

Positive Clinical Psychology and Schema Therapy (ST): The Development of the Young
Positive Schema Questionnaire (YPSQ) to Complement the Young Schema Questionnaire 3
Short Form (YSQ-S3)

John P. Louis¹, Alex M. Wood², George Lockwood³, Moon-Ho Ringo Ho⁴, Eamonn Ferguson⁵

April 2017

Conflict of Interest: Eamonn Ferguson is co-author on: O'Connor, S., Ferguson, E., Terri, C., House, E., & O'Connor RC. (2016) The Development and Evaluation of the Paediatric Index of Emotional Distress (PI-ED). *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 51, 15-26. DOI: 10.1007/s00127-015-1134-y for which he receives royalties from GL assessment in the UK

©American Psychological Association, 2017. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000567>

¹ University of Stirling, Stirling Management School, Stirling FK9 4LA, United Kingdom
Email: johnphiliploouis@gmail.com

² University of Stirling, Stirling Management School, 3B54 University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, United Kingdom.

Email: alex.wood@stir.ac.uk

³ Schema Therapy Institute Midwest, 471 West South Street, 41C Kalamazoo, MI 49007, USA.

Email: george@schematherapymidwest.com

⁴ Nanyang Technological University, HSS-04-07 School of Social Sciences, 14 Nanyang Drive, Singapore 637332, Singapore.

Email: homh@ntu.edu.sg

⁵ University of Nottingham, School of Psychology,, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom.

Email: eamonn.ferguson@nottingham.ac.uk

Abstract

Negative schemas have been widely recognized as being linked to psychopathology and mental health, and they are central to the Schema Therapy (ST) model. This study is the first to report on the psychometric properties of the Young Positive Schema Questionnaire (YPSQ). In a combined community sample (Manila, Philippines, $n = 559$; Bangalore, India, $n = 350$; Singapore, $n = 628$), we identified a 56-item 14-factor solution for the YPSQ. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the 14-factor model for data from the Singapore sample as well as 2 other samples; an Eastern sample from Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia ($n = 229$) and a Western sample from the United States ($n = 214$). Construct validity was demonstrated with the Young Schema Questionnaire 3 Short Form (YSQ-S3) that measures negative schemas and divergent validity was demonstrated for 11 of the YPSQ subscales with their respective negative schema counterparts. Convergent validity of the 14 subscales of YPSQ was demonstrated with measures of personality dispositions, emotional distress, well-being, trait gratitude, and humor styles. Positive schemas also showed incremental validity over and above negative schemas for these same measures thus demonstrating that both positive and negative schemas are separate constructs that relate in unique ways to mental health. Implications for using both the YPSQ and the YSQ-S3 scales in tandem in ST as well as cultural nuances from the use of Asian samples were discussed.

Keywords: positive schemas; Schema Therapy; incremental validity; culture.

Public Significance Statement

Active negative schemas (distinct thinking patterns and experiences) are associated to mental ill-health. We identify the specific positive schemas that both relate to good mental health and protect from mental ill-health, and we show how to easily measure these.

Positive Clinical Psychology and Schema Therapy (ST): The Development of the Young Positive Schema Questionnaire (YPSQ) to Complement the Young Schema Questionnaire 3 Short Form (YSQ-S3)

Schema Therapy (ST) has been shown to be successful in the treatment of a wide range of mental health conditions, including both affective disorders (Hawke, Provencher, & Parikh, 2013; Wang, Halvorsen, Eisemann, & Waterloo, 2010) and personality disorders (Bamelis, Evers, Spinhoven, & Arntz, 2014; Giesen-Bloo et al., 2006; Nadort et al., 2009; Sempertegui, Karreman, Arntz, & Bekker, 2013). Its central theoretical construct is an Early Maladaptive Schema (EMS or “negative schema”). A negative schema is made up of a specific pattern of thoughts, emotions, beliefs, bodily sensations, and neurobiological reactions, and is developed when a core emotional need such as that for connection and acceptance, autonomy, reasonable limits or and realistic expectations is not adequately met during childhood (Lockwood & Perris, 2012; Young, Klosko, & Weishaar, 2003). For example, the Emotional Deprivation Schema arises when the core emotional need for connection and acceptance is not met from a stable and predictable primary caregiver. Other secondary factors that also contribute to the development of schemas include culture, birth order, the quality of the parent’s marriage, and a child’s temperament (Louis & Louis, 2015; Young et al., 2003). Negative schemas can also, albeit more rarely, develop in later life, particularly following deeply distressing events. They have different degrees of strength and become organized around broad pervasive themes regarding oneself and

one's relationship with others (Young et al., 2003).

Schemas are also a central theoretical construct in cognitive psychology and are defined as an interconnected memory structure of "nodes" that store thematic information (Free, 2007). When one node gets activated, other strongly connected nodes also become active. From this vantage point, severe negative schemas are seen as more rigid and impervious to disconfirming information because they are made up of more tightly interconnected nodes, the activation of one node quickly activating the entire schema. An activated negative schema then subsequently strongly shapes people's interpretations of their interpersonal world through selective attention and encoding of stimuli and selective retrieval of schema associated information. The theoretical framework of ST identifies the affective, cognitive and interpersonal patterns making up the schemas most relevant to psychopathology and well-being. Research on cognitive therapy has contributed to our understanding of how these schemas operate and why they can become so maladaptively ridged.

The positive counterpart of a negative schema is termed an Early Adaptive Schema (EAS or "positive schema"; Lockwood & Perris, 2012). Similar to negative schemas, positive schemas consist of memories, cognitions, beliefs, bodily sensations and neurobiological reactions, regarding oneself and one's relationship with others. However, these schemas are made up of positive functions and adaptive behavioral dispositions that emerge during childhood and adolescence when one's core emotional needs are adequately met by primary caregivers (Young et al., 2003). Supplemental material, Appendix A, Table A1 shows the theoretical links between parenting patterns, core emotional needs, EASs, and EMSs (The terms 'positive', 'negative', 'adaptive', and 'maladaptive' are not intended to suggest that the schemas have this effect in every situation for every person, but rather that this is their general impact. Clinicians are

cautioned to recognize that all clients are different and that general statistical patterns may not apply to individuals; Held, 2016).

As it is widely accepted within cognitive psychology that schemas are defined by distinct themes (Free, 2007), it is reasonable to assume that positive and negative schemas are separate constructs that get activated by different types of experiences. In other words, it is likely that positive schemas tend to cluster together and that negative schemas also cluster together, but that both negative and positive schemas would not be in the same cluster. This would occur as disconfirming evidence and experiences would not be admitted into the same schema cluster. Individuals may experience both positive and negative schemas simultaneously, although the presence and strength of a positive schema would be expected to negatively predict the strength of the corresponding negative schema (and vice versa). Whilst a person could be given a more global assessment of functioning ranging from positive to negative (Wood & Joseph, 2010), each positive schema is predicted to be a distinct dimension and not simply the polar opposites of its corresponding negative schema. This also means that a diminution in intensity of a negative schema would not mean there will necessarily be a corresponding increase in a positive one, thus recognizing that people can hold multiple contradictory beliefs about themselves and the world. In such a case, emotion and behavior would depend on which (if either) schema is active in a given moment. These expectations suggest that positive and negative schemas should be measured separately and that the relative strength of both assessed if the clinician wants a holistic overview of that person in terms of the themes that ST considers important.

There is currently an established measure of negative schemas, the Young Schema Questionnaire (YSQ; Young & Brown, 1994), that has been validated in many countries (Australia: Lee, Taylor, & Dunn, 1999; China: Cui, Lin & Oei, 2011; Korea & Australia:

Baranoff, Oei, Cho, & Kwon, 2006; Norway: Hoffart et al., 2005; Turkey: Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, & Cakir, 2009; United Kingdom: Waller, Meyer, & Ohanian, 2001; and the United States: Cecero, Nelson, & Gillie, 2004). The treatment process in ST focuses first on helping patients to identify the negative schemas that underlie their long-term problems, and second, on supporting patients in challenging and overcoming both their negative schemas and the maladaptive ways in which they cope with them (Young et al., 2003). The YSQ is an integral part of ST practice, being given out routinely to patients to assist with the initial case conceptualization, and sometimes re-administered later in therapy to track and demonstrate a patient's progress. However, there is currently no corresponding validated measure of positive schemas. As a result these positive patterns cannot be objectively and systematically assessed in a manner parallel to their counterparts, despite the increasing awareness of this imbalance within the ST community (Lockwood & Perris, 2012; Taylor & Arntz, 2016).

The development of a measure of positive schemas is consistent with broader developments in the field of clinical psychology. Positive Clinical Psychology (PCP; Wood & Johnson, 2016; Wood & Tarrier, 2010, as clarified in Johnson & Wood, 2016) has drawn the field's attention to the importance of considering the positive alongside the negative since; (a) many characteristics highlighted by positive psychology are understudied (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), (b) these characteristics often have predictive validity in explaining psychopathology above and beyond the presence of the negative (Wood & Joseph, 2010; Wood, Joseph, & Maltby, 2009; Wood, Joseph, & Maltby, 2008) and; (c) interventions that focus on increasing the positive can be as successful at reducing psychopathology as those that focus on decreasing the negative (e.g., Geraghty, Wood, & Hyland, 2010). Thus an assessment of positive schemas would complement rather than replicate the existing measure of negative schemas allowing for a

more balanced approach to the investigation of a broader spectrum of these patterns in ST and research, which in turn, can lead to a more holistic and broadly integrative approach to assessment and treatment. Creating a measure of positive schemas will also avoid sending the unintended and wrong message that negative schemas should be the sole focus within ST.

Further, a more balanced focus on positive and negative schemas, consistent with the arguments for the need for PCP, would allow researchers to explore how both can work together in distinct and unique ways to influence psychopathology and well-being.

The Present Research

Given the importance of a comprehensive, systematic and empirically based examination of positive influences on mental health and the absence of such measures in the context of ST, the first aim was to develop an initial item pool for the Young Positive Schema Questionnaire (YPSQ) and establish its factor structure. The YPSQ is the first psychometric scale designed to measure a set of hypothesized positive schemas in adults. If similar factor structures emerged in the YPSQ and the latest version of the YSQ, the YSQ-S3 (Young & Brown, 2005), then we would expect there to be a correlation between the corresponding counterparts. We would further expect this correlation to be larger than that between the non-counterpart subscales demonstrating divergent validity.

The second aim of this study was to explore the association of the YPSQ subscales with other established measures of personality dispositions, emotional distress, positive well-being, the trait of gratitude, and humor styles. Since negative schemas involve distorted views of oneself and/or others (Beck, Brown, Steer, Eidelson, & Riskind, 1987) and positive schemas are hypothesized to involve adaptive beliefs of oneself and/or others, negative correlations of moderate strength were expected with subscales of YPSQ and measures of depression and

anxiety, and medium sized positive correlations were expected with measures of positive well-being, such as gratitude, satisfaction with life and positive related subscales of humor.

The third aim of the project was to investigate the incremental validity of the YPSQ scale by demonstrating that positive schemas add predictive power over and above that provided by the assessment of negative schemas (Hunsley & Meyer, 2003). The fourth and final aim of this study was to examine the prevalence and structure of positive schemas in both the Eastern and Western samples. While the theoretical development of ST and the psychometric validation of the negative schema scale were largely conducted in the West, the 18 negative schemas that have been identified have been hypothesized to be present in all cultures (Young et al., 2003). Thus if no meaningful results were obtained from a study on positive schemas conducted in Asia, then a question about the universality of schemas would be raised. However, it was also important to show that our results hold in the West, where most ST is conducted. We therefore sourced four out of the five samples from Asian populations and one sample from the United States to establish the generalizability of the findings.

Method

Initial Item Pool Development

The development of an initial item pool for the YPSQ involved four individuals. Each is an expert in his field. GL was an American schema therapist whose decades of experience included helping to develop the Early Adaptive Schema Questionnaire and collaborating with Young in developing ST. JPL was a Singapore-based schema therapist (the first author of this paper) and author of a book on parenting and CWL was a Professor of Psychology in Australia who has published research on the YSQ. Finally, AMW, a Professor of Psychology in Scotland, who has published over a hundred papers in the field of well-being (the second author of this

paper). Three of the team members (GL, JPL, & CWL) belong to the International Society of Schema Therapy (ISST), and two of them (GL & CWL) have served on the ISST Board. AMW was familiar with the therapeutic antecedents to ST, and therefore was able to serve as an external member with no association with the ISST or any prior training in ST.

It was theorized that each of the 18 negative schema subscales in the YSQ-S3 has a positive counterpart (Lockwood & Perris, 2012). Table A1 (in supplemental material, Appendix A) shows all the items for positive and negative schemas and their theoretical links with core emotional needs that were met and not met respectively. As a result, there was some degree of ‘mirroring’ between the positive and negative schema items. Some involved straightforward transpositions from negative to positive while others were more complex. A six-point Likert-type scale was used with scores ranging from 1 (*Completely untrue of me*) to 6 (*Describes me perfectly*). This resulted in an initial pool of 95 items designed to measure the 18 positive schemas that were theoretical counterparts to the 18 negative schemas in the YSQ-S3.

Samples

There were five different non-clinical English speaking community samples used in this study. Four of them were drawn from four major cities in Southeast Asia and South Asia: Manila (Philippines), Bangalore (India), Singapore, and Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia). The fifth sample was drawn from populations in three cities in the Eastern part of the United States (heretofore referred to as “USA East”): Fairfax and Stafford located in Northern Virginia, and Manchester in New Hampshire. The host organization and the stakeholders of this research in each city are global affiliates of a Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) international charity headquartered in the USA. The objectives of this research have been made clear to the NGOs in each of the five cities ahead of time. Ethical considerations were in line with standards advocated

by the British Psychological Society; approval was given by the respective ethics committee of each NGO and by the Stirling Management School ethics committee. Information such as the purpose of the research, the voluntary nature of their involvement, signing of a consent form, the estimated amount of the time required to complete the questionnaires and confidentiality of information were disseminated to all participants via email, by distribution of hard copies as well as on-line invitations through advertisements in their websites. Invitations to take part were also sent to all other types of organizations in these cities with a snow-ball sampling procedure whereby volunteers were encouraged to reach out to friends, and, as a result, samples were drawn from populations comprising professionals, students, and parents. As an incentive for participation, workshops on the effects of past parenting behavior and the development of schemas were conducted without charge. In Singapore, where this workshop was previously conducted, the participants were given a free copy of the first author's book on parenting as an incentive for completing the questionnaires. No volunteers from this NGO in any city were excluded because of race, color or religion. The only type of participants that were excluded were those below 18 years of age and those who did not have an adequate command of the English language. Sufficient grasp of the English language was determined by both polling members of the respective groups and the head investigators familiarity with the leaders of these respective groups and their familiarity with the members of the respective NGOs. India, Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore rely heavily on the use of English beginning at the primary school levels (see supplemental material, Appendix B). It was therefore not difficult to find a sizeable number of English-speaking community volunteers from their respective affiliated NGOs. We chose a Southeast Asian sample and a South Asia sample, both from developing countries, for analysis in Phase 1 for variability in sample make up (For detailed differences of

these populations see supplemental Appendix B) and another Southeast Asian sample from a developed country in Phase 2 (Singapore). This was judged preferable to two Southeast Asian samples in Phase 1. We also chose another Eastern (Kuala Lumpur) and Western (USA East) sample for Phase 3 to test for invariance between Western and Eastern samples. Table 1 contains participant demographic details. The mean age for the Manila sample was 43.47 years ($SD = 17.24$); the mean age of the Bangalore sample was 38.70 years ($SD = 16.19$); the mean age for the Singapore sample was 46.22 years ($SD = 22.34$); the mean age for the Kuala Lumpur sample was 41.40 years ($SD = 17.40$); and the mean age of the USA East sample was 37.85 years ($SD = 13.2$).

Instruments

YSQ-S3. This instrument measures 18 negative schemas. It has a six-point Likert scale that ranges from a score of 1 (*Completely untrue of me*) to a score of 6 (*Describes me perfectly*). Item examples are: “I feel that people will take advantage of me” (Mistrust / Abuse schema) and, “No man/woman I desire could love me once he/she saw my defects” (Defectiveness / Shame schema). It was recently validated in a Korean population (Lee, Choi, Rim, Won, & Lee, 2015) where all 18 schemas were positively correlated with depression and anxiety, which were measured using the subscales of the Symptom Checklist (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1994). In addition, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) supported the factorial structure of the YSQ-S3 in the Korean study. A study in Germany (Kriston, Schäfer, Jacob, Härter, & Hölzel, 2013) also validated the YSQ-S3 in a community as well as a smaller clinical sample. The internal consistency of 17 subscales was $>.70$, except for the Entitlement schema which was $.67$. Factorial reliability was satisfactory ($>.70$) in all subscales except for Entitlement. Factor scale congruence was high (at least $.95$) for 17 subscales. Convergent validity with the SCL-K-9, a

shorter version of the SCL-90-R (Klaghofer & Brähler, 2001; Sereda & Dembitskyi, 2016) was demonstrated with significant positive associations found between symptoms of personality disorder measured by The Standardized Assessment of Personality (Moran et al., 2003) and all the schemas except for Unrelenting Standards. A recent study validating the YSQ-S3 found that all the YSQ-S3 subscales had satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha > .7$; Bach, Simonsen, Christoffersen, & Kriston, 2017). It was expected that the construct validity of the final YPSQ subscales would be demonstrated through negative correlations with their respective counterparts in the YSQ-S3.

The Mini International Personality Item Pool (Mini-IPIP). The Mini-IPIP is a 20-item short form of its 50-item longer version, and measures the Big Five personality traits (Agreeableness, “Sympathize with others’ feelings”; Conscientiousness, “Get chores done right away”; Extraversion, “Am the life of the party”; Intellectual Openness, “Have a vivid imagination”; and Neuroticism, “Have frequent mood swings”). Items are measured on a five-point Likert scale that ranges from a score of 1 (*very inaccurate*) to a score of 5 (*very accurate*). The Mini-IPIP has been found to have high test-retest correlations in the short term (.62 to .87) and long term (.68 to .86; Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006; Linley & Stoker, 2012). As a demonstration of convergent validity, it is expected that the YPSQ subscales will show positive correlations with positive traits like conscientiousness and negative association with traits like neuroticism (Young et al., 2003). This expectation was supported by Thimm (2010) who found positive associations between negative schemas and negative personality traits like neuroticism since such traits are often represented by maladaptive coping styles used to avoid activation of negative schemas.

The Gratitude Questionnaire–6 (GQ-6). The GQ-6 with six-items measures the

disposition to experience gratitude using a Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to a score of 7 (*strongly agree*). An item example is, “When I look at the world, I don’t see much to be grateful for”. The GQ-6 scale correlated significantly and negatively with several measures of impaired sleep quality ($r = -.11$ to $-.29$), positively with pre-sleep cognitions ($r = .21$; Wood, Joseph, Lloyd, & Atkins, 2009) and other measures of well-being (Wood et al., 2010). The YPSQ subscales were therefore expected to correlate positively with this measure as evidence for convergent validity.

Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Subscales (DASS-21). The DASS-21 contains 21 items with three subscales of emotional distress: Depression, “I couldn’t seem to experience any positive feeling at all”; Anxiety, “I experienced trembling (e.g. in the hands)”; and Stress, “I found it hard to wind down”. Responses are measured on a four-point Likert scale, from 0 (*did not apply to me at all*) to 4 (*applied to me very much or most of the time*). Antony et al. (1998) has demonstrated that the instrument has high concurrent validity ($r > .50$) with the Beck Depression Inventory, Beck Anxiety Inventory (Beck et al., 1987) and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory -Trait version (Spielberger et al., 1983). Convergent validity was expected with the YPSQ since past studies (Thimm, 2010) revealed that EMSs correlated positively with depression and anxiety, with low to moderate effect sizes ($r = .10$ to $.50$).

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS). The SWLS (Pavot & Diener, 2008) is a short five-item instrument designed to measure life satisfaction. Each item uses a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Item example, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) reported a two month test-retest stability coefficient of .82, and a strong negative correlation with the Beck Depression Inventory (Blais,

Vallerand, Pelletier, & Briere, 1989). As evidence for convergent validity the YPSQ subscales were expected to show positive associations with this scale.

Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ). The HSQ consists of 32 items, each of which is a self-descriptive statement about particular uses of humor (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray, & Weir, 2003). Each item uses a seven-point Likert scale response format that ranges from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*). The two positively related subscales are Affiliative and Self-Enhancing. The latter involves the use of humor to amuse others and strengthen one's relationship with them (e.g. "I laugh and joke a lot with my closest friends"). The latter involves the use of humor to cope with stress and maintain a humorous outlook during times of difficulty (e.g. "If I am feeling depressed, I can usually cheer myself up with humor"). The two negatively related ones are Aggressive and Self Defeating. The former involves the use of sarcastic, or disparaging humor (e.g. "When telling jokes or saying funny things, I am usually not very concerned about how other people are taking it"). The latter involves the use of humor for self-disparagement (e.g. "I will often get carried away in putting myself down if it makes my family or friends laugh"). Statistically significant and moderately strong correlations were found between HSQ subscales and measures of depression, anxiety, hostility, aggression, self-esteem, optimism, and the Ryff's well-being scale (which consists of six subscales—positive relationships with others, autonomy, personal growth, environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance; Van Dierendonck, 2004). The HSQ scale was chosen as a more distal measure of functioning in everyday life that has previously been linked to well-being (Martin et al., 2003) and so it was expected that the YPSQ subscales would correlate positively and negatively with the positive and negative related subscales of the HSQ respectively as evidence of convergent validity.

Procedures and Statistical Analyses

This study was divided into Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3. In Phase 1, data from the Manila and Bangalore samples was used for an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) through principal axis factoring (PAF) with promax rotation of the initial 95-item pool. The results were used to develop a shorter item pool. In Phase 2, data from the Singapore sample was used for an EFA for further scale refinement of this shorter item pool. For samples in Phase 1 and Phase 2, Horn's (1965) Parallel Analysis (PA) was used to determine the number of factors to be extracted from each sample. Finally, in Phase 3, data from an Eastern Kuala Lumpur sample as well as a Western USA East sample was used for a CFA of the final version of the YPSQ.

