In ricordo di Marisa

In occasione dell'uscita del lavoro The Validation Process of the Resilience Stories Scale *la redazione ha ritenuto opportuno chiedere agli allievi della professoressa D'Alessio, Roberto Baiocco e Fiorenzo Laghi, di tracciarne un breve ricordo.*

Ringraziamo Anna Silvia Bombi e Fabio Lucidi per averci dato la possibilità di scrivere alcuni pensieri e riflessioni sulla persona che è stata nostra maestra e amica, Maria (per noi Marisa) D'Alessio, con cui abbiamo condiviso diversi anni di lavoro e tanti momenti importanti.

È bello pensare che uno dei suoi ultimi lavori pubblicati su questo numero di "Rassegna di Psicologia" sia proprio sulla resilienza, caratteristica che l'ha sempre contraddistinta, soprattutto nell'ultimo anno in cui ha dovuto affrontare la malattia.

Chi le è stato accanto nell'ultimo anno ha potuto apprendere tanto da lei: la forza, il coraggio, la tenacia e la passione che ha continuato ad avere nel portare avanti i progetti universitari; la serenità e la gioia nonostante la consapevolezza di avere davanti a sé poco tempo; la piena fiducia negli altri, anche quando sapeva che sarebbe stato meglio non "affidarsi"; la piena volontà di non tralasciare nulla, impegni accademici e ricerca scientifica compresi.

È stata per noi una maestra esigente, critica con se stessa e con gli altri una maestra "difficile" come qualcuno la dipingeva. Tanto difficile quanto generosa e capace di valorizzare le competenze altrui.

La molteplicità degli interessi di ricerca ha sempre accompagnato la sua straordinaria capacità di reperire fondi e di avviare progetti, che ha sempre condiviso con noi. Non sempre eravamo contenti di sentire "Vi devo dare una bella notizia" perché sapevamo che una bella notizia sarebbe stata, con molta probabilità, un'idea progettuale nuova su cui lavorare. "Mai fermarsi chi si ferma è perduto" questo era il suo motto, che naturalmente rendeva difficile un rapporto in cui l'altro si fermava, anche solo per riflettere e pensare.

Abbiamo condiviso tante linee di ricerca e tante pubblicazioni, in particolare sugli effetti dei media sullo sviluppo del bambino, tema molto caro a Marisa.

Non possiamo dimenticare i tanti commenti, a volte severi, che ci hanno aiutato a crescere da un punto di vista professionale.

Ogni lavoro era per lei un'occasione di spronarci a fare sempre meglio.

Chissà se anche su questo ultimo contributo non avrebbe avuto consigli da dare.

La ricordiamo con affetto e gratitudine,

Fiorenzo e Roberto

The Validation Process of the Resilience Stories Scale

by *Andrea Laudadio**, *Maria D'Alessio***

The term "resilience" is used to refer to the capacity of individuals to overcome unpleasant events. The techniques employed can evaluate the characteristics of the resilient individual, but are not able to provide an overall picture of resilience. This article presents the validation process termed the Resilience Stories Scale, and is composed of five stories about resilient subjects. The subjects were asked to evaluate the probability of their behaving in a similar way when confronted with certain traumatic situations. The validity of the construct was assessed using a sample of 1,000 adolescents (M = 17 years and 11 months; s.d. = 9 months) and the convergent validity on a sample of 559 adolescents (M = 17 years and 7 months; s.d. = 1 year and 1 month). The questionnaire seems to show good psychometric characteristics such as reliability and validity.
Key words: *resilience*, *questionnaire*, *scale*.

1
Introduction

In the field of psychology, the term "resilience" is used to refer to the capacity of the individual to overcome events which may lead to unpleasant consequences (Rutter, 1993) by being able to strengthen and transform himself (Groteberg, 1996) as a result of certain mental qualities he possesses, of behaviour and adaptation (Kreisler, 1996). The construct of resilience is able to explain why subjects exposed to high risk factors do not develop pathological behaviour patterns over the course of time (Werner, Smith, 1982; Gamerzy, Masten, Tellegen, 1984).

