

# METODOLOGÍA

## Spanish adaptation of the Adolescents' perceived collective family efficacy scale

Silvia Pepe, Jorge Sobral\*, José Antonio Gómez-Fraguela\* and Paula Villar-Torres\*  
University of Rome «La Sapienza» (Italy) and \* University of Santiago de Compostela

The aim of current article was the adaptation and validation of the Adolescents' Perceived Collective Family Efficacy Scale (EFCP/A) in the Spanish context. The sample includes 486 adolescents. Psychometric properties of the EFCP/A were examined with exploratory factor analysis, item analysis and reliability. Construct validity was examined by means of correlations with parental relationships (PBI). The correlations with drug use (tobacco, alcohol, cannabis) and coping strategies were also examined. Results supported the unidimensionality and reliability of the EFCP/A scale in the Spanish context. As hypothesised, adolescents' beliefs in collective family efficacy are highly correlated with the quality of their paternal and maternal relationships. Further, the adolescents who are convinced that their family is efficacious display more productive coping strategies and less drug use.

*Adaptación española de la escala de Eficacia Colectiva Familiar Percibida por los Adolescentes (EFCP/A).* El objetivo de este artículo fue la adaptación y validación en el contexto español de la escala de eficacia colectiva familiar percibida por los adolescentes (EFCP/A). La muestra incluye 486 adolescentes. Fueron examinadas las propiedades psicométricas del EFCP/A por medio de un análisis factorial exploratorio, el análisis de ítems y la fiabilidad. La validez de constructo fue examinada a través de las correlaciones encontradas con las relaciones mantenidas por los adolescentes con padres y madres. También se analizaron las relaciones de la escala con el uso de drogas (tabaco, alcohol y cannabis) y con las estrategias de afrontamiento. Los resultados apoyan la unidimensionalidad y la fiabilidad de la escala EFCP/A en el contexto español. Como se hipotetizaba, las creencias de los adolescentes sobre la eficacia familiar colectiva están altamente correlacionadas con la calidad de las relaciones con padres y madres. Además, los adolescentes que creen que su familia es eficaz usan estrategias de afrontamiento más productivas y presentan un menor consumo de drogas.

In social cognitive theory although personality functioning rests on a complex system of affective and cognitive elements, nevertheless research, suggests that self-system is one of the more important components in personality functioning (Bandura, 1997; Salanova, Grau, & Martínez, 2005). An example of self-system component perceived self efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1997). People make causal contributions to their own psychosocial functioning through mechanisms of personal agency. Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more focal or pervading than beliefs or personal efficacy. Self-efficacy beliefs attest to the propensity of

individuals to reflect on themselves and regulate their conduct in accordance with their personal goals and standards (Bandura, 1997).

Social cognitive theory extends the conception of human agency to collective efficacy. People's shared beliefs in their collective power to produce desired results are the key ingredients of collective agency in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997, 2000, 2001).

Bandura sustains that the strength of families, communities, organizations, social institutions, and even nations depends partly in people's sense of collective efficacy, that is, in their belief they can solve the problems and improve their lives through unified effort (Bandura, 1997; Caprara, Borgogni, Barbaranelli, & Rubinacci, 1999; Caprara, Regalia, & Scabini, 2001; Fernández Ballesteros, Díez Nicolás, Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Bandura, 2002). Collective efficacy is not only the sum of the efficacy beliefs of different individuals. Rather, it is an emergent group-

---

Fecha recepción: 3-7-06 • Fecha aceptación: 22-3-07

Correspondencia: Silvia Pepe  
Facoltà di Psicologia 2  
Università «La Sapienza» di Roma  
00185 Roma (Italy)  
E-mail: [silvia.pepe@uniroma1.it](mailto:silvia.pepe@uniroma1.it)

level attribute that is the product of coordinative and interactive dynamics.

Perceived collective efficacy beliefs refer to the sense of mission and purpose of a system, this means that perceived collective efficacy beliefs are related how well its members work together to produce results and group's resiliency against life difficulties (Bandura, 1997).

This study focuses on the perceived collective family efficacy, particularly on the adolescents' perceived collective family efficacy.

Previous research on this topic show the role of self-efficacy as protective factor of individual and family well-being (Caprara, Scabini, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, & Regalia, 1999; Caprara et al., 2001; Caprara, Regalia, Scabini, Barbaranelli, & Bandura, 2004; Caprara, Pastorelli, Regalia, Scabini, & Bandura, 2005).