We used IBM SPSS Statistics 23 (IBM Corp, 2015) and *MPlus* 8 software (Muthén & Muthén, 2017) to conduct all analyses. Participants with more than 10% missing data were removed. Missing data analysis was initially carried out using Little's Missing Completely at Random (MCAR; Little, 1988) test to see if missing patterns were at random on samples from all five cities. Three methods to tackle the impact of missing data on analysis were carried out: (1) "Exclude case pairwise" feature in SPSS, (2) replacing missing data with the mean value of a particular variable for that sample, and (3) Multiple Imputation (MI). As a robustness check, these three methods were employed to investigate the effects of missing data on the EFA on one of the five samples and the results did not change. As a result mean values were used to impute missing data values. Distribution of normality was examined through inspecting values of kurtosis and skewness although both CFA and EFA appear to be robust against such violations (Floyd & Widaman, 1995) especially if the sample size is large (200+; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012), which was the case here for all the five samples.

The psychometric refinement process began by testing the reliability and stability of the

factor structure of the initial item pool using EFA on two separate independent community samples in Phase 1 to see whether the same structure emerged. Multiple samples were used at this point for item selection, refinement, and confirmation, in order to ensure that the results were not unduly influenced by the characteristics of a single sample. This was preferable to CFA at this stage as we had no firm hypotheses about the number of factors to emerge. CFA might show a well-fitting model, but not necessarily the best fitting one that would have been suggested by a more exploratory analysis. For the EFAs in Phase 1 and 2, items that did not have a loading higher than .40 were excluded (Floyd & Widaman, 1995), and items that had significant loadings (>.40) on more than one factor were removed. Factors with one or no items would be rejected.

Criteria were established for selecting the most robust items from the two EFAs in Phase 1 for the shorter version of the scale. They were as follows: 1) items that had appeared strongly in both factor structures were given the highest priority and were retained (Arrindell et al., 1999); 2) if a lower loading item did not capture the central theme as clearly as other higher loading items in the same factor then this item would be removed; 3) if a lower loading item was very similar in content to a higher loading item, then the lower loading item would be deemed redundant and removed. A lower loading item would be retained in place of a somewhat higher loading one if it had greater clinical significance and contributed variability in content; 4) if an item appeared under one factor in Manila but in a different factor in Bangalore then the item judged to have captured the construct of the factor more precisely would be chosen instead. Thus we tried to balance statistical rigor with a particular emphasis on clinical meaning and utility and therefore a certain degree of judgment-call was involved in this procedure (Matsunaga, 2010). Intercorrelations between factors were also monitored. Furthermore, we aimed to have three to five robust items per factor in the final YPSQ version as too many items in each factor would

make subsequent CFA analysis difficult (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Since at least three items were expected to be in each factor of the final version of the YPSQ, factors with four or fewer items in Phase 1 inherited at least one new item to maximize the chance of these potentially weaker constructs to be represented in a robust manner in the next EFA in Phase 2. These new items were worded in such a way as to capture their respective constructs more precisely (Martin et al., 2003). The reliability values were tested using Cronbach's alpha values, and according to Nunnally (1978), factors with values of, $\alpha \geq .65$ for newly developed instruments, are acceptable. However, factors in Phase 1 with poor reliability values were not prematurely rejected since it was hoped that the new items added would improve these values in Phase 2. This shorter version of the YPSQ was then subjected to another EFA in Phase 2 using an independent sample to see if the same factor structure would replicate. No new items were developed and there was no item selection process in Phase 2. In Phase 3 both single group CFA and multi-group CFA (MGCFA) were conducted using a weighted least-squares means and variance adjusted estimation (WLSMV) algorithm to take into account the ordered-categorical nature of the response scales (Wirth & Edwards, 2007). These were conducted on two other independent samples from Kuala Lumpur and USA East. The report on the fit of each hypothesized model for the CFA was assessed using two absolute fit indices with values for an excellent fit as recommended by Browne & Cudeck (1993) and Kline (1998); the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA < .05) and the normed chi-square. The latter was derived by dividing the chi-square value by degrees of freedom ($X^2/df < 2$ to 3). One comparative fit index (CFI $\geq .95$) and one non-normed fit index known as the Tucker-Lewis (TLI $\geq .95$) were also used. The following measurements of invariance (Milfont & Fischer, 2010) were used for the two samples: (1) configural invariance (same factor structure across groups); (2) metric invariance (same factor

loadings across groups); (3) scalar invariance (same item intercepts across groups); (4) error invariance (same error variance across groups); (5) factor variance invariance (same factor variance across groups); (6) factor covariance (same factor covariance across groups), and (7) factor mean invariance (same factor mean across groups). If the model lacked an excellent fit and/or if items needed to be removed from factors with too many items (more than 5) in order to produce a more balanced YPSQ scale with three to five items per factor, the “Jackknife” approach of removing items recommended by Larwin and Harvey (2012) would be adopted. This item reduction procedure calls for calculating an estimate of the full model first and then removing one item at a time, starting with factors with the most number of items. Items with the lowest regression weights and/or those with high item-to-item correlation became targets for removal. After removal of items the model was re-estimated and the procedure repeated while observing the progress of the fit indices based on the CFI and RMSEA values under the following conditions when items were removed; 1) the original primary model must correlate with the reduced model at, $r \geq .95$ as recommended by Newcomb, Chou, Bentler, and Huba (1988); 2) each original factor must continue to explain at least three observed variables (Floyd & Widaman, 1995); 3) the structural integrity of the model must not be violated (Bollen, 1989); and 4) a good fit was obtained by the reduced model (Bollen, 1989).

Convergent and construct validity were assessed on the Singapore sample (used in Phase 2) using the IPIP, DASS-21, GQ6, SWLS and HSQ for convergent validity; YSQ-S3 for construct validity. The threshold guidelines for what are considered small ($r = .10$), medium ($r = .30$), and large effect sizes ($r = .50$) were adopted from Cohen (1992). In determining *a priori* what strength correlations would be taken to be acceptable convergent validity and intercorrelation between factors, we were guided by the theoretical belief that positive and

negative schemas are separate but related constructs and thus correlations would be expected to be of medium strength ($r = .30$ to $.50$; Hunsley & Meyer, 2003). A very high correlation (e.g. $|r| > .80$) would be more consistent with constructs being on the same continuum and suggesting a lack of divergent validity. For a formal test of divergent validity, we used the z-test proposed by Steiger (1980) to show that correlations between non-counterparts of subscales in the YPSQ and YSQ-S3 were statistically and significantly lower than correlations with counterparts of both subscales. Finally, incremental validity was conducted using hierarchical multiple regression where a minimum value of $\Delta R^2 = .0225$ (or 2.25%) should be achieved from the second to the third step of a regression analysis (Hunsley & Meyer, 2003) to show that positive schemas would demonstrate sufficient incremental validity in predicting psychopathology, emotional distress, and well-being and other distal measures of functioning, namely trait of gratitude and humor styles, after controlling for gender, age and negative schemas. The predictor variables for each hierarchical multiple regression were entered in the following three steps: (1) gender and age; (2) all negative schemas subscales from the YSQ-S3; and (3) all positive schemas subscales of the final version of the YPSQ.

Results

Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3 Data Analysis

Missing data and normality tests. Removal of participants with more than 10% missing data resulted in the following samples sizes: Manila ($n = 559$), Bangalore ($n = 350$), Singapore ($n = 628$), Kuala Lumpur sample ($n = 229$) and USA East ($n = 214$; Table 1). The percentages of missing values were very low (Manila = 0.97%; Bangalore = 1.11%; Singapore = 0.06%, Kuala Lumpur = 0.07% and USA East = 0.13%). MCAR tests that were carried out in Phase 1 for the Manila sample (Little's MCAR test $X^2 = 147256.51$, $df = 165,555$, $p = 1.000$), and the Bangalore

sample (Little's MCAR test $X^2 = 187.68$, $df = 116,566$, $p = 1.000$) showed that they were MCAR. In Phase 3, results also showed that the Kuala Lumpur sample (Little's MCAR test $X^2 = .000$, $df = 16,494$, $p = 1.000$) and USA East (Little's MCAR test $X^2 = 174.87$, $df = 12020$, $p = 1.000$) were MCAR. However, for the Singapore sample in Phase 2 (Little's MCAR test $X^2 = 50394.75$, $df = 48,588$, $p < .001$) there was a pattern associated with the missing data, a phenomenon which can happen in larger samples. Inspection of skewness and kurtosis values showed departure from normality for some of the data in the samples although both CFA and EFA are robust against such violations since the sample size was large (≥ 200 ; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012).

EFA in Phase 1 on Manila and Bangalore samples. An EFA was conducted on two independent samples as this allowed us to explore common and unique factors across both samples. In both the Manila and Bangalore samples, the KMO (.92 and .86 respectively) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($X^2 = 20,590$, $df = 4,465$, $p < .001$ & $X^2 = 13191$, $df = 4,465$, $p < .001$ respectively) indicated these data were suitable for EFA. PA suggested 19 factors be extracted from the Manila sample (accounting for 43.59% of the variance) and 12 factors from the Bangalore sample (accounting for 37.13% of the variance). Of the 19 Manila factors, seven factors had only one item and were rejected along with another factor with two items. This two-item factor was similar to constructs represented by two other factors. Thus 11 factors were accepted for further analysis. In the Bangalore 12 factor solution there were two factors with only one item each and these were rejected leaving 10 factors for further analysis (see supplemental material, Appendix C, Table C1 for loadings $> .4$, and Tables C3 and C4 for full loadings without cutoff points).

When the EFA from both samples were compared, there were nine common factors with eight factors having at least three items and one factor with only two items (Empathic

Consideration). There were two factors unique to the Manila sample - Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care (3 items), and Self-Directedness (2 items). There was also one factor unique to the Bangalore sample: Stable Attachment (4 items). When combined there were thus 12 factors with 62 items selected for the shorter version in Phase 1 using the established item selection criteria stated in the “Procedures and Statistical Analyses” section (See “Remarks” in supplemental Table C1 for rationale for item removal). Thus more factors resulted from the combined results than if the factor structure was based on either one of the two samples. The stability of these unique factors will be tested in Phase 2 with another independent sample to see if they replicate.

Among these 12 factors there were four factors that had four items or less and so eight new items were generated for these factors to ensure at least three robust items would emerge in the next EFA in Phase 2. These factors were Stable Attachment (one new item added), Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care (one new item added), Self-Directedness (two new items added), Empathic Consideration (four new items). However, the positive schema factor of Realistic Expectation did not appear as a factor in the EFA in Phase 1. Thus four more new items that would better capture this construct were developed, since expert team believed that this factor was highly relevant clinically. In total there were 12 new items (see supplemental Table C1) added to the 62 selected from Phase 1 resulting in a total of 74 items with the aim to further refine the YPSQ in the next EFA in Phase 2. Furthermore, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability values for five out of the 12 subscales were poor ($< .60$), in at least one of the two samples (See Cronbach’s alpha values in supplemental Table C1), which further justified the addition of these new items.

EFA in Phase 2 on Singapore Sample. For the Singapore sample, the KMO of .964 and Bartlett’s test of ($X^2 = 31,902$, $df = 2,701$, $p < .001$) indicated that these data were appropriate for

EFA. PA recommended 15 factors, but the EFA results revealed that the 15th factor did not have any items. However, 11 items from the initial 74 that were initially administered did not emerge since their loadings were less than .40, leaving only 14 factors that consisted of 63 items that emerged from Phase 2. No items were removed, and no new items were developed in Phase 2 and there were no items that cross loaded > .4 in more than one factor. Incidentally, we carried out EFA in *Mplus* using WLSVW and the resultant 15-20 factor model gave the same 14 factor solution as the EFA using SPSS and PA. Two additional factors appeared and were labeled Realistic Expectations (4 items) and Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence (3 items; See supplemental material, Appendix C, Table C2 for loadings > .4, and Table C5 for full loadings without cutoff points). When the EFA results of Phase 1 were compared to that of Phase 2, there was a significant refinement of the YPSQ seen in the following areas; 1) the EFA of the Singapore sample in Phase 2 revealed a 15 factor solution that accounted for 60.66 % of the variance which was higher than the values of both EFAs in Phase 1 (Manila = 43.59%; Bangalore = 37.13%); 2) the Cronbach's reliability values of the YPSQ subscales also improved substantially in Phase 2 in comparison to Phase 1 (compare Cronbach's alpha values from supplemental Table C1 with values in Table C2); 3) the factor loadings for most of the items for the 12 factors that had appeared in Phase 1 were higher in Phase 2. As far as intercorrelation between factors are concerned from the EFAs, both Phase 1 and 2 for all three samples (Manila, Bangalore and Singapore), they were mostly low and moderate in strength, (.10 to .69), indicating absence of overlap between factors (see supplemental material, Appendix D, Tables D1, D2 and D3). The 14 factors with 63 items that emerged from Phase 2 were labeled as (number of items) Emotional Fulfillment (7), Success (5), Empathic Consideration (5), Basic Health and Safety / Optimism (8), Emotional Openness and Spontaneity (4), Self-Compassion

(3), Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self (3), Social Belonging (5), Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline (4), Realistic Expectations (4), Self-Directedness (5), Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care (3), Stable Attachment (4), and Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence (3).

CFA and validation of the final YPSQ in Phase 3. The 14 factor-63 item model obtained from Phase 2 was imbalanced as far as the number of items for each factor was concerned (ranging from three to eight). In Phase 3 CFA analysis, a more balanced factor structure of three to five items per factor were developed, without compromising on the integrity of the model. Using the jackknife approach (Larwin & Harvey, 2012; see “Procedures and Statistical Analyses” section), a total of seven items (marked “✖” in supplemental Table C2) were removed; six, because they had the lowest regression weights of all items in that factor, and one, because it had a high item-to-item correlation (see “Remarks” column in supplemental Table C2). The correlation between this reduced 56-item model with the original 63-item model was, $r = .998$, ($p < .01$), which showed that the integrity of the original model was not compromised. Excellent fit indices for the 14 factor-56 item model were obtained using two independent samples for CFA; Kuala Lumpur, an Eastern sample ($\chi^2 = 2137.13$, $df = 1393$, $\chi^2/df = 1.53$, RMSEA = .048 [0.044, 0.052], CFI = .96, TLI = .96), and USA East, a Western sample ($\chi^2 = 2016.88$, $df = 1393$, $\chi^2/df = 1.45$, RMSEA = .046 [0.041, 0.059], CFI = .96, TLI = .96). Excellent fit indices were also obtained for MGCFA for the reduced 56-item model with these two samples (see Table 2), using the common fit indices used in CFA (Hu & Bentler, 1999; other fit indices recommended by Milfont and Fischer (2010) for MGCFA were not available in *Mplus*). When the Singapore sample was included in the MGCFA, excellent fit was also obtained (see supplemental material, Appendix E, Table E1). Since the 56-item model had a more balanced factor structure, this reduced model was adopted in preference to the original 63-

item model as the final version of the YPSQ (see supplemental Table C2). The reliability values of the 14 factors from the 63-item model were compared with those from the 56-item model for both the Singapore (this was the sample in Phase 2 from which the factor structure was derived from) and Kuala Lumpur samples (The USA East sample was only administered with the 56-item questionnaire). They remained stable with the greatest difference being .036 for the Emotional Fulfillment factor. All were, $\alpha \geq .65$ except for one, with .62 in the Kuala Lumpur sample. These values along with the mean and standard deviations are shown in Table 3.

Convergent, Construct, Divergent, and Incremental Validity

Convergent validity. Correlations between the 14 subscales (56 items) of the final YPSQ and the IPIP, GQ-6, DASS-21, SWLS, HSQ, and YSQ-S3 are shown in Table 4. As hypothesized, most subscales of the YPSQ had moderately high correlations with similar subscales of the IPIP; the IPIP Agreeableness with the YPSQ subscales of Emotional Openness and Spontaneity, and Social Belonging; the IPIP Conscientiousness with the YPSQ subscales of Success, Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline, Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence, Self-Directedness, and Social Belonging; the IPIP Extraversion with the YPSQ subscales of Emotional Openness and Spontaneity, and Social Belonging. Consistent with past studies (Sava, 2009) the IPIP Neuroticism subscale correlated statistically significantly and negatively with many subscales of the YPSQ. As hypothesized, all the YPSQ subscales correlated negatively and significantly with all subscales of DASS-21. The SWLS scale, a measure of overall life satisfaction, correlated statistically significantly and positively with each YPSQ subscale. We hypothesized that the YPSQ subscales would correlate positively with measures of gratitude and the positive related subscales of the HSQ (Self-Enhancing and Affiliative) and negatively with the negative related subscales of the HSQ (Aggressive and Self-Defeating). In all, the YPSQ

subscales demonstrated convergent validity with subscales of the IPIP, DASS-21, SWLS, GQ-6, and HSQ.

Construct and divergent validity. The YPSQ subscales were developed using the YSQ-S3 subscales as their theoretical counterparts, and so for a measure of construct validity we expected to see negative correlations between them. For the 14 YPSQ subscales we can summarize the statistically significant correlations with their hypothesized respective counterparts as follows: Abandonment – Stable Attachment ($r = -.62$); Approval Seeking – Self-Directedness ($r = -.52$); Dependence – Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence ($r = -.60$); Emotional Deprivation – Emotional Fulfillment ($r = -.67$); Emotional Inhibition – Emotional Openness and Spontaneity ($r = -.61$); Enmeshment – Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self ($r = -.62$); Entitlement – Empathic Consideration ($r = -.32$); Failure – Success ($r = -.72$); Insufficient Self-Control – Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline ($r = -.66$); Punitiveness – Self-Compassion ($r = -.48$); Self Sacrifice – Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care ($r = -.22$); Social Isolation – Social Belonging ($r = -.69$); Unrelenting Standards – Realistic Expectations ($r = -.37$); Vulnerability – Basic Health and Safety / Optimism ($r = -.66$). Since there were 18 YSQ-S3 subscales and only 14 YPSQ subscales were validated, four of the YSQ-S3 subscales showed moderately high correlations with other YPSQ subscales. These were Defectiveness – Emotional Fulfillment ($r = -.64$); Mistrust – Stable Attachment ($r = -.46$); Pessimism – Basic Health and Safety / Optimism ($r = -.59$); Subjugation – Success ($r = -.46$).

Support for divergent validity was established through a comparison of the correlations between counterpart and non-counterpart subscales from the positive YPSQ and the negative YSQ-S3 were significant at, $p < .05$ level for 11 YPSQ subscales as shown in supplemental material, Appendix F, Table F1.

Incremental validity. Since scores of YPSQ were not normally distributed WLSMV estimation was used during CFA. However, normality assumption in regression analysis is required for the dependent variable (DV), not for the independent variable (IV) / predictor. In the regression analysis the YPSQ subscales were used as independent variable /predictor (IV). Hair et al. (2010) and Byrne (2010) argued that data can be considered to be normal if skewness is between -2 to +2 and kurtosis is between -7 to +7, which was the case here for the DVs. Further, inspection of the normal Q-Q plot also did not reveal any clear evidence of violation of normality. Using the steps outlined (See “Procedures and Statistical Analyses” section) the YPSQ subscales accounted for an additional 6.4%, 4.6%, 6.9%, 5.7%, and 10.2% respectively of statistically significant variance beyond that accounted for by gender, age and negative schemas (see Table 5). The total model accounted for 33.2%, 35%, 44%, 23.7%, and 41.6% of the variance for IPIP subscales scores of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, intellect, and neuroticism respectively. For gratitude, SWLS, depression, anxiety, stress the YPSQ subscales accounted for an additional 5.7%, 10.5%, 2.6%, 4.0%, and 6.8%, of statistically significant variance after controlling for gender, age and negative schemas subscales. The total model accounted for 31.3%, 39.9%, 49.3%, 41%, and 45.6% of the variance for the scales of gratitude, SWLS and DASS-21 respectively. Finally, for HSQ subscales, the YPSQ subscales accounted for an additional 4.2%, 3.7%, and 11.5% respectively after controlling for gender, age and negative schemas. The total model accounted for 33.1%, 22.1%, and 22.7% of statistically significant variance for the HSQ subscales of affiliative, aggressive and self-enhancing respectively beyond that accounted for by gender, age and negative schemas subscales. Results for one humor subscale of self-defeating did not emerge as statistically significant. The change in R square contributed by positive schemas for all the subscales mentioned above except self-

defeating of the HSQ were above the recommended value of $\Delta R^2 = .0225$ (or 2.25%), thus demonstrating incremental validity for the YPSQ instrument. While the contribution of gender and age was small it was statistically significant in 10 out of the 14 dependent subscales.