The definition provided for the construct of resilience, although widely accepted, does not make clear if it is more easily relatable to a stable personality trait, or to a dynamic process of adaptation. Two positions on this can be found in the literature. The first considers resilience as an innate factor in personality and has its origins in the work of Block and Block (1980) and Block and Kremen (1996). They use the term "ego-resilience" to describe a set of traits reflecting independence and strength of character, as well as adaptability in behaviour in

* Eulab Consulting SRL.
** Sapienza Università di Roma.

the face of various environmental circumstances. From this perspective, it is seen as a basic characteristic of all human beings which exists prior to any exposure to painful events: events which, at most, play a role in revealing the resilient personality. The second position characterizes resilience as a dynamic process which involves a form of positive adaptation within a significantly adverse context (Luthar, Cicchetti, Becker, 2000), thus implying two basic presuppositions: exposure to a significant risk; and positive adjustment despite the considerable threat presented.

This distinction can also be found in a careful analysis of the methods used for measuring resilience, revealed in the literature (Laudadio, Colasante, D'Alessio, 2009). As can be seen in the table, of the 13 methods available (from 1993 to 2010) for measuring resilience, 11 are clearly designed to reveal the character traits of a resilient individual.

The combination of the tendency to consider resilience at a character trait and the lack of a common theoretical framework regarding the individual characteristics of a "resilient" subject, have resulted in a great diversity in the parameters used for the various instruments: an overall total of 34! The most frequently recurrent parameters (*Personal responsibilities and Social support*) are only to be found in four instruments, while more than half the parameters only occur in one method.

If on the one hand the personal characteristics of an ego-resilient individual have not been firmly identified, on the other hand there is a broad and well-established consensus with regard to what constitutes resilient behaviour.

Within such a wide and confusing framework, the methodology we propose is an attempt to develop a means of measuring "ego-resilience" without referring to the sub-characteristics of a resilient individual (with regard to which there is no clear opinion in the literature) but rather by restricting ourselves to an evaluation of perceived proximity in relation to a resilient individual.

Our aim has been to validate a measurement scale for ego-resilience in adolescence. The scale is based on a possible resemblance (in terms of the "probability" of developing similar behaviour) with respect to certain stories of resilience.

The objective can be expressed as the wish to ascertain: 1. if the representation of the individual's ego-resilience can be defined as a specific, coherent and comparable construct and 2. if such a construct allows us to associate adolescents with a high or a low ego-resilience. Specifically, our objective can be broken down into 5 sub-sections: *a*) to evaluate and check the factors included in the questionnaire, *b*) to evaluate the reliability of this particular instrument *c*) to check for the possible presence of gender differences, *d*) to check for convergent validity with other procedures for measuring resilience, and *e*) to test for divergent validity in the scale by using opposing groups in relation to the parameters under evaluation.

TABLE 1
Procedures available in literature

Summary of procedures available in literature

Year	Name	Authors	Type		Format	Parameters *(the recorded reliability is indicated in brackets)*
			Trait	Process		
1993	Resilience Scale (RS)	Wagnild Young	–		25 items 7-step Likert scale	1. Personal skills 2. Self-acceptance and acceptance of life *(total = 0,91)*
1995	Dispositional Resilience Scale (DRS-15)	Bartone	–		15 items 4-step Likert scale	1. Commitment (0,77) 2. Control (0,71) 3. Challenge (0,70)
1996	Egoresiliency Scale (ER89)	Block Kreman	–		14 items 4-step Likert scale	Monofactorial (0,76)
2001	Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP)	Hurtes Allen	–		34 items 6-step Likert scale	1. Insight 2. Independence 3. Creativity 4. Humour 5. Initiative 6. Social relations 7. Moral approach *(between 0,89 and 0,93)*
2002	Baruth Protective, Factors Inventory (BPFI)	Baruth Carroll	–		16 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Adaptable personality (0,76) 2. Supportive environment (0,98) 3. Limited number of stressors (0,55) 4. Compensatory experiences (0,83)
2003	Multi Trauma Resilience Recovery (MTRR-99)	Harvey Liang Harney Koenen Tummala-Narra Lebowitz	–		99 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Command of mental faculties 2. Integration of memory and disturbance 3. Adjustment to and tolerance of disturbance 4. Command of the symptom and positive coping 5. Self-esteem 6. Self-cohesion 7. Secure attachment 8. Meaning *(total = 0,83)*

