	Raramente sono confuso	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3	Per essere felice ti devi conformare agli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
4	Mi piace aiutare gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5	Spesso cerco di alleviare il dolore e le sofferenze degli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
6	Sono uno che ha le idée chiare	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7	Generalmente mi adatto ai desideri degli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8	La maggior parte della gente non è all'altezza del mio stile di vita	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9	Sono una persona che ama divertirsi	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
10	Sono una persona realistica	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11	Tendo a trovare i difetti degli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12	Sono una persona disinibita	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13	Non sono interessato a ciò che succede agli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14	Sono una persona a cui piace divertirsi	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15	Sono duro con gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
16	Generalmente incoraggio gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
17	Passo molto tempo cercando di scoprire cosa gli altri vogliono da me	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
18	Sono una persona energica	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
19	Non sono una persona altruista	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
20	Sono severo nei giudizi verso gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
21	Sono una persona molto logica	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
22	È importante accontentare gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
23	Non sono una persona entusiasta	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24	Non sono un tipo organizzato	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
25	Mi piace prendermi cura degli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
26	Sono una persona molto capace	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
27	Sono una persona molto gentile	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
28	Tendo a esasperare molto gli altri	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
29	Di solito sto molto attento	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
30	Sono una persona comprensiva	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
31	Sono una persona equilibrata	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
32	Sono spesso molto autoritario	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
33	Sono una persona avventurosa	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

ESQ-R-I Scoring

Genitore Normativo (GN)	Genitore Affettivo (GA)	Adulto (A)	Bambino Adattato (BA)	Bambino Libero (BL)
1*=	4=	2=	3=	9=
8=	5=	6=	7=	12=
11=	13*=	10=	17=	14=
15=	16=	21=	22=	18=
20=	19*=	24*=		23*=
28=	25=	26=		33=
32=	27=	29=		
	30=	31=		

Nota: Per gli item contrassegnati dall'asterisco* (item reverse) effettuare la seguente operazione: 6- la risposta fornita dal soggetto.

Ad esempio se la persona ha risposta 4 all'item 2 effettuare la seguente operazione: 6-4. A questo item sarà attribuito un punteggio uguale a 2