Discussion

ST has grown considerably over the past two decades. From 1991 to 1996 there were 11,400 articles and/or books available online; from 1997 to 2002 they were 17,100; from 2003 to 2008 they were 24,500; and in 2015 they were 27,500. The success of ST has in part been due to the fact that patients find negative schemas extremely helpful in making sense of long standing difficulties and how they originated, understanding what keeps them going, and guiding the process of change (Young et al., 2003). The findings and validation of positive schemas from this study will allow for a more balanced approach to the therapeutic process that, in addition to a focus on weakening negative schemas, will also be focused on strengthening positive schemas. To our knowledge this was the first study of its kind on positive schemas in adults. The final version of 14 subscales with 56 items showed good factorial validity, cross-cultural stability and excellent reliability. As hypothesized, the 14 YPSQ subscales showed convergent validity with measures of personality dispositions, emotional distress, positive well-being, humor, and the positive trait of gratitude. Divergent validity was evident from the significantly lower correlations between the 11 subscales of the YPSQ with non-counterpart subscales of the YSQ-S3 than with counterpart subscales except for three YPSQ subscales—Realistic Expectations, Empathic Consideration and Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care. The 14 subscales of the YPSQ also showed construct validity with subscales of the YSQ-S3 where there was a predictive trend between each scale in the YPSQ and its theoretical counterpart in the YSQ-S3, significantly, and in a negative direction. However, the higher correlations between subscales of the YPSQ and

their counterparts in the YSQ-S3 should not be interpreted as the scales being on opposite sides of the same underlying construct. Rather, each scale and its counterpart in both instruments should be viewed in its own right even though they correlated the highest with each other negatively. The assumption held by many that the presence of negative implies the absence of positive construct or vice versa was not supported by the findings of this study. This was evidenced from the moderate strength of the correlations and the test for incremental validity where the 14 positive subscales of the YPSQ added additional significant variance on top of that contributed by gender, age, as well as the 18 negative YSQ-S3 subscales. This additional variance for all but one scale (self-defeating of the HSQ) was statistically significant and above the recommended value for incremental validity of $\Delta R^2 = .0225$ (or 2.25%). These positive 14 subscales therefore contributed in unique ways that the 18 negative ones did not (Keyfitz, Lumley, Hennig, & Dozois, 2013; McArthur, Strother, & Schulte, 2017; Tomlinson, Keyfitz, Rawana, & Lumley, 2016). These results have provided evidence that the YPSQ is a reliable and valid instrument to measure positive schemas in adults. When the subscales of the YSQ-S3 were compared with the newly emerged subscales of the YPSQ, they were not exact parallels. While the initial item pool was developed with 18 counterpart subscales to the YSQ-S3, only 14 were empirically supported in this study. Four negative schema subscales from the YSQ-S3 that did not have a counterpart in the YPSQ shared moderately high correlations with the following subscales of the YPSQ: Defectiveness – Emotional Fulfillment; Mistrust – Stable Attachment; Pessimism – Basic Health and Safety / Optimism; Subjugation – Success. While the factor structure of both scales was similar in that the majority of the scales in the YSQ-S3 had counterparts in the YPSQ, there were also significant differences as four subscales had no counterparts; an outcome consistent with the notion that positive and negative schemas are

separate constructs. The greater number of negative schemas is in line with extensive empirical evidence for a negativity bias reflected in the tendency to attend to, learn from, and use negative information far more than positive information (Vaish, Grossmann, & Woodward, 2008). Since this process has been shown to begin in early development in the context of infant social referencing and other domains, it is likely to play a role in negative schemas being more nuanced and numerous relative to positive. This bias also shows up in the loss aversion phenomenon in which people prefer avoiding losses to acquiring equivalent gains (Boyce, Wood, Banks, Clark & Brown, 2013). The role of this bias in schema development and the therapeutic process will be an important focus for future research.

Limitations

There are limitations in this study that should also be highlighted. First, the incentive to attend a workshop on the effects of past parenting behavior and the development of schemas to draw participants may have attracted those who were more psychologically open and curious, possibly limiting generalizability to individuals with these traits. Secondly, although populations of the samples were drawn from Asian countries where English is taught at primary school levels, they also have their own respective native languages but only the English version of these questionnaires were available and administered to all the participants.

Future Studies and Implications

While development of the negative schema scale from its infancy to its present validated form took place mostly in the West, the development and validation of the first positive schema scale with four samples in the East and one from the West was advantageous in that it provided support for the universality of ST defined schemas, both positive and negative. Future studies on positive schemas should focus more on Western and clinical samples as such cross-cultural

validation of this instrument will only further support this claim. Since most of the samples for this study were drawn from Asia, there were some noteworthy cultural observations. Even though the YPSQ scale is a measure of positive schemas, it also provides a lens into the type of early parenting experienced since the development of schemas have significant links to the ability of early primary caregivers to meet a child's core emotional needs (Lockwood & Perris, 2012). One criticism that has emerged was that many scales are applicable to individualist Western cultures but not to those described as collectivistic, such as in China (Chao, 1994). According to Chao (1994), the high expectations of Chinese parents may be perceived by Western cultures as leading to harmful and authoritarian practices. However, she argues, it takes place in the context of a supportive mother-child relationship. Indeed, the Chinese character "guan" (管) means "to govern", "to love" and "to care for," illustrating the positive connotation of strict parenting in that society. Another example pertains to the notion of enmeshment between parent and child. In an Eastern collectivistic culture a highly enmeshed relationship is not discouraged since it is commonly viewed as healthy and very much part of normal family dynamics, unlike the Western culture. Son preference is another example that is prevalent and accepted as part of a cultural norm in the East but such a practice is likely to compromise the development of positive schemas such as Emotional Fulfillment in daughters. Results from this study in Asia showed that positive schemas such as Realistic Expectations, Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self, and Emotional Fulfillment, which are antitheses to strict expectations, an enmeshed parent-child relationship and son preference respectively, are prevalent in Asia and that these three positive schemas had negative correlations with measures of emotional distress such as Depression, Anxiety, Stress, and the IPIP measure of Neuroticism. These findings support that of other studies done in Asia on the association between healthy family dynamics

and psychological outcomes (Lin & Tsai, 2016), and the commonalities between the East and West from a neurobehavioral perspective (Tsai, Strong & Lin, 2015). Thus such cultural norms seem to interfere with the development of positive schemas through the deprivation of core emotional needs and may inadvertently inflict harm.

Going forward, the newly established and validated YPSQ scale, used in combination with the YSQ-S3, will provide therapists with a set of instruments to measure both patient's positive and negative schemas. The information from the YPSQ and YSQ-S3 scales can be helpful in understanding how best to leverage strengths in working on patients' problems. In addition, this line of investigation can help to elucidate how positive and negative constructs interact and influence adaptive functioning. Having an empirically based method to conceptualize and understand positive schemas can also provide a clearer vision of where one is headed beyond recovery from negative schemas. Correcting for the long standing over focus on negative measures as asserted by PCP (Wood & Tarrrier, 2010) and more fully integrating positive schemas will also lead to a potentially more respectful and effective approach to the initial assessment process with a balanced interest in a patient's strengths and weaknesses.

Future studies on the YPSQ can also focus on whether positive and negative schemas are the driving force behind many personality dispositions such as those represented by the IPIP. From this vantage point, the patterns of personality largely manifested in outward behavior can be seen as expressions of negative schema activation. Having measures of both negative and positive schemas may prove useful in discovering which types of patterns (e.g. schemas or personality as assessed by measures like the IPIP) lie at the core of personality dispositions. In the area of exploring past parenting experiences, a validated YPSQ now provides a balanced exploration of the past with equal attention to positive and negative schemas and formative

experiences. Previously, therapists have tended to emphasize the exploration of negative past experiences and many patients have emerged with a dimmer view of their parents' influence that they might otherwise have had. This balanced perspective can facilitate the development of both forgiveness and gratitude towards early primary caregivers.

References

- Antony, M. M., Bieling, P. J., Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Swinson, R. P. (1998). Psychometric properties of the 42-item and 21-item versions of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales in clinical groups and a community sample. *Psychological Assessment, 10*(2), 176–181.
- Arrindell, W. A., Sanavio, E., Aguilar, G., Sica, C., Hatzichristou, C., Eisemann, M., ... Ende, J. (1999). The development of a short form of the EMBU: Its appraisal with students in Greece, Guatemala, Hungary and Italy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*, 613–628.
- Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. O. (2006). Robust chi square difference testing with mean and variance adjusted test statistics. *Mplus Web Notes, No. 10*.
- Bach, B., Simonsen, E., Christoffersen, P., & Kriston, L. (2017). The Young Schema Questionnaire 3 Short Form (YSQ-S3): Psychometric properties and association with personality disorders in a Danish mixed sample. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 33*, 134–143.
- Bamelis, L. L., Evers, S. M., Spinhoven, P., & Arntz, A. (2014). Results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial of the clinical effectiveness of ST for personality disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 171*(3), 305–322.
- Baranoff, J., Oei, T. P. S., Cho, S. H., & Kwon, S. M. (2006). Factor structure and internal consistency of the Young Schema Questionnaire (Short Form) in Korea and Australian samples. *Journal of Affective Disorders 93*, 133-140.
- Bartlett, M. (1937). Properties of Sufficiency and Statistical Tests. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, *Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 160*(901), 268-282.
- Beck, A. T., Brown, G., Steer, R. A., Eidelson, J., & Riskind, J. H. (1987). Differentiating anxiety

- and depression: A test of the cognitive content-specificity hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 96*(3), 179–183.
- Blais, M. R., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Briere, N. M. (1989). L'Echelle de satisfaction de vie: Validation Canadienne-Francaise du "Satisfaction With Life Scale" [French-Canadian Validation of the Satisfaction With Life Scale]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 21*, 210–223.
- Bollen K. A. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Wiley.
- Boyce, C. J., Wood, A. M., Banks, J., Clark, A. E., & Brown, G. D. (2013). Money, Well-Being, and Loss Aversion Does an Income Loss Have a Greater Effect on Well-Being Than an Equivalent Income Gain?. *Psychological Science, 24*(12), 2557–2562.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In Bollen, K. A. & Long, J. S. [Eds.] *Testing structural equation models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 136–162.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cecero, J. J., Nelson, J. D., & Gillie, J. M. (2004). Tools and tenets of ST: Toward the construct validity of the Early Maladaptive Schema Questionnaire-Research Version (EMSQ-R). *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 11*, 344–357.
- Chao, R. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65*, 1111–1119.
- Cui, L., Lin, W., & Oei T., (2011). Factor structure and psychometric properties of the Young Schema Questionnaire (Short Form) in undergraduate students. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 9*, 645–655.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1994). *Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R®)*. Pearson: Clinical

Psychology. Pearson Education, Inc.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71–75.

Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The Mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 192–203.

Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 286–299.

Free, M. L. (2007). *Cognitive therapy in groups: guidelines and resources for practice*. Wiley.

Geraghty, A. W. A., Wood, A. M., & Hyland, M. E. (2010). Dissociating the facets of hope: Agency and pathways predict dropout from unguided self-help therapy in opposite directions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 155–158.

Giesen-Bloo, J., van Dyck, R., Spinhoven, P., van Tilburg, W., Dirksen, C., van Asselt, T., ... Arntz A. (2006). Outpatient psychotherapy for borderline personality disorder: randomized trial of schema-focused therapy vs. transference-focused psychotherapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63(6), 649–658

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hawke, L. D., Provencher, M. D., & Parikh, S. V. (2013). ST for bipolar disorder: A conceptual model and future directions, *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 148, 118–122.

Held, B. S. (2016). Why clinical psychology should not go “positive” – and/or “negative”. In A. M. Wood, & J. Johnson (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Positive Clinical Psychology* (pp. 31–45). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

- Hoffart, A., Sexton, H., Hedley, L. M., Wang, C. E., Holthe, H., Haugum, J. A., ... Holte, A. (2005). The Structure of maladaptive schemas: A Confirmatory factor analysis and a psychometric evaluation of factor-derived scales. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 29(6), 627–644.
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30, 179–185.
- Hunsley, J., & Meyer, G. J. (2003). The incremental validity of psychological testing and assessment: Conceptual, methodological, and statistical issues. *Psychological Assessment*, 15(4), 446–455.
- IBM Corp. (2015). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 23.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Johnson, J., & Wood, A. M. (2016). Integrating positive and clinical psychology: Viewing human functioning as continua from positive to negative can benefit clinical assessment, interventions and understandings of resilience. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 1–15.
- Keyfitz, L., Lumley, M. N., Hennig, K., & Dozois, D. J. A. (2013). The role of positive schemas in child psychopathology and resilience. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 37(1), 97–108.
- Klaghofer, R., & Brähler, E., (2001). Konstruktion und Teststatistische Prüfung einer Kurzform der SCL-90-R [Construction and test statistical evaluation of a short version of the SCL-90-R] *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie, Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 49(2), 115–124
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. NY: Guilford Press.
- Kriston, L., Schäfer, J., Jacob, G. A., Härter, M., & Hölzel, L. P. (2013). Reliability and validity of the German version of the Young Schema Questionnaire – Short Form 3 (YSQ-S3). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 29, 205–212.
- Larwin, K., & Harvey, M. (2012). A demonstration of a systematic item-reduction approach using

- structural equation modeling. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 17(8), 1–20.
- Lee, S. J., Choi, Y. H., Rim, H. D., Won, S. H., & Lee, D-W. (2015). Reliability and validity of the Korean Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 in medical students. *Psychiatry Investigation*, 12(3), 295–304.
- Lee, C. W., Taylor, G., & Dunn, J. (1999). Factor structure of the schema questionnaire in a large clinical sample. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 23(4), 441–451.
- Lin, C. Y., & Tsai, M. C. (2016). Effects of Family Context on Adolescents' Psychological Problems: Moderated by Pubertal Timing, and Mediated by Self-Esteem and Interpersonal Relationships. *Applied Research Quality Life*, 11, 907.
- Linley, A., & Stoker, H. (2012). *Technical manual and statistical properties for Realise2*. Coventry, UK: Centre of Applied Positive Psychology.
- Little, R. J. A. (1988). A Test of Missing Completely at Random for Multivariate Data with Missing Values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83(404), 1198-1202.
- Lockwood, G., & Perris, P. (2012). A new look at core emotional needs. In M. van Vreeswijk, J. Broersen, & M. Nadort (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of ST: Theory, research and science* (pp. 41-66). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Louis, J. P., & Louis, K. M. (2015). *Good enough parenting: An in-depth perspective on meeting core emotional needs and avoiding exasperation*. New York: Morgan James Publishing.
- Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the humor styles questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 48–75.
- Matsunaga, M., (2010). How to factor-analyze your data right: Do's, don'ts, and how-to's. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1), 97–110.

- McArthur, B. A., Strother, D., & Schulte, F. (2017). Positive schemas, psychopathology, and quality of life in children with pediatric cancer: A pilot study. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology* 35(3), 362–375.
- Milfont, T. L., & Fischer, R., (2010). Testing measurement invariance across groups: Applications in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1), 111–121.
- Moran, P., Leese, M., Lee, T., Walters, P., Thornicroft, G., & Mann, A. (2003). Standardised Assessment of Personality - abbreviated scale (SAPAS): preliminary validation of a brief screen for personality disorder. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 183, 228–232.
- Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O.(1998-2017). *Mplus User's Guide. Eight Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nadort, M., Arntz, A., Smith J. H., Giesen-Bloo, J., Eikelenboom M., Spinhoven, P., ... van Dyck, R., (2009). Implementation of outpatient ST for borderline personality disorder with versus without crisis support by the therapist outside office hours: A randomized trial. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 47(11), 961–973.
- Newcomb, M. D., Chou, C. C., Bentler, P. M., & Huba, G. J. (1988). Cognitive motivations for drug use among adolescents: Longitudinal tests of gender differences and predictors of change in drug use. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35, 426–438.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3, 137–152.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press and Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2010). Ensuring Positiveness of the Scaled Difference Chi-square Test Statistic. *Psychometrika*, *75*(2), 243–248.
- Sava, F., A. (2009). Maladaptive schemas, irrational beliefs, and their relationship with the five-factor personality model. *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, *9*(2), 135–147.
- Sempertegui, G. A., Karreman, A., Arntz, A., & Bekker M. H. J. (2013). ST for borderline personality disorder: A comprehensive review of its empirical foundations, effectiveness and implementations possibilities. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *33*(3), 426–447.
- Sereda, Y., & Dembitskyi, S. (2016). Validity assessment of the symptom checklist SCL-90-R and shortened versions for the general population in Ukraine. *BMC Psychiatry*, *16*(1), 300.
- Soygüt, G., Karaosmanoğlu, A., & Cakir, Z. (2009). Assessment of early maladaptive schemas: a psychometric study of the Turkish young schema questionnaire-short form-3. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, *20*(1), 75–84.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Statistics Solutions. (2013). Normality [WWW Document]. Retrieved November 8, 2017 from <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/academic-solutions/resources/directory-of-statistical-analyses/normality/>.
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *87*, 245–251.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Taylor, C. D. J., & Arntz, A. (2016). ST. In A. M. Wood, & J. Johnson (Eds.), *The Wiley*

- Handbook of Positive Clinical Psychology* (pp. 461–476). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Thimm, J. C. (2010). Personality and early maladaptive schemas: A five-factor model perspective. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 41*, 373–380.
- Tomlinson, R. M., Keyfitz, L., Rawana, J. S., & Lumley, M. N. (2016). Unique contributions of positive schemas for understanding child and adolescent life satisfaction and subjective happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*.
- Tsai, M. C., Strong, C., & Lin, C. Y. (2015). Effects of pubertal timing on deviant behaviors in Taiwan: A longitudinal analysis of 7th- to 12th-grade adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 42*, 87–97.
- Vaish, A., Grossmann, T., & Woodward, A. (2008). Not all emotions are created equal: The negativity bias in social-emotional development. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(3), 383–403.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2004). The construct validity of Ryff's scales of psychological well-being and its extension with spiritual well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 629–643.
- Waller, G., Meyer, C., & Ohanian, V. (2001). Psychometric properties of the long and short versions of the Young Schema: Core beliefs among bulimic and comparison women. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25*(2), 137–147.
- Wang, C.E., Halvorsen, M., Eisemann, M., & Waterloo, K. (2010). Stability of dysfunctional attitudes and early maladaptive schemas: A 9-year follow-up study of clinically depressed subjects. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 41*, 389–396.
- Wirth, R. J., & Edwards, M. C. (2007). Item Factor Analysis: Current Approaches and Future Directions. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 58–79. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.12.1.58.

- Wood, A., & Johnson, J. (2016). *The wiley handbook on positive clinical psychology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wood, A. M., & Joseph S. (2010). The absence of positive psychological (eudemonic) well-being as a risk factor for depression: A ten year cohort study. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 122*, 213–217.
- Wood, A. M., & Tarrrier, N. (2010). Positive Clinical Psychology: A new vision and strategy for integrated research and practice. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 819–829.
- Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., & Maltby, J. (2008). Gratitude uniquely predicts satisfaction with life: Incremental validity above the domains and facets of the five factor model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 49–54.
- Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., & Maltby, J. (2009). Gratitude predicts psychological well-being above the Big Five facets. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 443–447.
- Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Lloyd, J., & Atkins, S. (2009). Gratitude influences sleep through the mechanism of pre-sleep cognitions. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 66*(1), 43–48.
- Young, J. E., & Brown, G. (1994). Young schema questionnaire (2nd edition). In J. E. Young, *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema focused approach (revised edition)*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- Young, J. E., & Brown, G. (2005). *Young schema questionnaire: Short version 3*. New York: Cognitive Therapy Centre of New York.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. (2003). *ST: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Table 1

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants in the Manila, Bangalore, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, and the USA East Samples

	Categories	Manila Sample for EFA – Phase 1; n (%)	Bangalore Sample for EFA – Phase 1; n (%)	Singapore Sample for EFA – Phase 2; n (%)	Kuala Lumpur Sample for CFA – Phase 3; n (%)	USA East Sample for CFA – Phase 3; n (%)
Gender	Men	245 (42.76)	170 (47.35)	260 (41.20)	83 (35.78)	87 (39.73)
	Women	320 (55.85)	175 (48.75)	371 (58.80)	149 (64.22)	132 (60.27)
	Did not specify	8 (1.40)	14 (3.90)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Age (years)	20-29	41 (7.16)	102 (28.41)	100 (15.85)	42 (18.10)	86 (39.27)
	30-39	231 (40.31)	97 (27.02)	167 (26.47)	81 (34.91)	42 (19.18)
	40-49	245 (42.76)	123 (34.26)	277 (43.90)	90 (38.79)	40 (18.26)
	>= 50	49 (8.55)	20 (5.57)	87 (13.79)	18 (7.79)	51 (23.29)
	Did not specify	7 (1.22)	17 (4.74)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.43)	0 (0.00)
Parenting Status	Non parent	106 (18.50)	84 (23.40)	260 (41.2)	106 (45.69)	N. A.
	Parent	454 (79.23)	226 (62.95)	370 (58.64)	121 (52.16)	N. A.
	Did not specify	13 (2.27)	49 (13.65)	1 (0.16)	5 (2.16)	N. A.
Race	Chinese	2 (0.35)	0 (0.0)	508 (80.51)	205 (88.36)	N. A.
	Indonesian	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.79)	5 (2.16)	N. A.
	Indian	0 (0.0)	332 (92.48)	15 (2.38)	3 (1.29)	N. A.
	Filipino	559 (97.56)	0 (0.0)	91 (14.42)	9 (3.88)	N. A.
	Caucasian / White	1 (0.17)	2 (0.56)	2 (0.32)	2 (0.86)	92 (42.01)
	Black	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	88 (40.18)
	Latino	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	15 (6.85)
	Asian	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	9 (4.11)
	Others	4 (0.70)	12 (3.34)	9 (1.43)	8 (3.45)	13 (5.94)
	Did not specify	7 (1.22)	13 (3.62)	1 (0.16)	0 (0.00)	2 (0.91)
Educational Qualification	Masters Degree & above	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	54 (24.66)
	Postgraduate	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	11 (5.02)
	Bachelors Degree	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	90 (41.10)
	High School	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	45 (20.55)
	Others	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	17 (7.76)
Did not specify	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	N. A.	2 (0.91)	
Nationality	Filipino	559 (97.56)	0 (0.0)	85 (13.47)	9 (3.88)	N. A.
	Singaporean	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	437 (69.26)	2 (0.86)	N. A.
	Malaysian	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	63 (9.98)	210 (90.52)	N. A.
	Indonesian	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	19 (3.01)	7 (3.02)	N. A.
	Indian	0 (0.0)	331 (92.20)	5 (0.79)	1 (0.43)	N. A.
	Others	2 (0.35)	13 (3.62)	21 (3.33)	3 (1.29)	N. A.
	Did not specify	12 (2.09)	15 (4.18)	1 (0.16)	0 (0.00)	N. A.
Total		573 (100)	359 (100)	631 (100)	232 (100)	219 (100)
Respondents with more than 10% missing values		14 (2.44)	9 (2.51)	3 (0.48)	3 (1.29)	5 (2.28)
Final Sample Size		559 (97.56)	350 (97.49)	628 (99.52)	229 (98.71)	214 (97.72)

Note. For each cell, data is presented as *n* (%). For the four Asian samples, participants were not asked about “Educational Qualification”. For the USA East sample, “Parenting Status” and “Nationality” were not asked. “Race” selection was restricted to the most common ones found in the Asian and USA East samples respectively.