In social cognitive theory, the family is the first context that provides to the individual significant experiences capable to promote control on the outside world, therefore the feedback received from parents provide children with useful information about their ability to know how to behave in an efficacious way (Alonso & Román, 2005; Bandura, 1997; Villar, Luengo, Gómez-Fraguela, & Romero, 2003).

From the first empirical attempts to examine the existing association between the type of family relationships and the behavior children, researchers have proposed different dimensions and categories to classify the various processes and behavior that are realized in interactions between parents and children.

These dimensions represent same conceptual structures but exposed with different denominations (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Schaefer, 1965). They have been two the fundamental parental components that have been referred in literature: «support», defined by various types of affectionate behavior by parents towards their children; and «control», defined by a large range of parental ability to stablish family rules and discipline.

Throughout adolescence, the relationships between parents and children are continuously renegotiated along the two main axes of affect and controll.

During adolescence, individuals have to maintain relationships with a major number of persons and to confront a variety of social situations for which they are not prepared. If in the proximal contexts of adolescent development exist stressful events (i.e. interpersonal conflict) or deviant peers, it is posible tha the lack of adapted coping strategies lead adolescents to be involved in antisocial behavior (Agnew, 2003).

On the other hand, the emerging of new adolescent needs and requests, in particular related to more autonomy and independence, produces changes in the dynamics of the family, that often leads to conflicts. Under these circumstances, the constructive negotiation depends not only on a consideration of perceived needs but also on the capacity of adults to manage conflicts, on the perceived self-efficacy as a member of the family and on the perceived collective efficacy of the family as whole.

This study examines the psychometric properties of scale of perceived collective family efficacy in Spanish adolescents (EFCP/A). Another propose of the study is to analyze consistency and the internal validity of the scale. The validity of the construct is also examined by comparing EFCP/A with other scales wich measure constructs such as the perception of relations with parents (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979) and styles of adolescent coping

(Frydenber & Lewis, 1996b). Moreover, we examined correlations with some problematic behavior in adolescence, such as use of drugs (tobacco, alcohol and cannabis).

We hypothesized that the adolescents who reports greater levels of collective family efficacy will show a more adequate family functioning and present more productive strategies of coping and less substance use.

## Method

### *Participants*

The sample used for this study consisted on 486 adolescents from Santiago de Compostela between 13 and 18 years ( $M=14.88$ ,  $SD=.94$ ). The participants attended second to fourth year of secondary education during the 2004 - 2005 school year. The sample is part of the longitudinal project «Construyendo Salud» (Building Health), a project that was designed to assess the effects of multicomponent intervention to prevent problem behaviors among students in secondary education.

### *Measures*

The variables evaluated in this study were: collective family efficacy as perceived by adolescents, perception of the relationship with parents, styles of coping of the adolescent and frequency of drug use. These variables were measured through the following scales:

*Perceived Collective Family Efficacy* (EFCP/A, Caprara et al., 2001)

EFCP/A was measured by 20 items assessing beliefs in the family's efficacy to operate as a whole system in accomplishing task necessary for family functioning. The various items concern the family's capability to: manage daily routine operations, achieve consensus in decision-making and planning, cope together with adversities, promote reciprocal commitment, provide emotional support in stressful situations, enjoy each other and relax together in spite of multiple obligations, and keep good relations with the community at large. The scale used a 5-point scale response format from 1= *Not at well at all*, to 5= *Very well*. EFCP/A was developed by Caprara et al. (2001) and it has been valited on italian sample. An Italian researcher first traslated the original Italian version of the questionnaire into American English. The quality of the English traslation was evaluated by a Spanish researcher who was fluent in English and Italian. The English version of the EFCP/A was translated and adapted to the Castilian by three independent judges with great experience in the field of research with adolescents. This translation finally has been compared with the Spanish version of the scale used in a previous study between the Bolivian adolescent population.<sup>1</sup>

The obtained factor pattern identifies one factor. Explaining 61.4% of the variance. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was ranged from .96 to .97 (Caprara, 2001; Caprara et al., 2004). The instrument was realised following the recommendations of Bandura (1997). In this work we have proceeded with the adaptation of the scale in the Spanish context. Table 1 presents the English version as well as the Spanish translation.