(*continued on pages 114-5*)

TABLE 1 (*continuation*)

Summary of procedures available in literature

Year	Name	Authors	Type		Format	Parameters *(the recorded reliability is indicated in brackets)*
			Trait	Process		
2003	Resilience Scale for Adult (RSA)	Friborg Hjemdal Rosenvinge Martinussen	–		37 items 7-step semantic differential scale	1. Self-perception 2. Perception of the future 3. Life-style structure 4. Social skills 5. Family cohesion 6. Social resources *(between 0,67 and 0,90)*
2003	Connor-Davidson, Resilience Scale (CD-RISC)	Connor Davidson	–		25 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Personal skills, high standards and tenacity 2. Trust in one's own feelings, tolerance of negative sentiments and reinforcement 3. Acceptance of change and secure relationships 4. Control 5. Spiritual influences or fatalism *(total = 0,89)*
2002	Adolescent Resilience Scale (ARS)	Oshio Kaneko Nagamine Nakaya	–		21 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Search for novelty 2. Emotional control 3. Positive attitude to the future *(total = 0,85)*
2004	Brief-Resilient Coping Scale (BRCS)	Sinclair Wallston	–		4 items 5-step Likert scale	Monofactorial (0,69)
2006	Resilience Scale for Adolescent (READ)	Hjemdal Friborg Stiles Martinussen Rosenvinge	–		28 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Personal skills (0,85) 2. Life-style structure (0,82) 3. Social skills (0,69) 4. Family cohesion (0,85) 5. Social support (0,78)

(*continued on page 115*)

TABLE 1 (*closing*)

Summary of procedures available in literature

Year	Name	Authors	Type		Format	Parameters *(the recorded reliability is indicated in brackets)*
			Trait	Process		
2008	Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)	Smith Dalen Wiggins Tooley Christopher	–		6 items 5-step Likert scale	Monofactorial *(between 0,80 and 0,91)*
2010	Resilience Process Questionnaire (RPQ)	Laudadio Fiz Pèrez Mazzocchetti	–		15 items 5-step Likert scale	1. Reintegration with loss or disfunctional (0,81) 2. Resilient reintegration (0,82) 3. Return to homeostasis (0,81)

2
Methodology

2.1. Procedure

Phase 1. The preliminary phase of this research involved the preparation and evaluation of a range of stories of resilience considered to be representative of resilient behaviour. A group of 14 psychology students was asked to produce – with reference to real news items – a collection of stories in which the main protagonist demonstrated a form of behaviour which could clearly be described as resilient. Prior to this, all the students had taken part in a course on the construct of resilience. At the end of this procedure, 12 stories had been produced. Three judges then evaluated – independently – the extent to which each story complied with the objectives. At the end of this phase, 7 stories were selected.
Phase 2. The first version of the scale (7 stories) was administered to 21 subjects with an age below that of the reference sample in order to check for proper comprehension of the item using a procedure of *thinking aloud*. The subjects were asked to read the story and then retell it to the interviewer, to ascertain if they had understood it correctly and also to determine whether other information in their possession was capable of distorting their understanding of the story in some way. At the end of this phase, two of the stories were eliminated and the others were adapted on the basis of certain issues that emerged.
Phase 3. The scale (5 stories) was presented to a group of 300 subjects aged between 16 and 21 (M = 18 years old, s.d. = 11 months), of which 50 % were female. On the data collected, the balance and kurtosis of each item was carefully analyzed, subdividing the sample in relation to age and gender (Kline, 1996). For all the items, values of between –1 and 1 were recorded for both the tests. To check the adequacy of the data collected for the purposes of factorial analysis, the Bartlett and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin tests were carried out. The Bartlett test is significant and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index is equivalent to.745. The results indicate a sufficient level of adequacy of the factorial model to the data collected (Barbaranelli, 2003).