Table 2

Fit indices from MGCFA of Measurement and Structural Invariance tests (14 factors and 56 items - WLSMV) for Kuala Lumpur (n = 229), and USA East (n = 214) samples

Model	Number of parameters	χ^2 ($\Delta\chi^2$)*	df (Δ df)*	<i>p</i>	χ^2/df	CFI (Δ CFI)	TLI (Δ TLI)	RMSEA (Δ RMSEA)	Comparison	Decision
Configural invariance	852	4180.69	2786	<0.001	1.50	0.96	0.96	0.048 [0.045, 0.050]	-	Accept
Metric invariance	810	4193.08 (64.08)	2828 (42)	<0.001 (0.016)	1.48	0.96 (-0.001)	0.96 (-0.001)	0.047 [0.044, 0.050] (-0.001)	Configural vs. Metric	Accept
Scalar invariance	601	4429.22 (349.33)	3037 (209)	<0.001 (<0.001)	1.46	0.96 (0.001)	0.96 (-0.003)	0.045 [0.043, 0.048] (-0.002)	Metric vs. Scalar	Accept
Error variance invariance	545	4496.51 (156.88)	3093 (56)	<0.001 (<0.001)	1.45	0.96 (<0.001)	0.96 (<0.001)	0.045 [0.042, 0.048] (<0.001)	Scalar vs. Error	Accept
Factor variance invariance	531	4577.12 (64.85)	3107 (14)	<0.001 (<0.001)	1.47	0.96 (0.002)	0.96 (0.002)	0.046 [0.043, 0.049] (0.001)	Error vs. Factor variance	Accept
Factor covariance invariance	440	4227.89 (149.99)	3198 (91)	<0.001 (<0.001)	1.32	0.97 (-0.012)	0.97 (-0.013)	0.038 [0.035, 0.041] (-0.008)	Factor variance vs. Factor covariance	Accept
Factor mean invariance	426	4313.09 (50.62)	3212 (14)	<0.001 (<0.001)	1.34	0.97 (0.002)	0.97 (0.001)	0.039 [0.036, 0.042] (0.001)	Factor covariance vs. Factor mean	Accept
Acceptance criteria for indices (differences)						>0.95 (<0.01)	>0.95 (<0.01)	<0.06 (<0.015)		

Note. *The chi-square difference test results of nested models using the scaled chi-square (Satorra & Bentler, 2010) are reported as results DIFFTEST command implemented in Mplus (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2006).

Table 3

Reliability Coefficients, Mean, and Standard Deviations for the 14 Factors (no. of items) with 56 items of the final YPSQ in Singapore (n = 628), Kuala Lumpur (n = 229), and USA East (n = 214) samples

Factor Name	Singapore			Kuala Lumpur			USA East		
	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Fulfillment (5)	0.85	4.18	1.03	0.83	4.12	0.98	0.86	4.19	1.19
Success (5)	0.93	3.93	1.14	0.91	3.90	1.06	0.93	4.35	1.17
Empathic Consideration (4)	0.81	4.34	0.89	0.79	4.10	0.89	0.78	4.31	0.87
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism (5)	0.87	3.97	1.06	0.86	3.75	1.02	0.86	3.88	1.14
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity (4)	0.87	4.13	1.06	0.83	4.00	0.98	0.88	4.27	1.14
Self-Compassion (3)	0.81	3.54	1.06	0.83	3.44	1.04	0.84	3.48	1.20
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self (3)	0.78	4.65	1.06	0.62	4.67	0.87	0.71	5.02	1.06
Social Belonging (5)	0.92	3.96	1.06	0.92	3.83	1.02	0.91	3.82	1.12
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline (4)	0.80	3.85	0.99	0.78	3.59	0.93	0.86	3.73	1.15
Realistic Expectations (4)	0.85	4.42	1.04	0.81	4.24	0.96	0.80	3.88	1.11
Self-Directedness (4)	0.82	4.11	1.00	0.80	3.92	0.97	0.79	3.94	1.03
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care (3)	0.76	4.25	0.95	0.68	4.15	0.90	0.79	3.99	1.11
Stable Attachment (4)	0.86	4.22	1.08	0.83	3.94	1.08	0.86	4.16	1.18
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence (3)	0.85	4.67	0.97	0.81	4.45	1.02	0.85	4.91	1.02

Table 4

Pearson's Correlation Matrix of final YPSQ and IPIP, GQ-6, DASS-21, SWLS, HSQ, & YSQ-S3 (n = 628, Singapore)

	Stable Attachment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Reliance/Competence	Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration	Success	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Social Belonging	Realistic Expectations	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism
IPIP Agreeableness	.19**	.13**	.18**	.27**	.39**	.18**	.29**	.14**	.13**	.11**	.17**	.32**	.14**	.15**
IPIP Conscientiousness	.26**	.35**	.38**	.28**	.19**	.23**	.23**	.35**	.50**	.20**	.23**	.31**	.29**	.23**
IPIP Extraversion	.16**	.12**	.16**	.28**	.41**	.15**	.05	.27**	.19**	.17**	.24**	.48**	.16**	.15**
IPIP Intellectual Openness	.13**	.12**	.14**	.09	.24**	.05	.05	.26**	.08*	.12**	.20**	.17**	.02	.08*
IPIP Neuroticism	-.45**	-.34**	-.31**	-.33**	-.17**	-.25**	-.31**	-.32**	-.22**	-.30**	-.37**	-.37**	-.36**	-.47**
GQ-6 Gratitude	.34**	.27**	.34**	.47**	.34**	.28**	.28**	.29**	.27**	.20**	.32**	.38**	.26**	.32**
DASS-21 Depression	-.39**	-.37**	-.36**	-.44**	-.30**	-.27**	-.26**	-.40**	-.35**	-.31**	-.33**	-.45**	-.39**	-.45**
DASS-21 Anxiety	-.40**	-.20**	-.33**	-.28**	-.22**	-.27**	-.20**	-.27**	-.14**	-.24**	-.27**	-.30**	-.27**	-.40**
DASS-21 Stress	-.42**	-.36**	-.34**	-.33**	-.26**	-.26**	-.34**	-.34**	-.27**	-.34**	-.37**	-.39**	-.41**	-.48**
SWLS	.41**	.33**	.33**	.54**	.33**	.30**	.21**	.36**	.34**	.28**	.32**	.43**	.30**	.42**
HSQ Affiliative	.19**	.12**	.20**	.26**	.36**	.19**	.06	.23**	.06	.13**	.26**	.37**	.11**	.17**
HSQ Aggressive	-.12**	-.11**	-.11**	-.08*	-.14**	-.10**	-.27**	-.02	-.17**	-.10*	-.05	-.05	-.13**	-.08*
HSQ Self-Defeating	-.16**	-.19**	-.24**	-.14**	-.06	-.17**	-.17**	-.18**	-.17**	-.13**	-.11**	-.09*	-.13**	-.15**
HSQ Self-Enhancing	.19**	.32**	.16**	.21**	.24**	.11**	.14**	.26**	.21**	.24**	.28**	.30**	.21**	.28**
YSQ-S3:														
Abandonment	-.62**	-.47**	-.42**	-.37**	-.19**	-.30**	-.33**	-.35**	-.32**	-.34**	-.29**	-.36**	-.37**	-.42**
Approval-Seeking	-.28**	-.52**	-.24**	-.24**	-.16**	-.12**	-.34**	-.19**	-.34**	-.25**	-.12**	-.28**	-.36**	-.27**
Dependence	-.42**	-.33**	-.60**	-.34**	-.31**	-.41**	-.19**	-.55**	-.39**	-.26**	-.36**	-.37**	-.27**	-.39**
Emotional Deprivation	-.39**	-.24**	-.24**	-.67**	-.34**	-.19**	-.16**	-.27**	-.25**	-.19**	-.28**	-.40**	-.19**	-.27**
Emotional Inhibition	-.26**	-.25**	-.21**	-.35**	-.61**	-.20**	-.19**	-.28**	-.18**	-.27**	-.32**	-.44**	-.32**	-.29**
Enmeshment	-.40**	-.30**	-.44**	-.32**	-.26**	-.62**	-.30**	-.34**	-.25**	-.22**	-.26**	-.27**	-.31**	-.34**
Entitlement	-.12**	-.08*	-.04	-.11**	-.12**	-.07	-.32**	.03	-.11**	-.10*	.00	-.09*	-.17**	-.10*
Failure	-.36**	-.43**	-.41**	-.41**	-.33**	-.24**	-.15**	-.72**	-.44**	-.34**	-.36**	-.47**	-.30**	-.38**
Insufficient Self-Control	-.26**	-.34**	-.32**	-.27**	-.21**	-.22**	-.28**	-.39**	-.66**	-.23**	-.18**	-.31**	-.27**	-.27**
Punitiveness	-.26**	-.25**	-.20**	-.25**	-.25**	-.12**	-.13**	-.28**	-.18**	-.48**	-.20**	-.22**	-.29**	-.32**
Self-Sacrifice	-.08*	-.03	-.01	-.05	-.05	-.07	.11**	-.09*	-.01	-.13**	-.22**	-.03	-.04	-.09*
Social Isolation	-.45**	-.40**	-.34**	-.55**	-.46**	-.24**	-.30**	-.36**	-.36**	-.35**	-.33**	-.69**	-.42**	-.40**
Unrelenting Standards	-.13**	-.15**	.03	-.12**	-.17**	-.03	-.13**	.02	.06	-.33**	-.10*	-.14**	-.37**	-.20**
Vulnerability	-.44**	-.31**	-.41**	-.38**	-.31**	-.27**	-.27**	-.37**	-.31**	-.34**	-.28**	-.33**	-.31**	-.66**
Defectiveness	-.53**	-.48**	-.41**	-.64**	-.45**	-.28**	-.31**	-.45**	-.39**	-.39**	-.36**	-.59**	-.46**	-.44**
Mistrust	-.46**	-.32**	-.29**	-.40**	-.36**	-.22**	-.33**	-.25**	-.22**	-.31**	-.21**	-.38**	-.32**	-.43**
Pessimism	-.43**	-.36**	-.35**	-.36**	-.32**	-.24**	-.25**	-.39**	-.34**	-.41**	-.29**	-.34**	-.34**	-.59**
Subjugation	-.35**	-.41**	-.42**	-.37**	-.34**	-.36**	-.12**	-.46**	-.39**	-.30**	-.38**	-.39**	-.31**	-.36**

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); Values of, $r \geq 0.25$ are in bold; IPIP: International Personality Item Pool (IPIP); GQ-6: Gratitude Questionnaire-6; DASS-21: Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21; SWLS: Satisfaction With Life Scale; HSQ: Humor Styles Questionnaire; YSQ-S3: Young Schema Questionnaire 3 Short Form

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of final YPSQ Predicting IPIP, Gratitude, SWLS, Dass-21, and Humor Subscales (n = 628, Singapore)

	R ²	ΔR ²	ΔF
IPIP Agreeableness			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.013	.013*	4.123
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.269	.256***	11.801
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.332	.064***	4.033
IPIP Conscientiousness			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.041	.041***	13.349
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.304	.263***	12.751
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.350	.046***	3.015
IPIP Extraversion			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.001	.001	.187
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.371	.371***	19.882
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.440	.069***	5.229
IPIP Intellectual Openness			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.038	.038***	12.378
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.180	.142***	5.853
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.237	.057***	3.153
IPIP Neuroticism			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.047	.047***	15.312
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.313	.267***	13.101
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.416	.102***	7.431
Gratitude			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.005	.005	1.417
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.255	.251***	11.364
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.313	.057***	3.542
SWLS			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.009	.009	2.881
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.294	.285***	13.590
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.399	.105***	7.413
DASS-21 Depression			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.046	.046***	15.141
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.467	.420***	26.586
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.493	.026**	2.158
DASS-21 Anxiety			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.031	.031***	9.950
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.367	.336***	17.903
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.410	.043***	3.070
DASS-21 Stress			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.037	.037***	11.945
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.388	.351***	19.308
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.456	.068***	5.311
Humor Affiliative			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.030	.030***	9.688
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.288	.258***	12.221
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.331	.042***	2.687
Humor Aggressive			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.049	.049***	16.069
All Negative Schema's Subscales	.184	.135***	5.567
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.221	.037**	2.035
Humor Self Defeating			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.049	.049***	15.975
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.205	.156***	6.627
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.224	.019	1.039
Humor Self Enhancing			
<i>Step 1: Gender, Age</i>	.007	.007	2.219
<i>Step 2: All Negative Schema's Subscales</i>	.112	.105***	3.974
<i>Step 3: All Positive Schema's Subscales</i>	.227	.115***	6.327

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Supplemental Online Material – Integral

Appendix A

Table A1

Theoretical Links Between Parenting Patterns, Core Emotional Needs, EASs, and EMSs

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Disconnection & Rejection	Mistrust / Abuse	I feel that people will take advantage of me.	Connection & Acceptance	Basic Trust	I usually trust that other people will treat me fairly.
		I feel that I cannot let my guard down in the presence of other people, or else they will intentionally hurt me.			I usually feel relaxed and safe around other people, because I trust that they will not intentionally hurt me.
		It is only a matter of time before someone betrays me.			I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.
		I am quite suspicious of other people's motives.			I usually trust that other people have good motives.
		I'm usually on the lookout for people's ulterior motives.			I usually believe that other people are being honest with me and have good intentions.
Defectiveness / Shame		No man/woman I desire could love me one he/she saw my defects or flaws.		Self-Acceptance / Lovability	I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.
		No one I desire would want to stay close to me if he/she knew the real me.			There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.
		I'm unworthy of the love, attention, and respect of others.			I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.

I feel that I'm not lovable.

I feel that I'm a lovable person.

I am too unacceptable in very basic ways to reveal myself to other people.

I feel confident that, when I open up about myself on a deeper level with people I like, they will accept me as I am.

Emotional Deprivation	<p>I haven't had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, or care deeply about everything that happens to me.</p> <p>I don't have people to give me warmth, holding, and affection.</p> <p>I haven't felt that I am special to someone.</p> <p>I have not had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.</p> <p>I haven't had a strong or wise person to give me sound advice or direction when I'm not sure what to do.</p>	Emotional Fulfillment	<p>Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.</p> <p>In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.</p> <p>For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.</p> <p>For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.</p> <p>I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.</p>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

Table A1 (Continued)

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Disconnection & Rejection (Continued)	Social Isolation / Alienation	<p>I don't fit in.</p> <p>I'm fundamentally different from other people.</p> <p>I don't belong; I'm a loner.</p> <p>I feel alienated from other people.</p> <p>I always feel on the outside of groups.</p>	Connection & Acceptance (Continued)	<p>Social Belonging</p> <p>(Additional Non-extroversion biased Social Belonging Items)</p>	<p>I usually fit in with others.</p> <p>I have a lot in common with other people.</p> <p>I feel a sense of belonging with other people.</p> <p>I generally feel accepted when I'm around other people.</p> <p>I usually feel included in groups.</p> <p>I have all the friends I need or want.</p> <p>I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.</p> <p>I feel as included in groups as I want to be.</p> <p>I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.</p> <p>I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.</p>

Emotional Inhibition	<p>I am too self-conscious to show positive feelings to others (e.g., affection, showing I care).</p> <p>I find it embarrassing to express my feelings to others.</p> <p>I find it hard to be free-spirited and spontaneous around other people.</p> <p>I control myself so much that people think I am unemotional.</p> <p>People see me as uptight emotionally.</p>	Emotional Openness / Spontaneity	<p>I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.</p> <p>I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.</p> <p>With most people I like, it's easy for me to be warm and spontaneous when I feel like doing so.</p> <p>The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.</p> <p>When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.</p>
Failure	<p>Almost nothing I do at work (or school) is as good as other people can do.</p> <p>I'm incompetent when it comes to achievement.</p> <p>Most other people are more capable than I am in areas of work and achievement.</p> <p>I'm not as talented as most people are at their work.</p> <p>I'm not as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).</p>	Success	<p>When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.</p> <p>When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.</p> <p>I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.</p> <p>I'm as talented as most people are at their work.</p> <p>I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).</p>

Table A1 (Continued)

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Impaired Autonomy	Vulnerability to Harm or Illness	I can't seem to escape the feeling that something bad is about to happen.	Healthy Autonomy	Basic Health and Safety	I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.
		I feel that a disaster (natural, criminal, financial, or medical) could strike at any moment.			I generally feel safe and secure -- that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).
		I worry about being physically attacked by people.			I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds – I don't worry that I'll be attacked.
		I worry that I'll lose all my money and become destitute or very poor.			I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.
		I worry that I'm developing a serious illness, even though nothing serious has been diagnosed by a doctor.			I usually feel physically healthy and don't worry about my health, unless a doctor has diagnosed me with a serious medical problem.
	Dependence / Incompetence	I do not feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.		Self-Reliance / Competence	I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.
		I think of myself as a dependent person, when it comes to everyday functioning.			I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.
		I lack common sense.			I have good common sense.
		My judgment cannot be relied upon in everyday situations.			I usually trust my own judgment in everyday situations.
		I don't feel confident about my ability to solve everyday problems that come up.			I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.
	Enmeshment / Undeveloped Self	I have not been able to separate myself from my parent(s), the way other people my age seem to.		Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.
		My parent(s) and I tend to be over-involved in each other's lives and problems.			I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.
		It is very difficult for my parent(s) and me to keep intimate details from each other, without feeling betrayed or guilty.			My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.
		I often feel as if my parent(s) are living through me – that I don't have a life of my own.			I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me – they let me have a life of my own.
		I often feel that I do not have a separate identity from my parent(s) or partner.			I have my own sense of identity, separate from my parent(s) or partner.

Table A1 (Continued)

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Impaired Autonomy (Continued)	Abandonment / Instability	<p>I find myself clinging to people I'm close to, because I'm afraid they'll leave me.</p> <p>I need other people so much that I worry about losing them.</p> <p>I worry that people I feel close to will leave me or abandon me.</p> <p>When someone I care for seems to be pulling away or withdrawing from me, I feel desperate.</p> <p>Sometimes I am so worried about people leaving me that I drive them away.</p>	Healthy Autonomy (Continued)	Stable Attachment	<p>I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.</p> <p>I rarely worry about losing the people I'm close to; I know I can get by on my own if I have to.</p> <p>I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.</p> <p>When I feel someone I care for pulling away from me, I don't panic or feel desperate.</p> <p>I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.</p>
	Subjugation	<p>I think that if I do what I want, I'm only asking for trouble.</p> <p>I feel that I have no choice but to give in to other people's wishes, or else they will retaliate or reject me in some way.</p>		Assertiveness / Self-Expression	<p>When I do what I think is fair, I usually don't worry that it will upset other people.</p> <p>I don't worry that people will retaliate or reject me if I don't give in to their wishes.</p>

In relationships, I let the other person have the upper hand.

I've always let others make choices for me, so I really don't know what I want for myself.

I have a lot of trouble demanding that my rights be respected and that my feelings be taken into account.

In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.

I have generally made my own choices regarding major decisions in my life; I usually know what I want for myself, instead of relying mostly on what other people think I should do.

I usually stand up for my rights when I feel that other people are not taking my feelings into account or are not showing respect for my needs -- in the same way that I try to be considerate of others.

Negativity / Pessimism	<p>Even when things seem to be going well, I feel that it is only temporary.</p> <p>If something good happens, I worry that something bad is likely to follow.</p> <p>You can't be too careful; something will almost always go wrong.</p> <p>No matter how hard I work, I worry that I could be wiped out financially and lose almost everything.</p> <p>I worry that a wrong decision could lead to disaster.</p>	Optimism / Hopefulness	<p>When things are going well in my life, I usually feel happy and optimistic about the future.</p> <p>When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.</p> <p>There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.</p> <p>In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.</p> <p>I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.</p>
------------------------	---	------------------------	---

Table A1 (Continued)

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Impaired Limits	Entitlement / Grandiosity	I have a lot of trouble accepting "no" for an answer when I want something from other people.	Reasonable Limits	Empathic Consideration / Respect for Others	When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.

I'm special and shouldn't have to accept many of the restrictions placed on other people.

I hate to be constrained or kept from doing what I want.

I feel that I shouldn't have to follow the normal rules and conventions other people do.

I feel that what I have to offer is of greater value than the contributions of others.

Insufficient Self-Control / Self-Discipline

I can't seem to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.

If I can't reach a goal, I become easily frustrated and give up.

I have a very difficult time sacrificing immediate gratification to achieve a long-range goal.

I can't force myself to do things I don't enjoy, even when I know it's for my own good.

I have rarely been able to stick to my resolutions.

Approval-Seeking / Recognition-Seeking

Unless I get a lot of attention from others, I feel less important.

If I make remarks at a meeting or am introduced at a gathering, I look forward to recognition and admiration.

Lots of praise and compliments make me feel like a worthwhile person.

Accomplishments are most valuable to me if other people notice them.

Having money and knowing important people make me feel worthwhile.

I feel that I should have to follow the same rules and restrictions as everyone else – I don't expect special treatment.

I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide.

I feel that I should follow most of the normal rules and conventions other people do.

Most of the time, I feel that what other people have to offer is as valuable as my own contribution.

Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline

I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.

If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.

I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.

I'm usually able to get myself to do things I don't enjoy when I know it's for my own good.

I usually stick to my resolutions.

Self-Directedness

I feel that I'm important to people, even when they aren't paying a lot of attention to me.

When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.

I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.

I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.

I feel that I'm a worthwhile person, whether or not I have a lot of money or know important people.