*Table 1*  
Presents the English version as well as the Spanish translation

<p><i>How well, working together as whole, can your family:</i></p> <p>Set aside leisure time with your family when other things press for attention.</p> <p>Agree to decisions that require some sacrifice of personal interests.</p> <p>Resolve conflicts when family members feel they are not being treated fairly.</p> <p>Prevent family disagreements from turning into heated arguments.</p> <p>Get family members to share household responsibilities.</p> <p>Support each other in times of stress.</p> <p>Help each other to achieve their personal goals.</p> <p>Help each other with work demands.</p> <p>Build respect for each other's particular interests.</p> <p>Get family members to carry out their responsibilities when they neglect them.</p> <p>Build trust in each other.</p> <p>Figure out what choices to make when the family faces important decisions.</p> <p>Find community resources and make good use of them for the family.</p> <p>Get the family to keep close ties to their larger family.</p> <p>Celebrate family traditions even in difficult times.</p> <p>Cooperate with schools to improve their educational practices.</p> <p>Face up to difficulties without excessive tension.</p> <p>Remain confident during difficult times.</p> <p>Accept each member's need for independence.</p> <p>Serve as a positive example for the community.</p>	<p><i>En qué grado tu familia es capaz de:</i></p> <p>Proyectar y realizar actividades divertidas juntos a pesar de las muchas ocupaciones.</p> <p>Llegar a acuerdos que supongan alguna concesión para todas las partes.</p> <p>Resolver conflictos surgidos cuanto alguien siente que es tratado injustamente.</p> <p>Evitar que los desacuerdos se conviertan en conflictos.</p> <p>Conseguir que todos se responsabilicen de las tareas del hogar.</p> <p>Proporcionarse apoyo mutuo ante las situaciones difíciles.</p> <p>Ayudar a que los otros alcancen sus metas.</p> <p>Ayudarse ante los problemas del trabajo.</p> <p>Respetar los intereses de cada uno.</p> <p>Conseguir que cada uno asuma sus propias responsabilidades.</p> <p>Aumentar la confianza mutua.</p> <p>Llegar a un acuerdo entre todos sobre cuestiones importantes.</p> <p>Hacer buen uso de los recursos sociales.</p> <p>Mantener fuertes lazos con familiares y amigos.</p> <p>Celebrar las fiestas familiares aún en momentos difíciles.</p> <p>Colaborar con la escuela para mejorar la educación.</p> <p>Enfrentarse a las dificultades sin excesiva tensión.</p> <p>Mantener la confianza familiar aún en la adversidad.</p> <p>Respetar en lo posible la independencia de los demás.</p> <p>Representar un ejemplo positivo para la comunidad.</p>
--	--

#### *Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI, Parker et al., 1979)*

PBI was measured by 25 item, assessing the perceptions of relationships with the father and the mother. The format of the answers to this instrument is on a 4-point scale (1= *Never*; 4= *Always*). The authors proposed a scale that measured two dimensions: «affection», represented by warmth and emotional nearness in one extremity and to «negation» and «emotional coldness» in the other; to «super-protection», represented by super-protection, intrusion and rigid control in one extremity and of stimulus of «personal autonomy» in the other. There are diverse studies that discuss the uni-dimensionality of the dimension «super-protection» and they opt to differentiate, in this factor, a positive dimension named «autonomy promotion» characterised, exactly, by the increase in personal autonomy and a negative which has been named «psychological control» that can be defined as an excess of control or negation of psychological autonomy (Chambers, Power, Loucks, & Swanson, 2000; Gómez-Fraguela, Luengo, Romero, & Villar, 2004; Mohr, Preisig, Fenton, & Ferrero, 1999; Murphy, Brewin, & Silka, 1997). In this study we have hypothesized a structure composed of three factors.

#### *Adolescent Coping Scale (ACS, Frydenberg & Lewis, 1996a)*

ACS was measured by 79 item and an open ended question that permits the evaluation of 18 strategies aimed to confront a problem or difficulty. They include the seek social support; focus on solving the problems; keep to self; work hard and achieve; invest in close friends; seek to belong; hope for the best; not cope; reduce tension; social actions; ignore the problem; self-blame; worry; seek spiritual support; focus on the positive; seek professional support; seek relaxing diversions and physical

recreation. These 18 strategies are grouped by the authors in style of productive coping; styles of non productive coping and style of coping with an orientation towards others (Frydenberg & Lewis, 1996b). In this study the General Form was utilised in which the adolescent is asked what strategies he/she usually use when they must resolve a problem or difficulty. The format of the answers of the instrument is a 5-point scale (1= *It doesn't happen to me or I don't ever do it*; 5= *It happens to me or I do it very frequently*).