An Analysis of the Principal Components was carried out. Both the eigenvalues and the scree plot suggested the isolation of only one factor able to explain the 44,36% overall variation. The factor was common to all the items and – based on the criteria used to develop the questionnaire – referred to the self-efficacy of resilience.
Phase 4. The scale was administered to a sample of 1000 subjects, aged between 16 and 19 (M = 17 years and 11 months; s.d. = 9 months), of which 50% were female. The factorial analysis was repeated to check the presence of a factorial solution similar to that recorded previously. The analysis was carried out using

the Maximum Likelihood method on a sample of 500 subjects, balanced in terms of sex but randomly selected.

The analysis identified only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 able to explain the 54% variation. The adaptation index of this solution is not significant ($Chi^2 = 14,8$; g.d.l. = 5; n.s.).

TABLE 2
Factorial analysis: Self-value and variance explained

Factor	Total			Females			Males		
	Eigenvalue	% variance	% cumulated	Eigenvalue	% variance	% cumulated	Eigenvalue	% variance	% cumulated
1	2,700	54,00	54,00	2,774	55,48	55,48	2,619	52,38	52,38
2	0,755	15,11	69,11	0,843	16,86	72,34	0,748	14,96	67,34
3	0,563	11,26	80,36	0,558	11,16	83,50	0,612	12,24	79,58
4	0,510	10,20	90,57	0,475	9,50	93,00	0,519	10,39	89,97
5	0,472	9,43	100,00	0,350	7,00	100,00	0,501	10,03	100,00

TABLE 3
Factorial saturation

Item	Total	Females	Males
Story 1	0,738	0,761	0,714
Story 2	0,735	0,707	0,763
Story 3	0,791	0,826	0,755
Story 4	0,764	0,784	0,745
Story 5	0,636	0,631	0,633

All the items had a factorial saturation of at least 0,60 within the extracted factor. The factorial analysis was confirmed for both genders, with Tucker's congruence coefficient equal to 0,95. The reliability of the scale, measured using Cronbach's Alpha, is equivalent to 0,78. A confirmative analysis was carried out on the remaining 500 subjects. The Lisrel models obtained present acceptable indexes, taking into consideration the reduced number of items.

Phase 5. The concluding phase of the research focused on an analysis of the convergent and discriminant validity of the method used in the preceding phase, and to an analysis of the gender differences.

TABLE 4
Confirmatory factorial analysis

FIT Indices			GPF Indices		
Chi²	DF	RMR	GFI*	AGFI**	RMSEA***
11,23	5	0,06	0,96	0,91	0,05

* GFI = Goodness-of-Fit Index.
** AGFI = Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index.
*** RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.

2.2. Participants

The final phase of the research involved the participation of 559 subjects aged between 16 and 19 (M = 17 years and 7 months; s.d. = 1 year and 1 month), of who 50,80% were female and 49,20% male. Of this sample, 59,21% were from Salerno, while the remaining 40,79% were from Rome. As regards the type of school they attended: 53,3% were from a scientific high school, and 28,1% plus 18,6% studied at a technical institute.

2.3. Instruments

Apart from a questionnaire relating to social and personal data, and the definitive version of the Questionnaire on Resilience Stories (QRS), five other instruments were used. There follows a brief description of these instruments and – for each factor – an estimate of reliability measured with Cronach's Alpha.