Table A1 (Continued)

Experiences of Child from Unmet Core Emotional Need by Primary Caregiver	Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMSs)	Negative Schema Items (YSQ-S3, 90 Items)	Experiences of Child from Core Emotional Need met by Primary Caregiver	Early Adaptive Schemas (EASs)	Positive Schema Items (Initial Item pool of YPSQ, 95 Items)
Exaggerated Expectations	Unrelenting Standards / Hypercriticalness	I must be the best at most of what I do; I can't accept second best.	Healthy & Realistic Standards	Realistic Expectations	I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.
		I try to do my best; I can't settle for "good enough." I must meet all my responsibilities. I feel there is constant pressure for me to achieve and get things done. I can't let myself off the hook easily or make excuses for my mistakes.			I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough". I'm generally a responsible person, but I'm comfortable letting some things go and not worrying about them. I try to get things done, but I usually leave plenty of time for relaxation and fun, without worrying about the things I didn't have time to finish. When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.
	Punitiveness	If I make a mistake, I deserve to be punished.		Forgiveness / Self-Compassion	If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.
		If I don't try my hardest, I should expect to lose out. If I don't do the job, I should suffer the consequences. It doesn't matter why I make a mistake; when I do something wrong, I should pay the price. I'm a bad person who deserves to be punished.			Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out. Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it. If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad. I feel that I'm basically a good person.
	Self-Sacrifice	I'm the one who usually ends up taking care of the people I'm close to. I am a good person because I think of others more than of myself. I'm so busy doing for the people that I care about, that I have little time for myself. I've always been the one who listens to everyone else's problems. Other people see me as doing too much for others and not enough for myself.		Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	I take care of the people I'm close to, but I'm also comfortable letting them take care of me. I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others. While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too. I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine. Other people see me as doing a lot to help them, but they know that I expect them to take my needs into account too.

Appendix B

An overview of the differences (similarity in the English language as medium of instruction) in religion, history and economy in the countries from Southeast Asia and South Asia, namely Philippines, Malaysian, Singapore, and India, from which the samples were drawn for this study:

- Religion – The religious demographics in these countries are as follows (percentages are for main religions only): India¹ – Hinduism (79.8%), Islam (14.2%), Christianity (2.3%); Singapore² – Buddhism (33.2%), Taoism (10%), None (18.5%), Christianity (18.8%), Islam (14%), and Hinduism (5%); Malaysia³ – Islam (61.3%), Buddhism (19.8%); Christianity (9.2%), and Hinduism (6.3%); Philippines⁴ – *Christians (93%), and Islam (5%)*. All these religions continue to have a profound influence on the populations of these countries in their general philosophy as well as outlook in life. These cultures are also more collective and relationship oriented than Western cultures, value *interdependence over independence* and identify themselves in relation to significant others rather than just themselves⁵.
- Colonial History - The Philippines has been heavily influenced by America and Spain and has made it distinctly more “Western-oriented” in comparison with its neighbors in Southeast Asia⁶. For countries like India, Malaysia and Singapore, the British influence can still be felt strongly in the education and legal systems, and style of government.
- Medium of Instruction - The countries from which the samples were drawn in Asia (India, Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore) have made English a, if not the, medium of instruction in primary schools⁷, and therefore it was not difficult to find English speaking populations in these countries.
- Economic Development - Some parts are completely urban like Singapore, a developed world with one of the highest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in the world.

Malaysia, after Brunei has the third highest income per capita in Southeast Asia and is regarded as a middle income country⁸. India and the Philippines have substantially lower GDP by comparison.

Footnotes

Appendix C

Table C1

Items Selected from EFA in Phase 1 for Development of the Shorter Version of YPSQ (Manila, n = 559; Bangalore, n = 350)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
Emotional Fulfillment					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.69 [.65, .73]	.74 [.69, .78]			
RQA63 / RQSP46 For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.	.71	.67	✓		
RQA1 / RQSP1 Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.	.65	.63	✓		
RQA85 / RQSP63 I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.		.56	✓		
RQA46 / RQSP41 For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.	.55	.44	✓		
RQA208 / RQSP73 In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.		.47	✓		
RQA5 / RQSP4 I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.	.49		✓		
RQA11 I take care of the people I'm close to, but I'm also comfortable letting them take care of me.	.41		✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	
Success					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.84 [.82, .86]	.85 [.83, .87]			
RQA101 / RQSP65 I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).	.80	.72	✓		
RQA150 / RQSP71 I'm as talented as most people are at their work.	.84	.61	✓		
RQA54 / RQSP52 I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.	.67	.77	✓		
RQA6 / RQSP5 When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.	.52	.62	✓		
RQA29 / RQSP25 When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.	.52		✓		
RQA118 / RQSP68 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.	.43	.41	✓		
RQA55 / RQSP62 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.		.63	✓		
RQA53 / RQSP48 I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.		.59	✓		
RQA49 I feel that I'm basically a good person.		.46	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	
RQA7 / RQSP6 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.		.46	✗	Already have enough high loading items. This item was selected under the Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self factor (Manila) as it captured that construct more precisely.	

Table C1 (Continued)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
<u>Empathic Consideration</u>					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.46 [.37, .55]	.48 [.36, .58]			
RQA14 / RQSP17 When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.	.55	.52	✓		
RQA15 / RQSP13 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.	.41		✗	This item was selected under the Healthy Self-Control / Self-discipline (Bangalore) as it captured that construct more precisely.	
RQA13 / RQSP10 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.		.42	✓		
New Item RQSP74 When I have to go along with what others decide and can't do what I want, I can accept it without continuing to try to get my way.					✓
New Item RQSP20 I am usually OK with not getting my way in a group decision.					✓
New Item RQSP36 I respect others wishes even when they are different from mine.					✓
New Item RQSP30 I don't believe I am better or more deserving than others.					✓
<u>Basic Health and Safety / Optimism</u>					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.79 [.76, .81]	.76 [.72, .80]			
RQA56 / RQSP45 I generally feel safe and secure – that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).	.80	.44	✓		
RQA8 / RQSP7 I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.	.48	.62	✓		
RQA91 / RQSP51 I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.	.62		✓		
RQA37 / RQSP33 In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.	.61		✓		
RQA31 / RQSP26 There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.	.43	.72	✓		
RQA23 / RQSP15 When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.	.42		✓		
RQA48 / RQSP43 I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.	.42	.55	✓		
RQA79 / RQSP49 I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds – I don't worry that I'll be attacked.	.71		✓		
RQA92 I try to get things done, but I usually leave plenty of time for relaxation and fun, without worrying about the things I didn't have time to finish.	.41		✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	
RQA47 / RQSP42 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.		.43	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	
RQA3 I usually trust that other people will treat me fairly.		.42	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	

Table C1 (Continued)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.77	.71			
[95% CI]	 [.74, .80]	 [.66, .75]			
RQA138 / RQSP61 When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.	.80	.75	✓		
RQA123 / RQSP69 The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.	.56	.68	✓		
RQA42 / RQSP38 I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.	.83	.55	✓		
RQA12 / RQSP9 I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.	.60		✓		
RQA122 / RQSP55 I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine.		.52	✓		
RQA140 I feel confident that, when I open up about myself on a deeper level with people I like, they will accept me as I am.		.50	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. The above items are also what resonate most strongly in a clinical context.	
RQA107 With most people I like, it's easy for me to be warm and spontaneous when I feel like doing so.		.43	✗	This is very similar in content to RQA138, which captures the theme more clearly as evident by its higher loading.	
Self-Compassion					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.66	.52			
[95% CI]	 [.61, .70]	 [.43, .60]			
RQA18 / RQSP14 If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.	.59		✓		
RQA108 / RQSP59 When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.	.46		✓		
RQA32 / RQSP27 Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it.	.57		✓		
RQA24 / RQSP23 Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out.	.58		✓		
RQA36 / RQSP37 If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad.		.69	✓		
RQA35 / RQSP32 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".		.55	✓		
RQA43 / RQSP39 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.		.42	✗	This item was selected under the Healthy Self-Interest / Self-care (Manila) as it captured that construct more precisely.	

Table C1 (Continued)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.63 [.58, .68]	.50 [.40, .59]			
RQA45 / RQSP40 I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.	.45		✓		
RQA104 / RQSP53 I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me – they let me have a life of my own.		.42	✓		
RQA9 / RQSP8 I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.	.67		✓		
RQA7 / RQSP6 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.	.58		✓		
RQA55 / RQSP62 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.	.47		✗	This was not chosen because it is almost identical in content to RQA7 which had a higher loading, and it cross also loaded (>0.4) with a rejected factor. However, this item also appeared under Success factor in Bangalore, and it captured that construct more precisely.	
RQA78 / RQSP56 My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.		.52	✓		
RQA105 / RQSP58 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.		.46	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. Also, this item was selected under the Healthy Self-Interest / Self-care scale (Manila) as it captured that construct more precisely.	
Social Belonging					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.89 [.88, .91]	.85 [.83, .88]			
RQA88 / RQSP57 I usually feel included in groups.	1.11	.70	✓		
RQA4 / RQSP3 I usually fit in with others.	.65	.46	✓		
RQA144 / RQSP70 I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.	.67	.68	✓		
RQA114 / RQSP67 I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.	.65	.63	✓		
RQA201 / RQSP72 I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.	.54	.50	✓		
RQA67 I feel as included in groups as I want to be.	.84	.48	✗	This is very similar in content to RQA144 and RQA88 which capture the theme more clearly as evident by its higher loading.	
RQA52 I generally feel accepted when I'm around other people.	.63	.41	✗	This is very similar in content to RQA114 which capture the theme more clearly as evident by its higher loading. RQA114 was judged to be less biased towards extraversion and more clinically relevant.	
RQA89 / RQSP64 I feel that I'm a lovable person.	.51	.41	✓	This was chosen because variability of content, and feeling of lovability is often a central clinical theme and would assess a core private experience relative to the more public experience of social belonging that are tapped by the other items.	
RQA19 I have all the friends I need or want.	.49		✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items.	

Table C1 (Continued)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
<u>Social Belonging (Continued)</u>					
RQA27 I feel a sense of belonging with other people.	.47	.58	✗	This is very similar in content to other higher loading items which capture the theme more clearly, as evidenced by their higher loading values.	
RQA87 / RQSP54 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.	.42		✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items.	
RQA3 I usually trust that other people will treat me fairly.	.40		✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items.	
RQA26 I usually feel relaxed and safe around other people, because I trust that they will not intentionally hurt me.		.60	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items.	
<u>Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline</u>					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.66 [.61, .71]	.70 [.64, .74]			
RQA69 / RQSP47 I usually stick to my resolutions.		.62	✓		
RQA15 / RQSP13 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.		.46	✓		
RQA33 / RQSP28 If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.	.68	.56	✓		
RQA39 / RQSP35 I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.	.52	.54	✓		
RQA25 / RQSP24 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.	.56		✓		
RQA28 / RQSP31 There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.	.42		✓		
RQA38 / RQSP34 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.		.53	✗	Did not load as strongly and does not capture the central theme as clearly as the above items. Also, this item was selected under the Self-Directedness scale (Manila) as it captured that construct more precisely.	
<u>Self-Directedness</u>					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.58 [.50, .64]				
RQA47 / RQSP42 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.		.71	✓		
RQA38 / RQSP34 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.	.69		✓		
New Item RQSP12 What I think of myself matters more to me than what others think of me.					✓
New Item RQSP18 I am more focused on doing what matters most than getting people to think well of me.					✓

Table C1 (Continued)

Item	Manila Loading	Bangalore Loading	Items Selected for Shorter version	Remarks	New Items
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.52 [.45, .59]				
RQA106 / RQSP66 While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too.	.74		✓		
RQA43 / RQSP39 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.	.46		✓		
RQA105 / RQSP58 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.	.44		✓		
New Item RQSP19 I am willing to confront someone if I need to so that I don't get taken advantage of.					✓
Stable Attachment					
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]		.74 [.69, .78]			
RQA51 / RQSP44 I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.		.64	✓		
RQA86 / RQSP50 I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.		.50	✓		
RQA2 / RQSP2 I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.		.46	✓		
RQA87 / RQSP54 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.		.60	✓		
New RQSP21 – I know I can depend on the people closest to me to always be there for me.					✓
Realistic Expectations					
New Item RQSP16 I like to do well but don't have to be the best.					✓
New Item RQSP11 I have realistic expectations of myself and usually feel OK about how I am doing.					✓
New Item RQSP22 I work hard and also leave time for relaxation and fun.					✓
New Item RQSP29 I usually get chores done but can let them go at times if something special comes up.					✓
Rejected Two-Item Factor					
RQA110 I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide.	.50		✓	This factor was rejected but the item was selected for the Empathic Consideration factor since it captured that construct well.	
RQA120 I'm usually able to get myself to do things I don't enjoy when I know it's for my own good.	.42			This item was similar to items in Healthy Self-Control-Self Discipline factor.	
Rejected One-Item Factor					
RQA200 I feel that I'm important to people, even when they aren't paying a lot of attention to me.		.49		This factor was rejected because it had only one item.	
Rejected One-Item Factor					
RQA204 I feel that I should follow most of the normal rules and conventions other people do.		.44		This factor was rejected because it had only one item.	
Total Number of Items			62		12

Notes. "Research Question A" (RQA) denotes item from the initial YPSQ item pool subjected to EFA in Phase 1; "Research Question Schema Positive" (RQSP) denotes item selected from Phase 1 for Phase 2 and Phase 3; 95% CI denotes 95% Confidence Interval.

Total number of items selected from EFA in Phase 1 = 62
 Total number of new items = 12
 Total number of items administered for EFA in Phase 2 (Singapore sample) = 74

Table C2

Item Selection for the Final Version of the YPSQ in Phase 3 CFA (Singapore, n = 628)

Items Selected for Shorter version	Singapore Loading (Phase 2)	Items selected for final YPSQ based on CFA (Phase 3)	Remarks
Emotional Fulfillment			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.87		
[95% CI]	 [.86, .89]		
RQA63 / RQSP46 For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.	.94	✓	
RQA1 / RQSP1 Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.	.92	✗	Removed because it had the lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.55)
RQA85 / RQSP63 I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.	.73	✗	Removed because it had the second lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.65)
RQA46 / RQSP41 For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.	.62	✓	
RQA208 / RQSP73 In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.	.55	✓	
RQA5 / RQSP4 I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.	.50	✓	
New Item RQSP21 (Originally constructed for Stable Attachment Scale) – I know I can depend on the people closest to me to always be there for me.	.41	✓	
Success			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.93		
[95% CI]	 [.92, .94]		
RQA101 / RQSP65 I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).	.98	✓	
RQA150 / RQSP71 I'm as talented as most people are at their work.	.91	✓	
RQA54 / RQSP52 I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.	.87	✓	
RQA6 / RQSP5 When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.	.84	✓	
RQA29 / RQSP25 When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.	.62	✓	
RQA118 / RQSP68 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.			
RQA55 / RQSP62 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.			
RQA53 / RQSP48 I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.			

Table C2 (Continued)

Items Selected for Shorter version	Singapore Loading (Phase 2)	Items selected for final YPSQ based on CFA (Phase 3)	Remarks
<u>Empathic Consideration</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.84 [.82, .86]		
New Item RQSP74 – When I have to go along with what others decide and can't do what I want, I can accept it without continuing to try to get my way.	.87	✓	
RQA110 / RQSP60 I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide. (Introduce the weak factor at the end and write comments there)	.72	✗	This item was taken from the rejected two-item factor in Phase 1. In Phase 2, it was removed because it had the lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.67).
New Item RQSP20 – I am usually OK with not getting my way in a group decision.	.72	✓	
RQA14 / RQSP17 When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.	.61	✓	
New Item RQSP36 – I respect others wishes even when they are different from mine.	.61	✓	
RQA13 / RQSP10 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.			
<u>Basic Health and Safety / Optimism</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items [95% CI]	.90 [.88, .91]		
RQA56 / RQSP45 I generally feel safe and secure – that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).	.90	✓	
RQA8 / RQSP7 I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.	.85	✓	
RQA91 / RQSP51 I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.	.71	✓	
RQA37 / RQSP33 In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.	.63	✗	Removed because it had the second lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.73)
RQA31 / RQSP26 There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.	.61	✓	
RQA23 / RQSP15 When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.	.56	✗	Removed because it had a high correlation of 0.6 with item RQSP45
RQA48 / RQSP43 I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.	.50	✓	
RQA79 / RQSP49 I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds – I don't worry that I'll be attacked.	.45	✗	Removed because it had the lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.65)

Table C2 (Continued)

Items Selected for Shorter version	Singapore Loading (Phase 2)	Items selected for final YPSQ based on CFA (Phase 3)	Remarks
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.87		
[95% CI]	 [.86, .89]		
RQA138 / RQSP61 When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.	.90	✓	
RQA123 / RQSP69 The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.	.82	✓	
RQA42 / RQSP38 I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.	.80	✓	
RQA12 / RQSP9 I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.	.76	✓	
RQA122 / RQSP55 I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine.			
Self-Compassion			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.81		
[95% CI]	 [.79, .84]		
RQA18 / RQSP14 If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.	.81	✓	
RQA108 / RQSP59 When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.	.72	✓	
RQA32 / RQSP27 Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it.	.57	✓	
RQA24 / RQSP23 Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out.			
RQA36 / RQSP37 If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad.			
RQA35 / RQSP32 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".			
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.78		
[95% CI]	 [.75, .81]		
RQA45 / RQSP40 I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.	.70	✓	
RQA104 / RQSP53 I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me – they let me have a life of my own.	.70	✓	
RQA9 / RQSP8 I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.	.60	✓	
RQA7 / RQSP6 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.			
RQA78 / RQSP56 My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.			

Table C2 (Continued)

Items Selected for Shorter version	Singapore Loading (Phase 2)	Items selected for final YPSQ based on CFA (Phase 3)	Remarks
<u>Social Belonging</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.92		
[95% CI]	 [.91, .93]		
RQA88 / RQSP57 I usually feel included in groups.	.92	✓	
RQA4 / RQSP3 I usually fit in with others.	.87	✓	
RQA144 / RQSP70 I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.	.71	✓	
RQA114 / RQSP67 I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.	.60	✓	
RQA201 / RQSP72 I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.	.44	✓	
RQA89 / RQSP64 I feel that I'm a lovable person.			
<u>Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.801		
[95% CI]	 [.774, .825]		
RQA69 / RQSP47 I usually stick to my resolutions.	.644	✓	
RQA15 / RQSP13 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.	.622	✓	
RQA33 / RQSP28 If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.	.600	✓	
RQA39 / RQSP35 I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.	.594	✓	
RQA25 / RQSP24 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.			
RQA28 / RQSP31 There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.			
<u>Realistic Expectations</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.854		
[95% CI]	 [.835, .872]		
RQA13 / RQSP10 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.	.716	✓	
New Item RQSP16 - I like to do well but don't have to be the best.	.670	✓	
RQA35 / RQSP32 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".	.652	✓	
New Item RQSP11 - I have realistic expectations of myself and usually feel OK about how I am doing.	.598	✓	
<u>Self-Directedness</u>			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.84		
[95% CI]	 [.82, .86]		
New Item RQSP12 - What I think of myself matters more to me than what others think of me.	.75	✓	
RQA47 / RQSP42 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.	.62	✓	
New Item RQSP18 - I am more focused on doing what matters most than getting people to think well of me.	.57	✓	
RQA38 / RQSP34 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.	.52	✗	Removed because it had the lowest regression weight of all items in this factor (.73)
RQA25 / RQSP24 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.	.48	✓	

Table C2 (Continued)

Items Selected for Shorter version	Singapore Loading (Phase 2)	Items selected for final YPSQ based on CFA (Phase 3)	Remarks
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.76		
[95% CI]	[.72, .79]		
New Item RQSP22 Originally constructed for the Realistic Expectations scale – I work hard and also leave time for relaxation and fun.	.80	✓	
RQA106 / RQSP66 While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too.	.77	✓	
RQA43 / RQSP39 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.	.60	✓	
RQA105 / RQSP58 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.			
Stable Attachment			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.86		
[95% CI]	 [.84, .88]		
RQA51 / RQSP44 I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.	.69	✓	
RQA86 / RQSP50 I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.	.68	✓	
RQA2 / RQSP2 I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.	.55	✓	
RQA87 / RQSP54 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.	.43	✓	
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence			
Cronbach's Alpha Values for all items	.85		
[95% CI]	 [.83, .87]		
RQA55 / RQSP62 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.	.63	✓	
RQA118 / RQSP68 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.	.51	✓	
RQA7 / RQSP6 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.	.45	✓	
	63	56	

Notes. "Research Question A" (RQA) denotes item from the initial YPSQ item pool subjected to EFA in Phase 1; "Research Question Schema Positive" (RQSP) denotes item selected from Phase 1 for Phase 2 and Phase 3; 95% CI denotes 95% Confidence Interval.