#### *Drug use*

The questionnaire used to assess adolescent drug use was developed by Luengo, Romero, Gomez Fraguela, Garra and Lence (1999). The participants were asked to indicate the frequency of use of tobacco and alcohol, with a 7 point scale (0= *Never*; 6= *Every day*). To assess the amount, student also indicated number of cigarettes smoked approximately a week, with 5 alternatives of answer (0= *zero-less than five*; 1= *between 5 and 10*; 2= *between 11 and 20*; 3= *between 21 and 60*; 4= *more than 60*), number of cigarettes smoked in a day and number of times that they had been drunk (0= *Never*; 1= *Once or twice a year*; 2= *Once or twice a month*; 3= *Once or twice a week*; 4= *More than twice a week*); indicate the frequency of use of cannabis (0= *Never*; 1= *Have tried*; 2= *Some times*; 3= *Frequently*) and whether they had tried other types of drugs, a question with 2 alternative of answering dichotomy type (*Yes, No*).

#### Statistical analysis

##### *Item analysis*

Means, standard deviations and skewness were calculated for each of the five-point scale Likert items used to assess EFCP/A.

### Internal validity

To assess the internal validity of the instrument, a Principal Component Analysis was carried out on the 20-item instrument measuring EFCP/A. To determine the number of factors to retain, we used the analysis of eigenvalues (Cattell & Vogelmann, 1977). Factor were rotated using the Oblimin rotation, a procedure normally used when factors are expected to correlate and not be orthogonal (Gorsuch, 1983). The internal consistency of the EFA solution was further investigated by Cronbach's alpha and corrected item-total correlations.

We then tested the degree of congruence between the factor pattern emerged in our sample and the solution obtained in the Italian sample (Caprara, 2001), using the coefficient *phi* ( $\Phi$ ) devised by Tucker (1951).

### Construct validity

To analyze the construct validity of the scale, we examined Pearson correlations with the *Parental Bonding Instrument* (PBI) and the *Adolescent Coping Scale* (ACS). Moreover, we used Spearman coefficients to examine correlations with use of drugs (tobacco, alcohol and cannabis), that reveal a non-normal distribution. Finally, to carry out gender comparisons on the EFCP/A, a *t*-test for independent samples was used.

## Results

### Item analysis

The mean score of the five-point scale Likert items used to assess EFCP/A ranged from 2.82 to 3.31 ( $M = 3.08$ ,  $DS = .89$ ). None of the items have absolute skewness greater than 1. Although the distribution was slightly skewed toward the negative for some items, most of the scores revealed a reasonably normal distribution (see table 2).

Examining differences between boys and girls on the Perceived Collective Family Efficacy Scale, we observe that females scored higher than males on 18 items, even though the differences result in being significant only in 6 items ( $p < .05$ ). These are: «Plan and realise moments of entertainment together in spite of pressure from other tasks» (item 1), «Resolve conflicts when some believe not to have been treated in the correct way» (item 3), «Assure reciprocal support in stressful situations» (item 6), «Make sure to give reciprocal help in work problems» (item 8), «Always be sure that everyone assumes fully their responsibility» (item 10) and finally «Believe in yourself strongly during misadventures» (item 18). *Gender differences.* The mean score in the scale of EFCP/A was 61.6, with a standard deviation of 17.8. Examining differences between boys and girls on the EFCP/A, we observe that females ( $M = 62.6$ ) scored significantly higher than males ( $M = 60.3$ )  $t = 2.02$ ,  $p < .05$ .

### Internal validity

The first ten eigenvalues of the correlation matrix were: 8.18, 1.18, .95, .91, .83, .78, .76, .72, .68, .63. Although the second eigenvalue is greater than 1, the scree-test of the eigenvalues suggested a one factor solutions. This finding is consistent with the results of several past studies (Caprara, 2001; Caprara, 2004),

supporting the unidimensionality of the scale. The first factor, accounting for 40.9% of the variance. All the items showed a loading higher than .40, ranging from .44 to .73. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale met standard criteria (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), being .92. The corrected item-test correlations ranged from .40 to .68 ( $M = .52$ ;  $SD = .07$ ). The obtained factor pattern is highly similar to those obtained from Italian study ( $\Phi = .99$ ).