The *H&H Resilience Screening Tool* (Hunter, Chandler, 1999) is an instrument consisting of 41 items on the 5-step Likert scale. The scale measures the level of resilience in adolescents and considers the following aspects: Creativity (0,70), Humour (0,56), Independence (0,59), Initiative (0,54), Insight (0,59), Relations (0,72), Values (0,61), Self-esteem (0,72) and Self-efficacy (0,73).

The *Adolescent Resilience Scale* (Oshio *et al.*, 2002) contains 21 items on the 5-step Likert scale. The scale measures the psychological characteristics of resilient individuals by means of three factors: the search for novelty (0,81), emotional control (0,79) and a positive attitude to the future (0,79).

The *Resilience Scale for Adults* (Friborg *et al.*, 2003) consists of 37 items arranged in a semantic differential with 5-point responses, and it measures the protective resources which foster positive adaptation in adults. This instrument consists of five factors: Personal strength – Self-perception (0,78), Personal strength – Perception of the future (0,77), Life-style structure (0,63), Social skills (0,78), Family cohesion (0,82) and Social resources (0,78).

The *Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale* (Connor, Davidson, 2003) is made up of 25 items using the 5-step Likert scale. The instrument includes 5 factors: Personal

skills, high standards and tenacity (0,61), Trust in one's own feelings, tolerance of negative sentiments and reinforcement (0,44), Acceptance of change and secure relationships (0,59), Control (0,72) and Spiritual influences or fatalism (0,62).

The *Resilience Scale* (Wagnild, Young, 1993) consists of 25 items and a 7-step Likert scale and evaluates resilience as a positive personality trait able to increase the adaptability level of the individual, examining five factors: Meaningfulness (0,77), Serenity (0,78), Faith in oneself (0,75), Perseverance (0,56) and Autonomy (0,50).

3
Results

3.1. Preliminary Analyses

To make the following analyses, it needed to be ascertained that the important requisites were in place: normal distribution and reliability.

All the scales show symmetry and curtosis indexes of between –1 and 1, but some scales present reliability indexes of less than 0,65 and – for this reason – were excluded from the following analyses (specifically: Humour, Independence, Initiative, Insight and Values (H&H); Life-style structure (RSA); Perseverance and Autonomy (Resilience Scale) and all the CD-RISC scales except Control).

3.2. Correlations

All the scales present a significant correlation with the Resilience Stories Scale.

TABLE 5
Matrix of correlations*

	H&H				ARS			RSA					CD RISK	Resilience Scale		
	Creativity	Relations	Self-esteem	Self-efficacy	Search for novelty	Emotional control	Positive attitude to the future	Personal strength /Self-perception	Personal strength /Perception of the future	Social skills	Family cohesion	Social resources	Control	Meaningfulness	Serenity	Faith in oneself
RSS	0,328	0,389	0,536	0,603	0,302	–0,193	0,528	0,560	0,566	0,287	0,230	0,239	0,557	0,524	0,420	0,426

* All correlations are for a level of $p < 0{,}01$.

3.3. Discriminant Validity

From the total sample of subjects, two sub-groups of subjects were selected: *a*) 61 subjects with high scores in the RSS (total score above a standard deviation from the average); *b*) 65 subjects with low scores in the RSS (total score lower than a standard deviation from the average). To check if the two groups were balanced with regard to gender, the Chi^2 test was carried out, with no significant result ($Chi^2 = 3{,}43$; g.d.l. = 1; n.s.). The results of the MANOVA test highlighted the main effect of the group factor ($F = 13{,}47$; g.d.l. = 16; $p < 0{,}001$). The univariate effects were factorized using the ANOVA test.