Total number of items emerged from EFA in Phase 2	= 63 (Total items administered = 74)
Total number of items removed from CFA in Phase 3	= 7
Total number accepted in final reduced model	= 56

Table C3

Full Factor Loadings of Manila Sample in Phase 1 for Positive Schemas (n = 559), cut off was 0.0

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA88 I usually feel included in groups.	1.11	-.09	-.03	-.13	.00	-.07	.08	-.09	.01	.03	.00	-.14	.02	-.06	.08	.08	.12	.08	-.10
RQA67 I feel as included in groups as I want to be.	.84	.08	-.13	-.16	-.07	.02	.03	.04	-.07	.11	-.08	-.07	-.04	.07	.07	-.03	.10	.06	-.01
RQA144 I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.	.67	.07	-.18	.12	.07	.03	-.10	-.04	.00	.01	-.03	.00	.01	.10	.13	.03	.07	.02	-.05
RQA4 I usually fit in with others.	.65	.09	.03	.02	-.01	-.08	.08	-.05	.06	-.06	-.11	.02	-.04	-.17	-.07	-.08	.03	.07	.06
RQA114 I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.	.65	.08	.05	.05	-.06	.08	-.01	-.09	-.05	.03	-.05	-.04	-.06	.06	.08	-.05	-.12	.00	-.09
RQA52 I generally feel accepted when I'm around other people.	.63	.06	.04	.13	-.12	.02	-.02	-.03	.03	-.04	-.08	.01	-.06	.04	-.17	-.07	.03	-.04	.16
RQA201 I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.	.54	-.11	-.06	.15	.10	-.06	.06	-.04	-.07	-.01	.02	.09	-.03	-.03	.37	.14	-.08	.16	.10
RQA89 I feel that I'm a lovable person.	.51	.12	-.04	.03	-.15	-.02	.06	-.05	.06	.00	-.02	.09	.01	-.09	.03	.10	-.15	.23	.13
RQA19 I have all the friends I need or want.	.49	-.02	.08	.03	.20	.10	.00	.09	-.01	-.05	-.14	.01	.02	-.08	-.03	.10	-.20	.10	-.02
RQA27 I feel a sense of belonging with other people.	.47	-.08	.04	.20	-.04	-.04	.10	.05	.11	-.03	.11	.05	.13	-.05	.03	-.24	.14	.08	-.06
RQA87 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.	.42	-.08	.22	-.14	-.09	.02	.04	.15	-.03	-.07	.09	.01	.10	.11	-.05	.18	-.04	-.05	.04
RQA3 I usually trust that other people will treat me fairly.	.40	.00	.12	-.08	.06	-.05	.01	-.06	-.09	.02	.09	.14	.01	.00	.02	-.16	.03	.01	.07
RQA51 I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.	.30	-.02	.13	-.07	.06	.09	-.19	.27	.06	-.03	.00	-.12	-.17	.08	-.05	-.01	-.08	-.15	.13
RQA150 I'm as talented as most people are at their work.	.03	.84	.00	-.04	-.11	.00	-.12	.13	.08	.04	-.02	.03	-.01	.02	-.05	.07	.01	.00	-.09
RQA101 I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).	-.01	.80	.09	-.07	-.02	.00	-.07	.04	.00	.05	-.01	.12	-.01	.10	-.02	.03	.20	.02	-.08
RQA54 I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.	.07	.67	-.07	.00	-.02	.01	.03	.01	-.08	.03	.13	-.04	-.06	.02	-.06	-.05	.09	-.05	.20
RQA6 When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.	.07	.52	.16	-.05	.12	-.10	.10	.06	-.03	-.21	.08	-.03	-.07	-.01	.00	-.20	.13	.02	.07
RQA29 When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.	.03	.52	.13	-.06	.02	.12	.27	.08	-.20	-.04	.00	-.10	.07	-.01	.05	-.18	.12	.06	.04

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA118 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.	.05	.43	.09	.03	.10	.04	.00	-.06	-.05	.22	.06	.07	-.08	-.13	.02	.17	.01	-.09	.07
RQA102 I usually trust my own judgment in everyday situations.	.02	.40	.12	.06	.29	-.05	-.03	-.03	-.03	.02	.14	-.02	-.05	.18	-.04	.14	.29	-.08	-.01
RQA170 I have good common sense.	.05	.39	-.05	-.03	-.01	.06	.03	-.03	.06	.12	.05	-.05	.01	-.08	.10	.01	-.15	-.11	.12
RQA56 I generally feel safe and secure -- that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).	.06	.06	.80	-.07	-.03	.02	.03	-.08	.01	.00	-.11	-.05	-.06	-.05	-.08	-.05	.09	-.08	.05
RQA79 I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds -- I don't worry that I'll be attacked.	.02	.01	.71	.04	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.12	.01	-.09	-.10	-.14	.07	.21	-.07	-.07	.00	.14	-.20
RQA91 I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.	-.03	.10	.62	.03	.02	.00	.00	-.02	.04	-.03	-.13	-.01	.06	-.20	-.05	.19	-.08	-.02	.01
RQA37 In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.	-.15	.06	.61	-.08	.04	.06	.05	.10	-.06	.11	-.04	-.10	-.19	-.06	.00	-.01	.12	.06	.09
RQA8 I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.	.02	-.06	.48	-.07	.21	.02	.02	-.06	-.10	.01	-.01	.19	-.08	.01	-.04	-.13	-.06	-.04	.09
RQA31 There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.	.04	-.04	.43	-.03	-.03	.20	.08	.04	-.01	.09	-.09	.08	-.17	-.03	.07	-.02	.21	.22	-.04
RQA23 When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.	-.09	.10	.42	.00	.01	.03	-.02	.04	.05	.07	-.03	.00	.00	.04	.14	-.15	-.02	.22	.03
RQA48 I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.	.07	.02	.42	-.02	.01	.13	-.09	-.06	.30	-.06	-.33	.01	-.01	.12	.00	-.11	.01	.00	.18
RQA92 I try to get things done, but I usually leave plenty of time for relaxation and fun, without worrying about the things I didn't have time to finish.	-.04	.01	.41	-.04	-.06	.06	-.16	.01	-.10	.29	-.11	-.02	.31	.00	.00	.11	-.08	.05	-.08
RQA26 I usually feel relaxed and safe around other people, because I trust that they will not intentionally hurt me.	.25	-.04	.31	.07	-.08	-.03	-.10	.04	-.03	.01	.19	.18	-.02	.00	-.02	-.19	.00	.09	-.06

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA42 I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.	.06	-.18	-.12	.83	.12	.05	-.09	.05	-.15	.07	-.10	.06	-.01	.12	-.05	-.10	.17	-.04	.09
RQA138 When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.	-.06	.07	.02	.80	-.05	.03	.03	.02	.08	-.16	-.05	.00	.13	-.08	.02	.02	.01	-.02	.06
RQA12 I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.	.16	-.02	-.08	.60	.10	-.01	.03	.20	-.07	-.04	-.29	.07	-.03	-.03	-.17	-.05	.01	.19	.08
RQA123 The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.	.09	.06	.01	.56	.02	.00	.09	.06	.02	.09	.01	-.01	-.02	-.02	.02	.09	.06	-.04	-.14
RQA2 I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.	.14	-.14	.06	-.26	.16	-.01	-.08	.16	.03	.00	.17	.00	.23	-.06	.21	-.03	.06	-.01	.24
RQA122 I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine.	-.02	.11	.08	.20	.16	-.12	.00	.08	.16	.02	.16	-.19	-.02	.10	.07	.15	.15	.02	-.05
RQA9 I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.	-.06	-.07	-.04	.04	.67	.07	.06	.10	-.03	-.08	-.02	.07	-.04	.02	.06	.02	-.04	-.02	-.07
RQA7 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.	-.05	.11	.04	.04	.58	.00	.07	-.09	-.09	-.12	.11	.01	.00	.03	.06	.07	.12	.06	.19
RQA55 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.	-.11	.06	.00	.09	.47	-.04	.06	-.07	-.06	-.04	-.13	-.01	-.03	.08	.10	.10	-.14	.02	.43
RQA45 I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.	-.04	.03	.07	.07	.45	.09	-.24	-.02	.06	-.07	-.02	.05	.02	.13	.09	-.07	.07	-.29	.03
RQA121 I have generally made my own choices regarding major decisions in my life; I usually know what I want for myself, instead of relying mostly on what other people think I should do.	.00	-.03	.13	.08	.36	-.02	.05	.00	-.08	.25	.00	-.08	.00	-.02	.14	.02	.18	-.10	.14
RQA20 I have my own sense of identity, separate from my parent(s) or partner.	.02	-.03	.07	-.06	.34	-.05	.08	.02	.16	.20	-.15	-.03	-.02	.01	-.09	.07	-.24	-.03	.05
RQA17 When things are going well in my life, I usually feel happy and optimistic about the future.	-.03	.02	.04	-.02	.32	-.02	.16	.17	-.04	.06	.04	-.17	.03	.04	.08	-.05	-.11	.13	.02

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA18 If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.	.03	.08	-.02	.10	.05	.59	.12	-.05	-.01	-.13	-.13	.09	.04	.16	-.04	-.08	-.23	-.02	-.04
RQA24 Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out.	-.08	.02	.15	.05	.10	.58	-.05	.01	-.01	-.02	.32	.03	.12	-.23	-.05	.03	.04	.12	-.11
RQA32 Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it.	-.04	-.05	.03	-.18	.03	.57	.25	.03	-.04	.08	-.21	.03	.03	.11	.06	-.06	-.21	.04	.08
RQA108 When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.	.12	.07	-.04	.11	-.11	.46	-.04	-.12	.03	.08	.03	.08	.14	.02	.03	.14	.03	.03	-.02
RQA36 If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad.	-.01	-.02	.09	.06	.07	.39	.11	-.08	-.02	.00	.15	-.20	.02	-.11	.06	.06	-.10	.12	.14
RQA33 If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.	.16	.01	.10	-.01	.00	.04	.68	-.02	-.07	.03	-.09	.03	-.06	-.04	.05	.05	.18	.07	.00
RQA25 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.	.02	-.10	-.11	.00	.07	.30	.56	-.06	.09	.14	.10	-.04	.15	-.01	.01	-.10	.12	-.13	-.09
RQA39 I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.	-.02	-.01	-.01	-.04	.09	-.04	.52	-.04	.12	-.03	.11	.07	.02	.05	.04	.17	.08	.01	.09
RQA28 There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.	.01	.04	.00	.01	-.03	.06	.42	.12	.03	-.02	.08	-.07	.08	-.01	.03	-.02	-.02	.14	-.04
RQA16 I feel that I'm a worthwhile person, whether or not I have a lot of money or know important people.	.14	.18	.05	.04	.07	.03	.27	.01	.19	-.04	-.02	.05	.04	.01	-.17	.11	-.05	-.02	-.07
RQA63 For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.	-.01	-.01	.00	.25	-.03	.04	-.04	.71	.07	.00	-.10	-.12	-.06	-.09	.24	-.06	.23	.13	-.10
RQA1 Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.	.05	.16	-.13	-.01	.07	-.05	-.08	.65	-.11	.04	-.03	.15	.04	-.08	.03	-.05	.13	.12	-.07
RQA46 For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.	.01	.14	-.18	-.05	-.02	.03	.02	.55	.27	.05	-.12	.03	-.02	-.05	.15	-.16	.03	-.13	.17
RQA5 I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.	.04	-.05	.06	-.02	.13	-.11	.08	.49	.06	.09	-.06	.09	-.05	-.06	-.11	-.04	-.01	-.03	.00

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA11 I take care of the people I'm close to, but I'm also comfortable letting them take care of me.	-.04	.14	-.05	.03	-.01	-.02	.12	.41	-.06	.17	-.07	.02	-.03	.07	-.14	-.07	.01	.11	.01
RQA85 I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.	-.24	-.17	.12	.18	-.26	-.05	.17	.34	-.16	.09	.10	-.01	.06	.03	.02	.12	-.08	-.02	.04
RQA208 In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.	.29	.02	.07	.12	-.16	-.04	.07	.30	.01	-.04	.05	-.05	.01	-.04	.12	.05	-.05	.01	-.02
RQA180 When I do what I think is fair, I usually don't worry that it will upset other people.	.08	.01	.20	.12	-.04	-.10	.04	-.24	.17	.21	.02	-.05	.11	.02	.23	-.08	.10	-.11	.03
RQA47 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.	.06	.04	-.12	-.13	-.02	.01	.00	.07	.71	.06	-.09	.18	-.06	.05	.05	-.04	.10	-.10	-.06
RQA38 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.	-.08	-.06	.09	.01	-.03	-.02	.08	-.07	.69	-.20	.01	.06	-.05	.03	-.04	.14	.06	.09	.09
RQA34 I feel that I should have to follow the same rules and restrictions as everyone else – I don't expect special treatment.	-.05	.01	-.16	-.07	.02	-.04	.25	-.04	.39	-.04	.34	.12	-.17	.12	.05	.12	.14	.05	.02
RQA64 When I feel someone I care for pulling away from me, I don't panic or feel desperate.	.00	-.03	.13	.01	-.12	.08	.00	.09	.28	.04	-.02	.24	.00	-.11	.00	.03	.27	.03	.10
RQA106 While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too.	.00	.02	.05	-.11	-.09	.09	.07	.16	-.07	.74	-.10	.18	.06	.03	.04	.12	.16	-.06	-.08
RQA43 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.	-.02	.15	-.16	.07	.02	.05	-.19	.17	-.09	.46	.17	.08	.09	-.03	-.05	.11	-.11	.04	.21
RQA105 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.	-.11	.10	.08	.00	-.10	-.07	.15	-.05	.04	.44	.00	-.06	.19	.15	.01	-.05	.16	-.17	.06
RQA60 I usually stand up for my rights when I feel that other people are not taking my feelings into account or are not showing respect for my needs -- in the same way that I try to be considerate of others.	.11	-.08	.03	.31	-.07	-.08	-.02	.03	-.07	.38	-.16	-.14	.07	.01	.04	-.13	.09	-.11	.32
RQA107 With most people I like, it's easy for me to be warm and spontaneous when I feel like doing so.	.10	.01	.02	.27	.00	-.05	-.09	-.10	-.03	.37	.05	-.07	.03	.17	-.06	.17	-.08	.05	.14

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA13 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.	.13	-.14	.06	.04	.15	.02	.10	.02	.12	.20	-.04	.16	-.07	.01	-.19	.10	.01	.03	-.05
RQA204 I feel that I should follow most of the normal rules and conventions other people do.	-.05	.10	-.16	-.12	.00	.02	.05	-.07	-.04	-.05	.76	.00	.09	-.08	.13	.17	.15	.06	-.01
RQA35 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".	.05	-.16	.04	-.14	-.04	.17	-.02	.01	.25	.09	.32	-.03	-.22	-.07	.00	.04	.06	.28	.02
RQA86 I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.	.12	-.11	.20	.00	.03	.00	.03	.19	.01	-.22	.22	.04	.15	.20	-.05	.16	.10	-.07	.07
RQA14 When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.	-.01	-.02	-.10	-.03	.03	.09	-.05	.07	.26	.13	-.02	.55	-.05	.06	-.12	.14	.06	.02	-.05
RQA15 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.	-.11	.12	-.16	.12	.12	.00	.26	.06	.16	-.06	-.08	.40	.09	.02	-.01	.10	.17	.03	.07
RQA98 I usually trust that other people have good motives.	.12	.12	.27	.03	-.08	-.02	.00	-.01	-.10	.08	.21	.33	.01	.01	.00	.03	.03	-.08	-.10
RQA185 I usually believe that other people are being honest with me and have good intentions.	.14	-.04	.20	.05	-.02	-.07	-.01	.07	-.03	-.01	.16	.26	-.13	.04	.26	.03	.00	.02	-.04
RQA139 Other people see me as doing a lot to help them, but they know that I expect them to take my needs into account too.	-.02	-.03	-.15	.10	-.06	.13	.13	-.03	-.10	.14	.15	-.02	.58	.06	.13	.13	-.01	.03	.08
RQA21 I rarely worry about losing the people I'm close to; I know I can get by on my own if I have to.	-.12	-.07	.13	.00	.18	.01	-.11	.03	.13	.03	.01	.27	.29	-.08	.08	.06	.10	.22	.08
RQA104 I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me -- they let me have a life of my own.	-.04	.08	-.01	.06	.09	.01	-.01	-.13	.07	.10	-.09	.04	.03	.57	-.02	.04	.05	-.15	.02
RQA78 My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.	.04	-.04	.20	-.16	.00	-.12	.05	.13	.04	.14	-.28	.09	.19	.30	.06	.15	-.09	.19	.04
RQA200 I feel that I'm important to people, even when they aren't paying a lot of attention to me.	.15	-.03	-.09	-.07	.12	.03	.07	.07	.01	.02	.16	-.08	.13	-.03	.51	.03	.05	.11	.09
RQA74 Most of the time, I feel that what other people have to offer is as valuable as my own contribution.	.07	.21	-.15	-.09	.04	.03	-.10	.06	-.02	.01	.08	-.04	.21	.20	.32	.04	.04	.20	.07
RQA110 I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide.	.05	-.03	-.11	.04	-.03	.08	-.01	-.09	.13	.00	.26	.09	.09	.12	.05	.50	-.11	.21	.03

Table C3 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	11	Empathic Consideration	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
RQA120 I'm usually able to get myself to do things I don't enjoy when I know it's for my own good.	.02	.04	-.05	-.11	.22	-.10	.15	-.04	-.04	.25	.09	.14	.10	-.04	.01	.41	-.07	-.10	.03
RQA69 I usually stick to my resolutions.	.00	.18	.05	.12	.04	-.14	.14	.11	.13	.11	.16	.06	-.01	.04	.06	-.12	.64	-.07	-.08
RQA140 I feel confident that, when I open up about myself on a deeper level with people I like, they will accept me as I am.	.19	-.01	.01	.15	.10	.12	-.01	.00	.02	.00	-.10	.07	-.10	.11	.14	.10	-.32	-.11	.00
RQA103 I usually feel physically healthy and don't worry about my health, unless a doctor has diagnosed me with a serious medical problem.	-.04	.14	.25	.05	-.03	.17	.07	-.05	-.08	.10	.12	.08	.03	.21	-.11	.09	.30	-.01	-.06
RQA22 I have a lot in common with other people.	.29	-.01	.07	.01	.03	.11	.02	.08	-.03	-.21	.07	.02	.07	-.09	.15	.09	-.08	.47	.00
RQA49 I feel that I'm basically a good person.	.00	.31	.08	-.03	-.08	.04	-.11	-.13	.16	-.06	.06	-.03	-.01	.01	.07	.09	-.33	.16	.43
RQA53 I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.	.17	.10	-.12	.09	-.06	.05	.02	.15	-.10	.10	.12	-.05	.17	-.04	-.06	.06	-.14	-.01	.32
RQA44 I don't worry that people will retaliate or reject me if I don't give in to their wishes.	-.03	-.07	.10	.18	-.13	.06	.06	-.10	.29	.21	-.07	.08	.06	.07	.01	-.05	.22	-.02	.29
RQA41 I'm generally a responsible person, but I'm comfortable letting some things go and not worrying about them.	-.01	-.02	.07	.14	.15	.16	-.07	-.03	.08	.05	.02	.11	-.01	.00	-.05	-.04	.04	-.01	.17

Table C4

Full Factor Loadings of Bangalore Sample in Phase I for Positive Schemas (n = 350), cut off was 0.0

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Compassion	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Stable Attachment	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration	11	12
RQA88 I usually feel included in groups.	.70	.13	-.05	.06	.07	-.08	-.03	.07	.04	-.02	.08	.04
RQA144 I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.	.68	.04	-.14	.02	-.03	.03	-.08	-.04	-.02	.04	.17	.26
RQA114 I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.	.63	.00	-.01	.02	.02	.09	-.07	-.02	.10	-.04	.04	.15
RQA26 I usually feel relaxed and safe around other people, because I trust that they will not intentionally hurt me.	.60	-.12	.17	-.06	-.14	-.01	.05	.16	-.08	.11	-.08	-.12
RQA27 I feel a sense of belonging with other people.	.58	-.03	.04	.06	-.09	-.03	.09	.07	-.04	.01	-.04	.00
RQA201 I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.	.50	-.05	-.02	.05	.08	-.01	.17	-.01	-.04	.02	.20	.08
RQA67 I feel as included in groups as I want to be.	.48	.11	-.01	.10	.06	-.09	.02	-.07	.05	-.05	.13	.29
RQA4 I usually fit in with others.	.46	.16	.11	-.09	.02	-.02	-.11	-.07	-.09	.20	-.04	-.04
RQA89 I feel that I'm a lovable person.	.41	.29	.00	-.06	.16	.11	-.04	.20	-.14	-.12	-.03	-.12
RQA52 I generally feel accepted when I'm around other people.	.41	.21	-.01	.01	.09	.00	-.07	.10	.18	-.03	-.13	-.02
RQA98 I usually trust that other people have good motives.	.40	-.04	.19	.01	.04	-.14	-.08	.13	.10	-.11	-.03	-.04
RQA12 I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.	.35	-.08	-.11	.12	.11	-.04	.34	-.13	-.01	.08	-.23	.08
RQA22 I have a lot in common with other people.	.35	-.03	.02	-.04	.08	.01	.01	-.08	.15	.12	-.14	.16
RQA19 I have all the friends I need or want.	.35	-.09	.04	.03	.04	.17	.05	.20	.00	-.05	.07	.02
RQA79 I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds – I don't worry that I'll be attacked.	.29	.08	.20	-.17	-.10	-.14	-.10	.07	.27	.15	-.08	.15
RQA54 I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.	-.01	.77	.06	.14	.07	-.03	-.10	-.08	.07	.00	-.02	-.02
RQA101 I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).	-.04	.72	.13	-.02	.00	-.14	-.06	-.07	.21	-.06	-.06	.02
RQA55 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.	-.06	.63	.03	.05	-.10	.13	-.01	.01	-.12	.10	.12	.12
RQA6 When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.	-.02	.62	.03	.12	.03	-.07	-.06	-.11	-.03	.04	.03	.00
RQA150 I'm as talented as most people are at their work.	.05	.61	-.06	-.02	.03	-.02	.07	-.15	.18	.07	.09	.03
RQA53 I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.	.20	.59	-.05	-.10	.09	.10	.03	-.06	-.10	-.17	-.02	-.08
RQA49 I feel that I'm basically a good person.	-.02	.46	.04	-.08	-.01	.23	.11	.19	-.22	-.13	-.01	-.05
RQA7 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.	.06	.46	.15	.13	-.13	.17	-.13	-.04	-.19	.13	.15	-.09
RQA118 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.	.07	.41	.02	.05	-.18	.10	.06	.10	.02	.15	.15	-.13
RQA170 I have good common sense.	-.01	.39	-.02	.01	-.01	-.09	.15	.02	.04	.09	.18	-.05
RQA16 I feel that I'm a worthwhile person, whether or not I have a lot of money or know important people.	.00	.31	.01	.04	-.01	-.02	.10	.10	.16	.21	-.01	.04