### Construct validity

*Parental Bonding Instrument.* Results showed that the beliefs of perceived collective family efficacy of the adolescents are highly positively correlated with paternal and maternal affection and promotion of autonomy, both in boys and girls. In contrast, the correlations with psychological control applied by father and mother are negative and significant. The more the adolescents are convinced of being efficacious as a family, the more they understand their parents in an affectionate way and as able to build personal autonomy, and the less they see them as super protective and controlling (see table 3).

Table 3 presents the means and the standard deviations for the dimensions of PBI. Girls scored significantly higher in the PBI affection scale than boys ( $p < .05$ ) regarding paternal and maternal affection. These differences did not emerged for promotion of psychological autonomy and control.

*Adolescent Coping Scale.* Concerning the relationship between perceived collective family efficacy and coping strategies, results related a positive relationship with productive coping strategies

Table 2  
Skewness, corrected item-total and mean for EFCP/A

EFCP/A	Skewness	Corrected item-total	Mean (total sample)	Mean boys	Mean girls	t
Item 1	-.30	.61	2.87 (.97)	2.76 (1.06)	2.96 (.87)	-2.05*
Item 2	-.16	.60	2.88 (.89)	2.80 (.93)	2.94 (.84)	-1.61
Item 3	-.37	.64	3.09 (.90)	2.97 (.94)	3.19 (.85)	-2.34*
Item 4	-.35	.49	2.99 (.95)	2.91 (.99)	3.07 (.92)	-1.57
Item 5	-.31	.56	3.01 (.95)	3.07 (.97)	2.95 (.92)	1.21
Item 6	-.62	.68	3.23 (.89)	3.09 (.94)	3.34 (.81)	-2.67**
Item 7	-.59	.64	3.27 (.83)	3.21 (.83)	3.32 (.82)	-1.37
Item 8	-.43	.65	3.17 (.85)	3.06 (.92)	3.26 (.77)	-2.34*
Item 9	-.68	.64	3.24 (.89)	3.17 (.94)	3.30 (.83)	-1.37
Item 10	-.40	.60	3.16 (.86)	3.05 (.88)	3.26 (.83)	-2.33*
Item 11	-.56	.68	3.17 (.87)	3.11 (.88)	3.22 (.85)	-1.26
Item 12	-.48	.63	3.22 (.81)	3.18 (.85)	3.25 (.75)	-.82
Item 13	-.32	.53	2.94 (.91)	2.90 (.95)	2.98 (.86)	-.89
Item 14	-.86	.56	3.31 (.89)	3.23 (.95)	3.38 (.82)	-1.69
Item 15	-.36	.40	2.94 (.97)	2.97 (1.00)	2.90 (.93)	.64
Item 16	-.27	.52	2.82 (.94)	2.72 (1.00)	2.91 (.87)	-1.88
Item 17	-.24	.55	2.88 (.83)	2.85 (.88)	2.90 (.77)	-.61
Item 18	-.50	.61	3.09 (.89)	2.99 (.96)	3.17 (.79)	-1.99*
Item 19	-.45	.60	3.14 (.86)	3.13 (.90)	3.15 (.82)	-.28
Item 20	-.41	.51	3.18 (.89)	3.14 (.96)	3.21 (.82)	-.74
Total scale			61.6 (17.8)	60.3 (18.7)	62.6 (16.7)	-2.02*

Note: \*\*\* 0.001; \*\* 0.01; \* 0.05

(concentrating on resolving problems, to force oneself to obtain results, invest in close friends, seek to belong, focus on the positive, seek relaxing diversions or physical recreation). The more the adolescents are convinced of being efficacious as a family, the more he/she uses productive coping strategies. Perceived collective family efficacy also has a positive and significant correlation with the strategies oriented toward others («seek social support», «seek spiritual support», «seek professional support»), and with some non productive coping strategies («worry» and «wishful thinking»); other non productive coping strategies («tension reduction») has a negative and significant correlation. Results are presented in table 4.