TABLE 6
Discriminant analysis

Procedure	Scale	Low		High		ANOVA	
		M	DS	M	DS	F	Meaningfulness
H&H	Creativity	9,79	1,83	11,52	2,14	23,89	p < 0,01
	Relations	25,36	4,81	29,72	4,44	27,99	p < 0,01
	Self-esteeem	22,51	5,09	28,03	4,00	46,07	p < 0,01
	Self-efficacy	28,20	4,84	36,11	4,27	94,88	p < 0,01
ARS	Search for novelty	21,11	3,67	23,75	2,91	20,13	p < 0,01
	Emotional control	26,39	3,44	25,48	3,23	2,38	n.s.
	Positive attitude to the future	14,46	3,70	19,75	3,31	71,82	p < 0,01
RSA	Personal strength/ Self-perception	16,85	3,75	22,65	2,85	96,13	p < 0,01
	Personal strength/ Perception of the future	11,61	3,35	16,94	2,26	110,90	p < 0,01
	Social skills	22,75	3,45	25,52	3,30	21,17	p < 0,01
	Family cohesion	22,11	4,53	25,52	4,09	19,72	p < 0,01
	Social resources	25,23	3,49	28,11	3,96	18,63	p < 0,01
CD RISK	Control	9,07	2,30	12,34	1,41	94,08	p < 0,01
Resilience Scale	Meaningfulness	32,59	7,20	41,23	5,24	59,82	p < 0,01
	Serenity	22,52	5,66	28,34	4,57	40,44	p < 0,01
	Faith in oneself	25,98	5,44	32,77	4,36	60,12	p < 0,01

There is no significant difference between the groups solely in relation to emotional control. In general, the subjects with high resilience, measured by means of the RSS, register higher scores in all the scales under review.

3.4. Gender Differences

To test the presence of significant gender differences for the RSS, it was decided to make a diagram of the univariate analysis of variance. The ANOVA test showed no significant differences ($F_{(1,558)} = 3{,}750$; n.s.).

4
Discussion

In relation to the main objective, the Resilience Stories Scale seems to represent a real step forwards in the possibility of measuring ego-resilience, the personal ability to overcome traumatic events. With regard to the specific objectives, a factor has emerged that can explain 54% of variance. Confirmatory factor analysis confirms the effectiveness of the monofactorial structure. The reliability and internal validity of the Resilience Stories Scale seems to be good. The analysis of opposing groups and convergent validity appears to confirm the validity of the procedure and its Discriminant capacity. No differences according to gender were identified.

5
Conclusions, limitations and developments

The resilient process or characteristics of a resilient element are applicable in many fields of research (e.g. biology, engineering, computer science) and – depending on the disciplinary approach – assume personal connotations and characteristics. In psychology, the study of resilience can vary according to subject and the interaction between subjects and life events. According to Cyrulnik and Malaguti (2005), trauma can never be the same because it affects different psychic structures at different times. During childhood the subject follows patterns of behaviour connoted by an as yet low level of awareness, so the resilient response during this phase is instinctual; it is then guided by a high level of determination during adolescence and accompanied by the metacognitive competence and cultural superstructures impressed on the subject's personality in adult life.

Because of the intrinsic and extrinsic variability and mutability of resilience, it is necessary to resort to new methods of study and, perhaps, of approach. Furthermore, in epistemological terms, borrowing from certain authors (Saleebey, 1997, 2001; Weick, Chamberlain, 1997) in other disciplinary contexts it is more appropriate to shift attention from the "deficits" (lack of resilience) to the specific characteristics of resilient subjects, to permit – on the applicational level – the development of psycho-pedagogical interventions for improving resilience.

The "Resilience Stories Scale" was devised and developed upon within this perspective, with the objective of promoting further study and research into the

relations between high personal resilience (and ego-resilience more in general) and individual, social and environmental parameters.

The method currently has suitable psychometric characteristics but is still subject to revision. In addition to validation with adults, we are proceeding with the development of a version with a larger number of items.

Annex – The Resilience Stories Scale
Below are five real stories of the protagonists. After reading each one, please mark – as a percentage – the likelihood you would react in the same way as the protagonist in the same situation

Alessandro Zanardi

Alessandro Zanardi is a racing driver. On September 15th 2001 he had an accident during a race in Germany and was so badly wounded he had to have both legs amputated.