Table C4 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Compassion	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Stable Attachment	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration	11	12
RQA29 When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.	.06	.19	.07	.13	.00	.01	-.03	-.01	.04	-.09	-.03	.07
RQA31 There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.	.06	.00	.72	.08	.05	-.05	.04	-.04	-.14	.05	-.04	-.06
RQA8 I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.	.02	.15	.62	-.03	.10	-.01	-.11	.00	-.12	.03	-.03	.13
RQA48 I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.	.01	.05	.55	.16	.12	.12	-.03	-.04	-.10	.07	.07	.04
RQA56 I generally feel safe and secure -- that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).	.08	.09	.44	.06	-.02	-.06	-.08	.18	.00	.04	-.01	.22
RQA47 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.	-.23	.07	.43	.29	.25	-.18	.12	-.02	.10	.10	.11	.11
RQA3 I usually trust that other people will treat me fairly.	.28	.00	.42	-.05	.04	-.13	.11	.12	-.15	.06	-.06	-.04
RQA41 I'm generally a responsible person, but I'm comfortable letting some things go and not worrying about them.	-.02	.03	.39	.15	.02	-.18	.08	-.18	-.07	.24	-.03	-.08
RQA103 I usually feel physically healthy and don't worry about my health, unless a doctor has diagnosed me with a serious medical problem.	.02	.12	.34	-.11	.03	.00	-.04	.06	.01	.08	.14	.15
RQA64 When I feel someone I care for pulling away from me, I don't panic or feel desperate.	.01	.01	.34	.21	.05	-.03	-.10	.02	-.06	.05	.21	.08
RQA21 I rarely worry about losing the people I'm close to; I know I can get by on my own if I have to.	.17	-.14	.33	-.15	-.06	.14	-.14	-.25	.07	.23	.19	-.02
RQA108 When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.	.03	.00	.28	-.19	-.11	.17	.12	-.14	.16	-.11	.09	.10
RQA18 If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.	.05	-.01	.28	.01	-.23	.20	-.06	-.01	.19	-.10	-.07	-.12
RQA69 I usually stick to my resolutions.	.07	.16	.04	.62	-.02	-.10	-.08	.09	-.09	-.11	.06	.04
RQA33 If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.	.07	.30	-.16	.56	-.03	-.13	-.08	.00	.15	.07	-.07	-.08
RQA39 I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.	.07	-.09	.08	.54	-.07	-.02	.15	.05	-.10	.07	-.05	.15
RQA38 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.	-.10	-.21	.25	.53	-.05	.07	-.05	.05	.08	.13	.02	.12
RQA15 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.	.09	.22	-.14	.46	-.01	-.02	.01	.02	-.05	.19	.05	-.02
RQA34 I feel that I should have to follow the same rules and restrictions as everyone else -- I don't expect special treatment.	-.09	.02	.02	.35	.06	-.05	-.03	.04	.08	.33	-.21	.26
RQA44 I don't worry that people will retaliate or reject me if I don't give in to their wishes.	-.14	.08	.21	.31	.04	.08	.02	.14	.11	.06	.17	-.10
RQA63 For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.	.15	-.08	.13	.04	.67	.07	-.11	.06	.06	-.10	.01	.06
RQA1 Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.	.01	-.06	-.03	.00	.63	.07	.02	.12	-.02	-.04	-.02	.15
RQA85 I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.	-.06	-.03	-.02	-.09	.55	.05	.04	.00	-.02	.03	.02	.20
RQA208 In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.	.24	-.16	-.06	.08	.47	-.07	.16	.17	.10	.05	-.04	.11

Table C4 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Compassion	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Stable Attachment	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration	11	12
RQA46 For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.	.13	.19	.26	-.03	.44	-.09	-.05	.00	-.04	-.06	-.06	-.04
RQA110 I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide.	-.02	.08	.13	.03	.36	-.09	.05	-.08	-.11	.12	.20	.31
RQA121 I have generally made my own choices regarding major decisions in my life; I usually know what I want for myself, instead of relying mostly on what other people think I should do.	.08	.30	.01	.03	-.32	-.06	.24	-.06	.18	.10	.16	-.26
RQA5 I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.	.01	.04	.12	-.09	.31	.09	.10	.10	-.05	.06	.10	-.07
RQA11 I take care of the people I'm close to, but I'm also comfortable letting them take care of me.	.07	.14	.07	-.04	.27	.22	.04	-.14	.00	.11	-.23	.04
RQA28 There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.	-.09	.22	.11	-.06	.25	-.04	.19	.12	-.01	-.01	-.17	-.10
RQA36 If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad.	-.01	-.03	-.12	-.04	.05	.69	-.17	.16	.07	-.02	.07	-.01
RQA35 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".	-.11	.04	.06	-.02	.01	.55	-.25	.17	.01	.08	.04	-.09
RQA43 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.	-.13	.10	.11	.01	.15	.42	.13	-.12	.10	-.25	.00	.06
RQA106 While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too.	.00	.14	-.03	-.05	.04	.36	.06	-.03	.15	-.13	.19	-.03
RQA24 Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out.	.15	-.08	.30	-.11	.03	.34	.00	-.05	.00	.03	.11	-.04
RQA25 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.	.05	.07	-.04	.09	.07	.33	.05	.10	.13	.16	.03	-.18
RQA60 I usually stand up for my rights when I feel that other people are not taking my feelings into account or are not showing respect for my needs -- in the same way that I try to be considerate of others.	-.13	.15	-.17	.20	.22	.31	.16	-.07	.04	-.09	.18	-.07
RQA92 I try to get things done, but I usually leave plenty of time for relaxation and fun, without worrying about the things I didn't have time to finish.	-.03	-.07	.14	-.27	.20	.29	-.03	.02	.22	-.05	.03	.02
RQA23 When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.	.19	-.08	.15	-.11	.12	.28	.02	.02	.04	.02	.10	-.07
RQA32 Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it.	.03	-.13	.22	.09	-.20	.28	.17	.07	.15	-.01	-.19	-.10
RQA17 When things are going well in my life, I usually feel happy and optimistic about the future.	.09	.19	-.10	-.08	.14	.27	.06	.02	-.10	.16	-.06	.08
RQA37 In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.	.05	-.07	.22	.15	-.13	.26	.17	.10	-.11	-.04	-.07	.23
RQA138 When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.	.03	-.02	-.09	.03	-.06	-.13	.75	.02	-.05	-.15	.13	-.03
RQA123 The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.	-.09	.08	-.01	-.05	.07	-.05	.68	.12	-.02	-.05	.06	-.06
RQA42 I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.	.16	-.14	.06	.16	.03	-.02	.55	-.09	-.05	-.12	.00	-.18
RQA122 I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine.	-.15	.23	.06	-.22	.06	-.17	.52	.06	.05	.11	.03	-.05
RQA140 I feel confident that, when I open up about myself on a deeper level with people I like, they will accept me as I am.	.12	-.10	.08	.01	.06	-.16	.50	.14	-.10	-.02	.14	.05

Table C4 (Continued)

	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Compassion	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Stable Attachment	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration	11	12
RQA107 With most people I like, it's easy for me to be warm and spontaneous when I feel like doing so.	-.06	.17	-.11	-.14	.03	.08	.43	.09	.06	.02	.03	.17
RQA139 Other people see me as doing a lot to help them, but they know that I expect them to take my needs into account too.	.03	.04	-.05	-.01	.07	.02	.35	-.20	.02	-.34	.07	.28
RQA51 I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.	.06	-.13	-.03	.07	.10	.12	.12	.63	.07	.03	-.06	-.12
RQA87 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.	.20	.02	-.05	.04	.07	-.02	.12	.60	.11	-.09	-.01	-.06
RQA86 I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.	.12	-.04	-.13	-.05	.26	.13	-.10	.50	.29	.12	.12	.04
RQA2 I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.	.09	-.16	.00	.15	-.03	.36	-.10	.46	.06	.12	-.05	-.05
RQA185 I usually believe that other people are being honest with me and have good intentions.	.24	-.05	.07	-.01	.05	-.07	.16	.30	.06	-.06	.09	-.11
RQA91 I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.	.15	.09	.13	.07	-.09	.10	-.02	.27	-.03	-.13	.13	.17
RQA78 My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.	-.05	.03	-.13	-.01	.04	.05	-.10	.18	.52	.13	-.16	-.01
RQA105 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.	.07	.12	-.12	.12	-.05	.04	.03	.00	.46	-.04	.03	.03
RQA104 I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me – they let me have a life of my own.	.08	-.05	-.07	-.05	.03	.16	-.01	.07	.42	.16	.04	.11
RQA102 I usually trust my own judgment in everyday situations.	.08	.29	.08	-.04	-.12	.11	-.07	.00	.37	-.18	-.11	.11
RQA20 I have my own sense of identity, separate from my parent(s) or partner.	.05	.33	-.11	.07	-.15	-.02	.15	.13	.35	.16	-.14	.09
RQA14 When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.	.09	-.02	.18	.19	.02	-.03	-.14	-.03	.12	.52	.02	.01
RQA13 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.	-.06	.14	.04	.22	.02	.20	-.08	-.06	.06	.42	-.21	-.02
RQA9 I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.	-.01	.21	.09	-.03	-.16	-.11	.10	.03	.06	.33	-.02	.17
RQA200 I feel that I'm important to people, even when they aren't paying a lot of attention to me.	.06	.13	.04	-.01	-.01	.09	.07	-.03	-.13	-.12	.49	.02
RQA180 When I do what I think is fair, I usually don't worry that it will upset other people.	-.13	.09	.10	-.05	.00	.00	.20	.11	.15	.00	.32	-.02
RQA120 I'm usually able to get myself to do things I don't enjoy when I know it's for my own good.	.16	-.13	-.06	.06	-.03	.02	.30	.00	-.07	.01	.30	.16
RQA204 I feel that I should follow most of the normal rules and conventions other people do.	.23	-.05	.03	.05	.15	-.16	-.05	-.16	.01	.03	.02	.44
RQA74 Most of the time, I feel that what other people have to offer is as valuable as my own contribution.	-.16	-.06	.01	.08	.20	.15	-.04	.13	.25	-.06	-.06	.36
RQA45 I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.	.00	.08	.17	.09	-.24	.17	.01	.06	.00	-.03	.16	.27

Table C5

Full Factor Loadings of Singapore Sample in Phase 2 for Positive Schemas (n = 628), cut off was 0.0

	Emotional Fulfillment	Success	Empathic Consideration	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Social Belonging	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Realistic Expectations	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Stable Attachment	Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	.15
RQSP46 For the most part, I have had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.	.94	-.07	-.05	-.04	.02	-.02	-.03	-.10	.04	-.07	-.02	.04	.03	.05	.02
RQSP1 Most of the time, I have had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, and care deeply about everything that happens to me.	.92	.00	.01	-.13	-.07	.00	.08	-.10	.07	-.02	-.12	-.16	.06	-.02	-.06
RQSP63 I have usually had someone to be strong for me, and to give me sound advice and direction when I'm not sure what to do.	.73	-.13	.05	.03	.10	.02	.09	.07	.07	-.09	-.10	.00	-.25	.10	-.21
RQSP41 For much of my life, I have felt that I am special to someone.	.62	.04	-.09	.00	-.03	.08	.02	.03	.08	-.03	.08	.12	.01	-.19	.12
RQSP73 In general, people have been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.	.55	-.04	-.01	.11	.15	-.07	-.07	.10	.02	.01	.00	.09	.00	.02	-.13
RQSP4 I'm confident that there is a man/woman I desire who would continue to love me, even if he/she saw my weaknesses.	.50	.12	-.06	-.03	-.02	.05	-.03	.06	-.03	.18	.03	-.18	.26	-.03	.23
RQSP21 I know I can depend on the people closest to me to always be there for me.	.41	-.15	.12	.08	-.02	-.01	-.04	.07	-.17	-.09	.16	.10	.23	.10	.04
RQSP31 There are people I desire who will want to stay close to me when they get to know the real me.	.34	.03	.13	.01	.06	-.08	-.03	-.13	-.04	.20	.00	.04	.14	.12	.10
RQSP48 I'm worthy of love, attention and respect from others.	.30	.24	-.03	.00	.12	-.11	.02	-.11	.03	-.06	.05	.19	.19	.00	.22
RQSP64 I feel that I'm a lovable person.	.27	.14	.05	.02	.13	-.09	.10	.21	.02	.00	-.06	.13	-.02	.04	.13
RQSP65 I'm as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).	.00	.98	.04	-.07	-.03	-.04	.04	-.07	-.03	-.02	-.11	.04	.07	.07	.03
RQSP71 I'm as talented as most people are at their work.	-.10	.91	-.01	-.04	.00	.00	.03	.08	.00	.00	-.03	.03	.03	.03	-.02
RQSP52 I am as capable as most other people in areas of work and achievement.	-.02	.87	.03	.09	.03	.07	.01	-.03	.03	-.05	.00	-.02	-.06	.00	-.04
RQSP5 When it comes to work (or school), I usually do as well as, or better than, other people.	.00	.84	.01	-.05	.03	.01	.02	.07	.04	-.04	-.03	-.15	-.07	.05	.15
RQSP25 When it comes to achievement, I consider myself a competent person.	-.07	.62	-.10	.14	.03	.01	-.06	-.12	.05	-.06	.25	.14	-.05	.04	.06
RQSP74 When I have to go along with what others decide and can't do what I want, I can accept it without continuing to try to get my way.	.02	.11	.87	-.02	.02	.03	.01	.03	-.04	-.07	-.05	-.07	.01	.00	.04
RQSP60 I can accept most situations in which I'm not allowed to do what I want to do and have to go along with what others decide.	.01	-.01	.72	-.01	-.06	.00	.15	.06	-.01	.01	-.16	.02	-.04	.07	-.04
RQSP20 I am usually OK with not getting my way in a group decision.	-.04	-.04	.72	-.12	.03	.10	.03	.01	-.02	-.03	.23	-.04	.02	-.02	-.04
RQSP17 When I ask someone for something and the answer is "no," I'm usually comfortable accepting it without pushing to get my own way.	-.09	.09	.61	-.01	.11	-.07	.09	.00	.01	.07	.15	-.19	.04	-.02	.02
RQSP36 I respect others wishes even when they are different from mine.	.00	.01	.61	-.01	-.06	.02	-.06	.04	.10	-.11	.14	.21	-.06	-.08	.10
RQSP30 I don't believe I am better or more deserving than others.	.09	-.20	.37	.07	.11	.06	-.04	-.18	.14	.11	.05	-.02	-.04	.01	-.14
RQSP45 I generally feel safe and secure -- that nothing bad is going to happen to me (such as serious financial problems, illnesses, strangers hurting me, or catastrophic events).	-.07	-.03	.01	.90	.05	-.03	-.05	-.06	.06	-.06	.02	-.02	.05	.05	.05
RQSP7 I usually feel that I'm not in any danger and that things will be OK.	-.07	-.09	-.04	.85	.07	.07	.03	.00	-.03	-.07	.00	-.14	.03	.20	.11

Table C5 (Continued)

	Emotional Fulfillment	Success	Empathic Consideration	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Social Belonging	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Realistic Expectations	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Stable Attachment	Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	15
RQSP51 I feel confident that I will have enough money to get by in the future and don't worry about losing everything.	.02	.13	-.04	.71	-.04	.02	-.13	.02	.12	.04	-.04	-.06	.09	-.07	-.20
RQSP33 In good economic times, I'm usually optimistic about the future when it comes to my finances; I don't worry any more than most other people I know.	.00	-.03	.01	.63	-.06	.03	-.07	-.01	.15	.33	-.13	-.01	.09	-.16	-.09
RQSP26 There's no need to worry all the time; things generally work out pretty well.	.04	.09	-.04	.61	-.02	.02	.18	-.04	-.07	.06	.19	.04	-.14	-.09	-.05
RQSP15 When something good happens, I can usually enjoy it, without expecting something bad to follow.	-.06	-.05	-.02	.56	.05	.04	.32	.13	.03	-.16	.00	.01	-.07	.07	.21
RQSP43 I'm usually relaxed about making decisions; I don't worry that something terrible will happen if I'm wrong.	-.03	.05	-.05	.50	-.05	-.10	.22	-.01	-.07	-.06	.30	.01	.09	.03	-.07
RQSP49 I usually feel safe when I'm out in public or in crowds – I don't worry that I'll be attacked.	-.01	.00	.04	.45	.11	.00	-.08	-.10	-.01	-.05	-.19	.08	.16	.31	.06
RQSP61 When it comes to showing my emotions, the people I care about see me as capable of being expressive and spontaneous.	.03	.01	.08	.03	.90	-.07	.00	-.01	-.11	-.02	-.06	.00	-.06	.03	-.01
RQSP69 The people who matter to me see me as capable of being open and comfortable showing my emotions.	.04	.12	.07	-.06	.82	-.01	-.11	.00	-.03	.14	-.05	-.05	.04	.02	-.08
RQSP38 I'm usually comfortable expressing my feelings to others when I want to.	-.04	-.08	-.01	.06	.80	-.02	-.01	-.04	.08	-.01	.07	.04	.05	-.18	.00
RQSP9 I'm usually comfortable showing my positive feelings to others (e.g., physical affection, telling people I care about them) when I want to.	.01	.03	-.03	.07	.76	.18	.01	.12	.01	.08	.02	-.24	-.12	-.09	.13
RQSP40 I have been able to establish a life of my own, and am not overly involved with my parent(s) and their problems.	-.14	-.07	.06	.06	.00	.70	.00	.01	.01	.00	-.03	.04	.09	.11	-.03
RQSP53 I don't feel that my parent(s) are trying to live through me – they let me have a life of my own.	.11	.14	.07	.01	-.01	.70	.00	-.08	-.09	-.04	-.01	.06	.02	.00	-.03
RQSP8 I have been able to separate from my parent(s) and become an independent person, as much as most other people my age.	.03	-.04	-.05	-.03	.07	.60	.06	.01	.02	.12	-.03	-.06	-.13	.31	.11
RQSP56 My parent(s) and I have healthy boundaries: we have privacy from each other when we want it, without feeling guilty about not sharing everything.	.17	.02	.05	.04	-.08	.35	-.04	-.02	-.03	-.08	.00	.16	.25	-.05	-.11
RQSP14 If I make a mistake, I can usually forgive myself; I don't feel that I deserve to be punished.	.04	.02	.02	-.09	-.03	.02	.81	-.04	.01	.06	.00	-.08	.15	.00	.19
RQSP59 When I make mistakes, I usually go easy on myself and try to give myself the benefit of the doubt.	.04	.01	.10	-.04	-.08	-.01	.72	.09	.00	.03	-.07	.00	.02	.00	-.03
RQSP27 Even when I fail at something, I don't feel that I should be made to suffer for it.	.05	.03	.09	.21	.02	.01	.57	-.05	.01	.04	-.01	.01	-.06	-.07	-.01
RQSP23 Even when I don't try my hardest, I feel OK about it. I don't expect to lose out.	.04	.03	.03	.02	.05	.04	.39	.02	-.28	.32	.07	.22	-.13	-.04	-.07
RQSP57 I usually feel included in groups.	-.02	-.06	.00	-.01	.00	-.01	.03	.91	.12	-.03	-.09	.03	.07	-.05	-.03
RQSP3 I usually fit in with others.	-.09	.01	.02	.04	.02	.00	.05	.87	.05	-.01	-.11	-.14	.15	-.08	.14
RQSP70 I feel as much a part of groups as I want to be.	.05	.06	-.04	-.10	.04	.00	-.05	.71	.04	.09	.12	.05	-.02	.03	-.07
RQSP67 I generally feel as accepted by others as I want to be when I am around other people.	.02	-.03	.06	-.05	-.06	-.02	-.06	.60	-.03	-.01	.08	.33	.08	.05	.02
RQSP72 I feel as connected as I want to be with other people.	.14	.14	-.04	-.01	.23	-.08	-.07	.44	-.02	.01	.15	.10	-.07	.04	-.08
RQSP47 I usually stick to my resolutions.	.12	.05	-.04	.08	.00	-.04	-.04	.08	.64	-.07	.03	-.03	-.03	.00	-.16
RQSP13 I'm usually able to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.	-.03	.01	.12	-.05	-.08	.09	-.09	.16	.62	.12	.04	-.11	-.03	.09	.07
RQSP28 If I can't reach a goal, I'm usually persistent and don't easily give up.	.02	.09	-.12	.10	.01	-.05	.06	.04	.60	.01	.11	-.07	-.10	.12	-.03

Table C5 (Continued)