Tabla 4 presents the means and the standard deviations for ACS; *t*-test revealed significant differences between boys and girls. With respect to the «productive coping strategies», girls scored significantly higher in «seek to belong» ( $p < .05$ ) than boys,

while boys scored higher in «physical recreation» ( $p < .001$ ). With respect to «non productive coping strategies», girls scored significantly higher in «worry» ( $p < .001$ ) and «self-blame» ( $p < .05$ ), while boys scored higher in «ignore the problem» ( $p < .001$ ). Finally, with respect to the «strategies oriented toward others», girls scored significantly higher in «seek social support» ( $p < .01$ ), while boys a higher score in «social action» ( $p < .001$ ).

*Use of drugs.* In the last month, 24.8% of participants used tobacco, 30.1% used alcohol and 15.0% cannabis. Correlational analysis between drug use with perceived collective family efficacy have been effectuated (table 5). From these analysis, significant correlations between drugs use and perceived collective family efficacy have emerged. The more the adolescents are convinced of being efficacious as a family, the less they smoke and consume tobacco, the less they drink and get drunk, the less they use cannabis. Analysing in a separate way these relations in

Table 3  
Means and standard deviation for the dimensions of PBI and Pearson correlation with EFCEP/A

		Means			t	Correlation EFCEP/A
		Total	Boys	Girls		
Mother	Affection	36.9 (6.1)	36.3 (5.8)	37.6 (6.2)	-2.12*	.588 (***)
	Psychological autonomy	17.6 (3.4)	17.7 (3.3)	17.6 (3.5)	.34	.393 (***)
	Psychological control	16.7 (4.6)	17 (4.6)	16.6 (4.7)	.84	-.114 (*)
Father	Affection	35.8 (6.0)	35.1 (5.6)	36.5 (6.3)	-2.25*	.609 (***)
	Psychological autonomy	17.6 (3.4)	17.7 (3.3)	17.5 (3.6)	.44	.376 (***)
	Psychological control	15.7 (4.3)	15.9 (4.5)	15.6 (4.1)	.66	-.125 (*)

Note: \*\*\* 0.001; \*\* 0.01; \* 0.05

Table 4  
Means and standard deviations facets of ACS and Pearson correlation with EFCEP/A

		Means			t	Correlation EFCEP/A
		Total	Boys	Girls		
<i>Productive coping</i>						
	Focus on solving the problem	68.4 (14.8)	67.3 (14.8)	69.3 (14.7)	-1.39	.405 (**)
	Work hard and achieve	83.1 (16.5)	82.9 (16.3)	83.2 (16.8)	-.21	.389 (**)
	Invest in close friends	69.0 (15.3)	68.1 (15.6)	69.8 (14.9)	-1.19	.270 (**)
	Seek to belong	71.6 (13.6)	69.9 (14.5)	73.1 (12.5)	-2.36*	.342 (**)
	Focus on the positive	65.5 (16.0)	64.8 (16.7)	66.2 (15.3)	-.87	.367 (**)
	Seek relaxing diversions	75.2 (16.8)	75.7 (17.1)	74.7 (16.6)	.57	.210 (**)
	Physical recreation	68.2 (21.3)	73.1 (21.4)	63.5 (20.2)	4.68***	.240 (**)
<i>Non productive coping</i>						
	Worry	71.1 (14.8)	68.5 (14.3)	73.6 (14.8)	-3.60***	.413 (**)
	Wishful thinking	59.8 (14.8)	58.4 (15.1)	61.2 (14.5)	-1.95	.240 (**)
	Not cope	44.1 (13.2)	44.2 (13.7)	43.9 (12.8)	.21	-.083
	Tension reduction	39.7 (15.2)	39.1 (15.7)	40.2 (14.7)	-.69	-.114 (*)
	Ignore the problem	42.8 (15.6)	47.7 (15.9)	38.2 (13.8)	6.51***	-.104
	Self-blame	53.9 (16.5)	52.2 (15.6)	55.5 (17.2)	-2.05*	.010
	Keep to self	51.9 (15.3)	53.0 (15.1)	50.9 (15.4)	1.38	-.038
<i>Coping toward others</i>						
	Seek social support	66.1 (17.0)	63.2 (16.1)	68.8 (17.4)	-3.38**	.404 (**)
	Seek spiritual support	43.2 (14.4)	43.8 (15.1)	42.7 (13.8)	.79	.202 (**)
	Seek professional support	50.4 (18.1)	52.1 (17.7)	48.8 (18.3)	1.85	.252 (**)
	Social action	41.1 (13.3)	44.0 (14.6)	38.3 (11.4)	4.34***	.066