After a very long period of rehabilitation and with the use of prosthetic limbs, Zanardi was able to walk again and, just a year after the accident, returned to the racetrack with a vehicle adapted to his needs.

He wrote two books about his career, his accident and his extraordinary recovery: another race with his prosthetic legs which, "after many repressed tears of pain, have given him back his life and a sense of satisfaction".

If you were in the same situation, how likely is it you would do the same as the protagonist?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Marco Baldini

Marco Baldini is a radio presenter. He worked for various local radio stations before approaching a national radio station and television. Due to personal problems relating to gambling, he left his job and found himself struggling with debt.

After reaching rock bottom, he decided to turn a new leaf and start over. The occasion presented itself when he was offered a new job in another town and he decided to leave.

From then on he worked hard to pay off the many debts he had accrued over ten years playing poker and betting on the horses. He also wrote a self-help book for people struggling to quit a life of gambling, basing it on his own experiences.

If you were in the same situation, how likely is it you would do the same as the protagonist?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Claudio Imprudente

Claudio Imprudente, a journalist and author, has a serious physical affliction and is unable to talk; to communicate he uses a transparent Plexiglas board with letters on it which he points out to another person with his eyes to express himself.

In this way he has written books and children's stories and taken part in conferences and television programmes, trying to promote a culture where we accept other people, above all with respect and consideration for their diversity.

Claudio says his style of life is "bold", emphasizing the determined manner and self-deprecating humour with which he faces his handicap, without victimization or self-pity but with a great love of life.

If you were in the same situation, how likely is it you would do the same as the protagonist?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Stefano

Stefano is 18 years old and it was during his final year at high school that he was diagnosed with a tumor. The following year was difficult for him, having to balance chemotherapy sessions with his studies, exams and school outings. In spite of all this, however, he never stopped smiling or enjoying life.

He faced his illness with great courage and overcame it. He is now at University and, in his free time, works as a volunteer at a hospital.

If you were in the same situation, how likely is it you would do the same as the protagonist?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Suma

Suma moved to Italy recently with her mother to join her father who has lived and worked in the country for several years. Her younger brother is still in India with her grandparents and she misses them all very much.

With little grasp of the Italian language, she struggled to make friends and would stay at home all day by herself waiting for her parents to return from work. She then decided to go to high school but she had trouble fitting in, because her classmates would treat her with indifference and some would tease her on account of her skin colour.

Suma rose to the challenge, however, and organized a party to break the ice and gain the friendship of her classmates.

If you were in the same situation, how likely is it you would do the same as the protagonist?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

References

Barbaranelli C. (2003), *Analisi dei dati. Tecniche multivariate per la ricerca psicologica e sociale.* LED Edizioni, Milano.

Bartone P.T. (1995), *A short hardiness scale*. Relazione presentata al 103° Congresso American Psychological Association, June, New York.

Baruth K. E., Carroll J. J. (2002), A formal assessment of resilience: The Baruth protective factors inventory. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 58, pp. 235-44.

Block J. H., Block J. (1980), The role of ego-control and ego resiliency in the organization of behaviour. In W. A. Collins (ed.), *Minnesota Symposium on child psychology*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale.

Block J., Kremen A. M. (1996), IQ and ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, pp. 349-61.

Connor K. M., Davidson J. R. T. (2003), Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18, pp. 76-82.

Cyrulnik B., Malaguti E. (2005), *Costruire la resilienza. La riorganizzazione positiva della vita e la creazione di legami significativi*. Erickson, Trento.

Friborg O., Hjemdal O., Rosenvinge J. H., Martinussen M. (2003), A new rating scale for adult resilience: What are the central protective resources behind healthy adjustment?. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12, 2, pp. 65-76.

Gamerzy N., Masten A. S., Tellegen A. (1984), The study of stress and competence in children: A building block for developmental psychopatology. *Child Development*, 55, pp. 97-111.

Groteberg E. (1996), *The international resilience project: Promoting resilience in children*. In http://resilnet.uiuc.edu/library/grotb97a.html.