Note: \*\*\* 0.001; \*\* 0.01; \* 0.05



Table 5  
Spearman correlation between EFCP/A with drug use

Drug use	EFCP/A		
	Total	Boys	Girls
Tobacco use frequency	-.218 (**)	-.156 (*)	-.288 (**)
Weekly tobacco use	-.157 (**)	-.155 (*)	-.168 (*)
Daily tobacco use	-.180 (**)	-.180 (*)	-.203 (**)
Alcohol use frequency	-.150 (**)	-.102	-.215 (**)
Frequency of drunkenness	-.111 (*)	-.108	-.142
Cannabis use frequency	-.134 (*)	-.161 (*)	-.088

Note: \*\*\* 0.001; \*\* 0.01; \* 0.05

boys and girls the associations disappear in the sample of boys about drink and get drunk and in the sample of girls about get drunk and cannabis use, while maintaining itself in the girls for the use of tobacco and alcohol.

### Discussion

Current study proposed the objective to contribute to the adaptation and to the validation of the Adolescents' Perceived Collective Family Efficacy (EFCP/A) in the Spanish context. Our findings revealed that the unidimensionality of the scale was replicated also in this context. This scale showed good psychometric properties; factor analysis and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient supported the internal validity and the reliability of the instrument. Furthermore, as revealed by the item analysis, the scale and each single item followed a normal distribution. With regard to gender differences, girls are more convinced of being efficacious as a family than males. These differences did not emerged on previous studies conducted in Italy with the same measure (Caprara, 2001; Caprara et al., 2004). Similarly, differences across gender have also been observed in the PBI affection scale, both for fathers and mothers. Likely these findings might indicate different family perceptions between boys and girls in the spanish cultural context

(Motrico et al., 2001; Shearer et al., 2005). It is likely that this difference could be caused by the family perception of the Spanish boys and girls. It will be necessary to study this question in depth in future works. The construct validity was supported by the relations between the scale of collective family efficacy and the dimensions of the PBI; this results support the value of this scale, able of effectively measure the organisational capacity and the good functioning of the family. Specifically, as expected, it is evident how the beliefs of collective family efficacy are correlated in a consistent way to indicators that favors good family functioning such as affection and promotion of autonomy, rather than indicators that undermine family functioning such as psychological control of the adolescent by parents. The construct validity was also supported by the relations which emerged with the strategies of coping. As hypothesised, these beliefs are positively related with the realization of the adolescent strategies of «productive coping» rather than the realization of strategies of «unproductive coping» in front to situations or problematic events that can occur in everyday life. Moreover, adolescents' perceived collective family efficacy beliefs seem to have a protective function in regards to the use of drugs. Adolescents that perceive themselves in an efficacious way at a collective familiar level result to use less alcohol, tobacco, and cannabis. To conclude, it is possible to recognize, the perceived collective familiar efficacy of the adolescent as protective elements, able to promoting the health of the young adult, and to opposing to problematic behavior: use of tobacco, alcohol and drugs.

After all, the scale Adolescents' Perceived Collective Family Efficacy (EFCP/A), can be applied in the Spanish context, analysing it in relation to other variables, and in the field of intervention for programs of preventive kinds and for interventions relative to sustaining family relations.

### Note

- <sup>1</sup> «Risk and Protective Factors in to Bolivian Sample of Adolescents», Manuscript no published, University «San Pablo» Bolivia, 2004 - 2005 by Interuniversity Center for Research on Prosocial and Antisocial Motivation (CIRMPA).