Harvey M. R., Liang B., Harney P., Koenan K., Tummala-Narra P., Lebowitz L. (2003), A multidimensional approach to the assessment of trauma impact, recovery and resiliency: Five psychometric studies. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 6, 2, pp. 87-109.

Hjemdal O., Friborg O., Martinussen M., Rosenvinge J. H. (2001), Preliminary results from the development and validation of a Norwegian scale for measuring adult resilience. *Journal of Norwegian Psychological Assessment*, 38, pp. 310-7.

Hunter A., Chandler G. (1999), Adolescent resilience. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 31, 3, pp. 243-7.

Hurtes K. P., Allen L. R. (2001), Measuring resiliency in youth: The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 35, 4, pp. 333-47.

Kline P. (1996), *Manuale di psicometria: Come costruire, valutare e applicare un test psicologico.* Astrolabio, Roma.

Kreisler L. (1996), La résilience mise en spirale. *Spirale*, 1.

Laudadio A., Colasante G., D'Alessio M. (2009), La resilienza: analisi dei modelli e degli strumenti di misurazione. GIPO – *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia dell'Orientamento*, 10, 3, pp. 3-21.

Laudadio A., Fiz Pérez F. J., Mazzocchetti L. (2010), *La resilienza. Teorie, modelli e strumenti di misurazione*. Carocci, Roma.

Luthar S. S. (1993), Annotation: Methodological and conceptual issues in the study of resilience. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 34, pp. 441-53.

Luthar S. S., Cicchetti D., Becker B. (2000), The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71, 3, pp. 543-62.
Oshio A., Kaneko H., Nagamine S., Nakaya M. (2002), Development and validation of an Adolescent Resilience Scale. *Japanese Journal of Counseling Science*, 35, pp. 57-65.
Rutter M. (1993), Resilience: Some conceptual considerations. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 14, pp. 626-31.
Saleebey D. (1997), *The strengths perspective in social work practice.* Longman, New York.
Id. (2001), The diagnostic strengths manual?. *Social Work*, 46, 2, p. 183.
Sinclair V. G., Wallston K. A. (2004), The development and psychometric evaluation of the Brief Resilient Coping Scale. *Assessment*, 11, pp. 94-101.
Smith B. W., Dalen J., Wiggins K., Tooley E., Christopher P., Bernard J. (2008), The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15, pp. 194-200.
Wagnild G. M., Young H. M. (1993), Development and psychometric evaluation of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 1, pp. 165-78.
Weick A., Chamberlain R. (1997), Putting problems in their place: Further explorations in the strengths perspective. In D. Saleebey (ed.), *The strengths perspective in social work practice*. Longman, New York.
Werner E. E., Smith R. S. (1982), *Vulnerable but invincible: A study of resilient children*. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Riassunto

La resilienza fa riferimento alla capacità degli individui di superare eventi spiacevoli. Gli strumenti misurano le caratteristiche dell'individuo resiliente e non sono in grado di fornire un'indicazione complessiva circa la resilienza. L'articolo presenta il percorso di validazione della *Resilience Stories Scale*, articolato in cinque storie di soggetti resilienti. Ai soggetti è chiesto di valutare la probabilità di comportarsi nello stesso modo davanti a situazioni traumatiche. La validità di costrutto è stata verificata su un campione di 1.000 adolescenti (M = 17 anni e 11 mesi; d.s. = 9 mesi) e la validità convergente su un campione di 559 adolescenti (M = 17 anni e 7 mesi; d.s. = 1 anno e 1 mese). Lo strumento sembra presentare buone caratteristiche psicometriche di attendibilità e validità.

Parole chiave: *resilienza*, *questionario*, *scala*.

Articolo ricevuto nel giugno 2009, revisione del novembre 2011.

Le richieste di estratti vanno indirizzate ad Andrea Laudadio, via San Tommaso d'Aquino 60, 00136 Roma; e-mail: a.laudadio@eulabconsulting.it.