### References

- Agnew, R. (2003). An integrated theory of the adolescent peak in offending. *Youth & Society*, 34, 263-299.
- Alonso, J., & Román, J.M. (2005). Prácticas educativas familiares y autoestima. *Psicothema*, 17(1), 76-82.
- Baldwin, A.L. (1948). Socialization and the parent-child relationship. *Child Development*, 19, 127-137.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 75-78.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, E.A. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38, 291-327.
- Caprara, G.V., Scabini, E., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli C., & Regalia, C. (1999). Autoefficacia, percezioni familiari e adattamento psicosociale in un campione di adolescenti./Self-efficacy, familiar perceptions and psycho-social adjustment within a sample of adolescents. *Età Evolutiva*, 62, 25-33.
- Caprara, G.V., Borgogni, L., Barbaranelli, C., & Rubinacci, A. (1999). Convinzioni di efficacia e cambiamento organizzativo. *Sviluppo e organizzazione*, 174, 19-32.
- Caprara, G.V. (2001). *La valutazione dell'autoefficacia*. Trento: Edizioni Erickson.
- Caprara, G.V., Regalia, C., & Scabini, E. (2001). Autoefficacia familiare. In G.V. Caprara (Ed.): *La valutazione dell'autoefficacia*, 63-86, Trento: Edizioni Erickson.
- Caprara, G.V., Regalia, C., Scabini E., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2004). Assessment of filial, parental, marital and collective family efficacy beliefs. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 20(4), 247-261.
- Caprara, G.V., Pastorelli, C., Regalia, C., Scabini, E., & Bandura A. (2005). Impact of adolescents' filial self-efficacy on quality of family functioning and satisfaction. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 15(1), 71-97.

- Cattell, R.B., & Vogelmann, S. (1977). A comprehensive trial of the Scree and KG criteria for determining the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 12, 289-325.
- Chambers, J.A., Power, K.G., Loucks, N., & Swanson, V. (2000). Psychometric properties of the Parental Bonding Instrument and its association with psychological distress in a group of incarcerated young offenders. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 35, 318-325.
- CIRMPA (2004 - 2005). Risk and Protective Factors in to Bolivian Sample of Adolescents. *Manuscript no published*. Universidad boliviana «San Pablo».
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487-496.
- Fernández Ballesteros, R., Díez Nicolás, J., Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2002). Determinants and structural relation of personal efficacy to collective efficacy. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51, 107-125.
- Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1996a). *Escala de afrontamiento para adolescentes*. Madrid: TEA.
- Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1996b). The adolescent coping scale: Multiple forms and applications of a self report inventory in a counselling and research context. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 12(3), 224-235.
- Gómez-Fraguela, J.A., Luengo, M.A., Romero, E., & Villar, P. (2004). *Evaluación de las relaciones familiares en la adolescencia a través del PBI*. Oral presentation in VII European Conference on Psychological Assessment, Málaga, España.
- Gorsuch, R. (1983). *Factor analysis*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Luengo, M.A., Romero, E., Gómez Fragueta, J.A., Garra, A., & Lence, M. (1999). *La prevención del consumo de drogas y la conducta antisocial en la escuela: análisis y evaluación de un programa*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura.
- Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E.M. Hetherington & P.H. Mussen (Eds.): *Handbook of child psychology: vol. 4. Socialization, personality and social development*. New York: Wiley.
- Mohr, S., Preisig, B.T., Fenton, B.T., & Ferrero, F. (1999). Validation of the French version of the Parental Bonding Instrument in adults. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 26, 1065-1074.
- Motrico, E., Fuentes, M.J., & Bersabé, R. (2001). Discrepancias en la percepción de los conflictos entre padres e hijos/as a lo largo de la adolescencia. *Anales de Psicología*, 17(1), 1-13.
- Murphy, E., Brewin, C.R., & Silka, L. (1997). The assessment of parenting using the Parental Bonding Instrument: Two or three factors? *Psychological Medicine*, 27, 333-342.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.), New York, NY: McGraw-Hill (1st ed., 1967).
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L.B. (1979). A parenting bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1-10.
- Salanova, M., Grau, R.M., & Martínez, I.M. (2005). Demandas laborales y conductas de afrontamiento: el rol modulador de la autoeficacia profesional. *Psicothema*, 17(3), 390-395.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development*, 36, 462-479.
- Shearer C.L., Crouter A.C., & McHale, S.M. (2005). Parents' perceptions of changes in mother-child and father-child relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(6), 662-684.
- Tucker, L.R. (1951). *A method for the synthesis of factor analytic studies* (Personnel Research Report No. 984). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army.
- Villar Torres, P., Luengo, A., Gómez-Fraguela, J.A., & Romero, E. (2003). Una propuesta de evaluación de variables familiares en la prevención de la conducta problema en la adolescencia. *Psicothema*, 15(4), 581-588.