	Emotional Fulfillment	Success	Empathic Consideration	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Social Belonging	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Realistic Expectations	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Stable Attachment	Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	15
RQSP35 I'm usually able to sacrifice immediate gratification or pleasure in order to achieve a long-range goal.	.07	-.01	.23	.09	-.03	-.06	.01	.00	.59	-.07	.08	-.05	-.06	.02	.04
RQSP10 I'm usually realistic when it comes to expectations for myself; I don't have to be among the best to be satisfied with what I've done.	-.01	-.05	-.01	-.07	.05	.11	-.05	.03	-.03	.72	.14	.10	-.01	-.02	.09
RQSP16 I like to do well but don't have to be the best.	-.15	-.01	.03	-.05	.11	-.04	.12	-.04	.04	.67	-.08	-.07	.18	.08	-.07
RQSP32 I don't have to be perfect; I can usually accept "good enough".	-.06	-.17	.09	.08	-.01	-.09	.12	.01	-.05	.65	.06	.08	.05	.05	-.02
RQSP11 I have realistic expectations of myself and usually feel OK about how I am doing.	.07	.08	-.10	.02	.00	.04	-.01	.02	.05	.60	.19	.09	-.07	-.01	.08
RQSP12 What I think of myself matters more to me than what others think of me.	-.10	-.03	-.02	.02	.02	-.01	-.04	.00	.01	.06	.75	.08	.04	-.01	.05
RQSP42 I don't need a lot of praise or compliments from others to feel that I'm a worthwhile person.	.17	.01	.09	-.05	-.13	.02	.06	.00	.15	.03	.61	-.15	.12	-.07	-.04
RQSP18 I am more focused on doing what matters most than getting people to think well of me.	-.10	.01	.24	-.01	.07	-.09	-.08	-.08	.08	.04	.57	.00	.13	.10	.05
RQSP34 When I speak up at a meeting or am introduced in a social situation, getting recognition and admiration from others is not that important to me.	-.06	-.04	.38	.03	.00	.00	.01	-.01	.09	.10	.52	-.12	-.04	.02	-.13
RQSP24 I value my own accomplishments even when other people don't notice them.	-.08	.05	.06	.03	-.01	.03	-.06	-.07	.02	.07	.48	.36	-.06	.01	.09
RQSP19 I am willing to confront someone if I need to so that I don't get taken advantage of.	.01	-.04	-.18	-.16	.15	-.02	.16	-.14	.22	-.02	.30	.10	.28	.13	-.11
RQSP22 I work hard and also leave time for relaxation and fun.	.02	-.06	-.03	-.04	-.12	.00	.00	.11	-.09	.06	.09	.80	-.19	.10	.04
RQSP66 While I enjoy doing things for the people I care about, I make sure I have time for myself too.	.01	.09	-.04	-.07	-.06	.04	-.03	-.07	-.09	.06	.01	.77	-.05	.12	-.16
RQSP39 I can be a good person and, at the same time, consider my own needs to be as important as those of others.	-.15	-.10	-.14	-.05	.21	.07	.13	.03	.12	.03	-.03	.60	.16	-.10	.12
RQSP55 I'm most comfortable in relationships where I listen to other people's problems, and they're just as interested in hearing mine.	-.01	-.06	.24	.13	.16	.13	-.11	-.01	-.04	-.10	-.11	.32	.11	.01	-.16
RQSP29 I usually get chores done but can let them go at times if something special comes up.	.08	.06	.17	.08	-.05	-.05	.08	-.08	.22	.22	-.22	.30	-.09	.12	.02
RQSP37 If I do something wrong, but there are good reasons to explain why, I don't think I should be made to feel that I'm bad.	-.03	.09	.11	.05	-.03	-.04	.26	-.03	.13	.10	-.10	.28	.12	-.16	.03
RQSP44 I feel confident that the people I'm close to won't leave or abandon me.	.19	-.04	-.02	.16	-.09	.00	.07	.04	-.09	.01	.16	-.16	.69	-.03	.11
RQSP50 I trust that people won't leave me, so I don't act needy and drive them away.	.01	-.01	.03	.15	-.05	-.04	-.04	.11	-.06	.09	-.02	.00	.68	.05	.07
RQSP2 I don't cling to the people I'm close to because I'm confident that they won't leave me.	.10	.03	.03	.06	-.05	.06	.01	.09	-.03	.12	.05	-.19	.55	-.03	.06
RQSP54 I am confident that most people I know will be loyal and not betray me.	.06	.02	.04	.25	.03	.08	-.03	.16	-.14	-.02	-.05	.03	.43	.03	-.09
RQSP58 In relationships, I usually share control over decisions – I don't automatically give in to the other person.	-.07	-.01	-.10	-.21	.18	.14	.23	.06	.20	-.19	.03	.07	.39	.07	-.12
RQSP62 I think of myself as an independent, self-reliant person, when it comes to everyday functioning.	.03	.11	.07	-.01	-.08	.18	-.03	-.08	.10	.01	.01	.19	-.08	.63	-.01
RQSP68 I feel confident about my ability to solve most everyday problems that come up.	-.02	.13	-.08	.14	-.16	.07	-.02	.10	.12	.11	-.02	.09	.11	.51	-.13
RQSP6 I feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.	.02	.09	-.04	.08	-.06	.19	.01	-.03	.01	.01	.15	-.07	.16	.45	.01

Appendix D

Table D1

Inter-factor correlation for Manila sample in Phase 1 (n= 559)

Factor	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Empathic Consideration
Social Belonging	1.00										
Success	.46	1.00									
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	.61	.40	1.00								
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	.54	.41	.33	1.00							
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	.28	.50	.40	.28	1.00						
Self-Compassion	.31	.15	.37	.13	.14	1.00					
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	.40	.43	.27	.52	.35	.05	1.00				
Emotional Fulfillment	.59	.31	.41	.38	.13	.27	.37	1.00			
Self-Directedness	.42	.39	.46	.41	.47	.38	.39	.23	1.00		
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	.33	.39	.34	.57	.44	.21	.42	.20	.47	1.00	
Empathic Consideration	.28	-.01	.40	.04	.08	.21	.08	.12	.12	-.01	1.00

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization

Table D2

Inter-factor correlation for Bangalore sample in Phase 1 (n= 350)

Factor	Social Belonging	Success	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Emotional Fulfillment	Self-Compassion	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Stable Attachment	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Empathic Consideration
Social Belonging	1.00									
Success	.49	1.00								
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	.47	.42	1.00							
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	.21	.24	.17	1.00						
Emotional Fulfillment	.38	.13	.07	.20	1.00					
Self-Compassion	.39	.42	.49	.19	.16	1.00				
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	.52	.51	.36	.24	.34	.56	1.00			
Stable Attachment	.29	.32	.30	-.06	.01	.06	.15	1.00		
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	.33	.35	.45	.08	.12	.27	.33	.10	1.00	
Empathic Consideration	.12	.19	.18	.13	-.12	.13	.17	.21	-.03	1.00

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization

Table D3

Inter-factor correlation for Singapore sample in Phase 2 (n= 628)

Factor	Emotional Fulfillment	Success	Empathic Consideration	Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Self-Compassion	Social Belonging	Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Realistic Expectations	Self-Directedness	Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Stable Attachment	Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence
Emotional Fulfillment	1.00													
Success	.50	1.00												
Empathic Consideration	.44	.27	1.00											
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	.56	.55	.56	1.00										
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	.60	.51	.36	.47	1.00									
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	.37	.44	.35	.43	.35	1.00								
Self-Compassion	.40	.51	.36	.59	.48	.25	1.00							
Social Belonging	.69	.58	.43	.51	.64	.34	.46	1.00						
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	.38	.59	.33	.40	.41	.32	.44	.41	1.00					
Realistic Expectations	.43	.46	.57	.58	.44	.39	.56	.51	.37	1.00				
Self-Directedness	.50	.59	.43	.55	.45	.30	.60	.57	.54	.63	1.00			
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	.65	.65	.44	.63	.65	.45	.57	.59	.52	.51	.56	1.00		
Stable Attachment	.60	.55	.45	.60	.48	.50	.44	.52	.44	.40	.48	.62	1.00	
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	.38	.47	.32	.39	.46	.39	.28	.46	.32	.31	.39	.40	.48	1.00

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization

Appendix E

Table E1

Fit indices from MGCFA of Measurement and Structural Invariance tests (14 factors and 56 items - WLSMV) for Singapore (n = 628), Kuala Lumpur (n = 229), and USA East (n = 214) samples

Model	Number of parameters	χ^2 ($\Delta\chi^2$)*	df (Δdf)*	p	χ^2/df	CFI (ΔCFI)	TLI (ΔTLI)	RMSEA [90% CI] ($\Delta RMSEA$)	Comparison	Decision
Configural invariance	1278	7361.33	4179	<.001	1.76	0.97	0.96	0.046 [0.044, 0.048]	-	Accept
Metric invariance	1194	7304.68 (101.50)	4263 (84)	<.001 (.094)	1.71 (-0.048)	0.97 (0.005)	0.97 (0.006)	0.042 [0.040, 0.044] (-0.004)	Configural vs Metric	Accept
Scalar invariance	776	7697.84 (630.21)	4681 (418)	<.001 (<.001)	1.64 (-0.069)	0.97 (-0.001)	0.97 (0.002)	0.040 [0.039, 0.042] (-0.002)	Metric vs Scalar	Accept
Error variance invariance	664	7544.49 (259.27)	4793 (112)	<.001 (<.001)	1.57 (-0.070)	0.97 (0.001)	0.97 (0.001)	0.040 [0.038, 0.042] <.001	Scalar vs Error variance	Accept
Factor variance invariance	636	7564.64 (85.42)	4821 (28)	<.001 (<.001)	1.57 (-0.005)	0.97 (-0.003)	0.97 (-0.003)	0.042 [0.040, 0.044] (0.002)	Error variance vs Factor variance	Accept
Factor covariance invariance	454	6644.91 (276.51)	5003 (182)	<.001 (<.001)	1.33 (-0.241)	0.98 (0.015)	0.98 (0.015)	0.030 [0.028, 0.032] (-0.012)	Factor variance vs Factor covariance	Accept
Factor mean invariance	426	6806.97 (104.43)	5031 (28)	<.001 (<.001)	1.35 (0.025)	0.98 (-0.002)	0.98 (-0.001)	0.031 [0.030, 0.033] (0.001)	Factor covariance vs Factor mean	Accept
Acceptance criteria for indices (differences)						>0.95 (<0.01)	>0.95 (<0.01)	<0.06 (<0.015)		

Note. *The chi-square difference test results of nested models using the scaled chi-square (Satorra & Bentler, 2010) are reported as results DIFFTEST command implemented in *Mplus* (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2006).

Appendix F

Table F1

Divergent Validity of the YPSQ Subscales

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Approval-Seeking	-.62	-.28	-10.61	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Defectiveness	-.62	-.53	-3.12	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Dependence	-.62	-.42	-6.05	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Emotional Deprivation	-.62	-.39	-6.38	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Emotional Inhibition	-.62	-.26	-9.34	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Enmeshment	-.62	-.40	-6.55	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Entitlement	-.62	-.12	-12.91	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Failure	-.62	-.36	-7.54	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Insufficient Self-Control	-.62	-.26	-10.09	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Mistrust	-.62	-.46	-5.10	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Pessimism	-.62	-.43	-6.21	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Punitiveness	-.62	-.26	-10.09	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Self-Sacrifice	-.62	-.08	-13.14	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Social Isolation	-.62	-.45	-5.31	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Subjugation	-.62	-.35	-8.25	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Unrelenting Standards	-.62	-.13	-12.39	<.01
Stable Attachment	Abandonment	Vulnerability	-.62	-.44	-5.72	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r_{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r_{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: $r_{jk} - r_{jh} = 0$	2-tailed p
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Abandonment	-.52	-.47	-1.75	.08
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Defectiveness	-.52	-.48	-1.27	.20
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Dependence	-.52	-.33	-4.77	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Emotional Deprivation	-.52	-.24	-6.81	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Emotional Inhibition	-.52	-.25	-6.51	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Enmeshment	-.52	-.30	-5.41	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Entitlement	-.52	-.08	-11.88	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Failure	-.52	-.43	-2.54	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Insufficient Self-Control	-.52	-.34	-5.31	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Mistrust	-.52	-.32	-5.44	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Pessimism	-.52	-.36	-4.68	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Punitiveness	-.52	-.25	-7.15	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Self-Sacrifice	-.52	-.03	-10.67	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Social Isolation	-.52	-.40	-3.42	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Subjugation	-.52	-.41	-2.98	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Unrelenting Standards	-.52	-.15	-9.39	<.01
Self-Directedness	Approval-Seeking	Vulnerability	-.52	-.31	-5.39	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Abandonment	-.60	-.42	-5.35	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Approval-Seeking	-.60	-.24	-9.09	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Defectiveness	-.60	-.41	-5.96	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Emotional Deprivation	-.60	-.24	-9.71	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Emotional Inhibition	-.60	-.21	-10.23	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Enmeshment	-.60	-.44	-4.76	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Entitlement	-.60	-.04	-12.72	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Failure	-.60	-.41	-6.60	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Insufficient Self-Control	-.60	-.32	-8.36	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Mistrust	-.60	-.29	-8.37	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Pessimism	-.60	-.35	-7.56	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Punitiveness	-.60	-.20	-10.83	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Self-Sacrifice	-.60	-.01	-13.93	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Social Isolation	-.60	-.34	-7.59	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Subjugation	-.60	-.42	-6.09	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Unrelenting Standards	-.60	.03	-13.79	<.01
Healthy Self-Reliance / Competence	Dependence	Vulnerability	-.60	-.41	-5.94	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Abandonment	-.67	-.37	-8.46	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Approval-Seeking	-.67	-.24	-11.34	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Defectiveness	-.67	-.64	-1.23	.22
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Dependence	-.67	-.34	-9.34	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Emotional Inhibition	-.67	-.35	-9.32	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Enmeshment	-.67	-.32	-9.66	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Entitlement	-.67	-.11	-13.90	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Failure	-.67	-.41	-7.83	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Insufficient Self-Control	-.67	-.27	-10.73	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Mistrust	-.67	-.40	-8.08	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Pessimism	-.67	-.36	-8.88	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Punitiveness	-.67	-.25	-11.25	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Self-Sacrifice	-.67	-.05	-14.70	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Social Isolation	-.67	-.55	-4.25	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Subjugation	-.67	-.37	-8.85	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Unrelenting Standards	-.67	-.12	-13.07	<.01
Emotional Fulfillment	Emotional Deprivation	Vulnerability	-.67	-.38	-8.11	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Abandonment	-.61	-.19	-10.67	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Approval-Seeking	-.61	-.16	-11.18	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Defectiveness	-.61	-.45	-5.32	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Dependence	-.61	-.31	-8.05	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Emotional Deprivation	-.61	-.34	-7.36	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Enmeshment	-.61	-.26	-8.82	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Entitlement	-.61	-.12	-12.03	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Failure	-.61	-.33	-7.92	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Insufficient Self-Control	-.61	-.21	-10.36	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Mistrust	-.61	-.36	-7.31	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Pessimism	-.61	-.32	-8.43	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Punitiveness	-.61	-.25	-10.23	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Self-Sacrifice	-.61	-.05	-14.03	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Social Isolation	-.61	-.46	-5.12	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Subjugation	-.61	-.34	-8.08	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Unrelenting Standards	-.61	-.17	-12.17	<.01
Emotional Openness and Spontaneity	Emotional Inhibition	Vulnerability	-.61	-.31	-8.08	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H ₀ : r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Abandonment	-.62	-.30	-9.01	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Approval-Seeking	-.62	-.12	-12.55	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Defectiveness	-.62	-.28	-9.34	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Dependence	-.62	-.41	-6.35	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Emotional Deprivation	-.62	-.19	-11.21	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Emotional Inhibition	-.62	-.20	-10.82	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Entitlement	-.62	-.07	-13.66	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Failure	-.62	-.24	-10.04	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Insufficient Self-Control	-.62	-.22	-10.53	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Mistrust	-.62	-.22	-10.55	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Pessimism	-.62	-.24	-10.60	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Punitiveness	-.62	-.12	-12.21	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Self-Sacrifice	-.62	-.07	-12.66	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Social Isolation	-.62	-.24	-9.94	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Subjugation	-.62	-.36	-7.72	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Unrelenting Standards	-.62	-.03	-13.73	<.01
Healthy Boundaries / Developed Self	Enmeshment	Vulnerability	-.62	-.27	-9.77	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H ₀ : r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Abandonment	-.32	-.33	0.23	.81
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Approval-Seeking	-.32	-.34	0.47	.64
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Defectiveness	-.32	-.31	-0.40	.69
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Dependence	-.32	-.19	-2.82	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Emotional Deprivation	-.32	-.16	-3.49	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Emotional Inhibition	-.32	-.19	-3.05	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Enmeshment	-.32	-.30	-0.64	.52
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Failure	-.32	-.15	-3.57	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Insufficient Self-Control	-.32	-.28	-1.17	.24
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Mistrust	-.32	-.33	0.20	.85
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Pessimism	-.32	-.25	-1.76	.08
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Punitiveness	-.32	-.13	-4.50	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Self-Sacrifice	-.32	.11	-4.30	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Social Isolation	-.32	-.30	-0.54	.59
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Subjugation	-.32	-.12	-4.26	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Unrelenting Standards	-.32	-.13	-4.62	<.01
Empathic Consideration	Entitlement	Vulnerability	-.32	-.27	-1.12	.26

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H ₀ : r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Success	Failure	Abandonment	-.72	-.35	-11.73	<.01
Success	Failure	Approval-Seeking	-.72	-.19	-15.54	<.01
Success	Failure	Defectiveness	-.72	-.45	-10.97	<.01
Success	Failure	Dependence	-.72	-.55	-6.84	<.01
Success	Failure	Emotional Deprivation	-.72	-.27	-13.77	<.01
Success	Failure	Emotional Inhibition	-.72	-.28	-13.73	<.01
Success	Failure	Enmeshment	-.72	-.34	-11.34	<.01
Success	Failure	Entitlement	-.72	.03	-16.91	<.01
Success	Failure	Insufficient Self-Control	-.72	-.39	-11.34	<.01
Success	Failure	Mistrust	-.72	-.25	-14.13	<.01
Success	Failure	Pessimism	-.72	-.39	-11.80	<.01
Success	Failure	Punitiveness	-.72	-.28	-14.26	<.01
Success	Failure	Self-Sacrifice	-.72	-.09	-15.93	<.01
Success	Failure	Social Isolation	-.72	-.36	-13.00	<.01
Success	Failure	Subjugation	-.72	-.46	-10.13	<.01
Success	Failure	Unrelenting Standards	-.72	.02	-17.40	<.01
Success	Failure	Vulnerability	-.72	-.37	-11.20	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Abandonment	-.66	-.32	-9.87	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Approval-Seeking	-.66	-.34	-10.01	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Defectiveness	-.66	-.39	-8.59	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Dependence	-.66	-.39	-8.69	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Emotional Deprivation	-.66	-.25	-11.11	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Emotional Inhibition	-.66	-.18	-12.98	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Enmeshment	-.66	-.25	-11.41	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Entitlement	-.66	-.11	-15.55	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Failure	-.66	-.44	-7.48	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Mistrust	-.66	-.22	-12.03	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Pessimism	-.66	-.34	-10.12	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Punitiveness	-.66	-.18	-13.38	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Self-Sacrifice	-.66	-.01	-15.40	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Social Isolation	-.66	-.36	-9.41	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Subjugation	-.66	-.39	-8.53	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Unrelenting Standards	-.66	.06	-14.25	<.01
Healthy Self-Control / Self-Discipline	Insufficient Self Control	Vulnerability	-.66	-.31	-10.05	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H ₀ : r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Abandonment	-.48	-.34	-3.64	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Approval-Seeking	-.48	-.25	-5.94	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Defectiveness	-.48	-.39	-2.59	.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Dependence	-.48	-.26	-5.54	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Emotional Deprivation	-.48	-.19	-7.05	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Emotional Inhibition	-.48	-.27	-5.51	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Enmeshment	-.48	-.22	-6.01	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Entitlement	-.48	-.10	-9.35	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Failure	-.48	-.34	-3.81	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Insufficient Self-Control	-.48	-.23	-6.42	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Mistrust	-.48	-.31	-4.60	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Pessimism	-.48	-.41	-2.13	.03
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Self-Sacrifice	-.48	-.13	-8.31	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Social Isolation	-.48	-.35	-3.51	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Subjugation	-.48	-.30	-4.80	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Unrelenting Standards	-.48	-.33	-4.32	<.01
Self-Compassion	Punitiveness	Vulnerability	-.48	-.34	-3.68	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H ₀ : r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Abandonment	-.22	-.29	1.51	.13
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Approval-Seeking	-.22	-.12	-2.00	.05
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Defectiveness	-.22	-.36	2.86	<.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Dependence	-.22	-.36	2.88	<.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Emotional Deprivation	-.22	-.28	1.04	.30
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Emotional Inhibition	-.22	-.32	2.12	.03
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Enmeshment	-.22	-.26	0.72	.47
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Entitlement	-.22	.00	-4.53	<.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Failure	-.22	-.36	-12.48	<.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Insufficient Self-Control	-.22	-.18	-0.87	.39
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Mistrust	-.22	-.21	-0.34	.73
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Pessimism	-.22	-.29	1.34	.18
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Punitiveness	-.22	-.20	-0.46	.64
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Social Isolation	-.22	-.33	2.26	.02
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Subjugation	-.22	-.38	3.85	<.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Unrelenting Standards	-.22	-.10	-2.77	.01
Healthy Self-Interest / Self-Care	Self Sacrifice	Vulnerability	-.22	-.28	1.27	.21

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Abandonment	-.69	-.36	-10.11	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Approval-Seeking	-.69	-.28	-11.99	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Defectiveness	-.69	-.59	-4.67	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Dependence	-.69	-.37	-9.70	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Emotional Deprivation	-.69	-.40	-9.62	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Emotional Inhibition	-.69	-.44	-8.84	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Enmeshment	-.69	-.27	-11.41	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Entitlement	-.69	-.09	-15.88	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Failure	-.69	-.47	-7.92	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Insufficient Self-Control	-.69	-.31	-11.67	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Mistrust	-.69	-.38	-10.54	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Pessimism	-.69	-.34	-11.41	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Punitiveness	-.69	-.22	-14.00	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Self-Sacrifice	-.69	-.03	-15.72	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Subjugation	-.69	-.39	-10.19	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Unrelenting Standards	-.69	-.14	-14.84	<.01
Social Belonging	Social Isolation	Vulnerability	-.69	-.33	-11.17	<.01

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Abandonment	-.37	-.37	0.09	.93
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Approval-Seeking	-.37	-.36	-0.20	.84
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Defectiveness	-.37	-.46	2.09	.04
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Dependence	-.37	-.27	-2.15	.03
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Emotional Deprivation	-.37	-.19	-3.75	<.01
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Emotional Inhibition	-.37	-.32	-1.37	.17
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Enmeshment	-.37	-.31	-1.30	.19
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Entitlement	-.37	-.17	-4.98	<.01
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Failure	-.37	-.30	-1.48	.14
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Insufficient Self-Control	-.37	-.27	-2.03	.04
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Mistrust	-.37	-.32	-1.10	.27
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Pessimism	-.37	-.34	-0.85	.39
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Punitiveness	-.37	-.29	-2.24	.02
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Self-Sacrifice	-.37	-.03	-7.59	<.01
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Social Isolation	-.37	-.42	1.15	.25
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Subjugation	-.37	-.31	-1.33	.18
Realistic Expectations	Unrelenting Standards	Vulnerability	-.37	-.31	-1.41	.16

Table F1 (Continued)

Scale j	Scale k	Scale h	Correlation between Scale j and scale k (r _{jk})	Correlation between Scale j and scale h (r _{jh})	z-test for testing if H0: r _{jk} - r _{jh} = 0	2-tailed p
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Abandonment	-.66	-.42	-7.71	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Approval-Seeking	-.66	-.27	-10.80	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Defectiveness	-.66	-.44	-7.21	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Dependence	-.66	-.39	-8.72	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Emotional Deprivation	-.66	-.27	-10.56	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Emotional Inhibition	-.66	-.29	-10.36	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Enmeshment	-.66	-.34	-9.42	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Entitlement	-.66	-.10	-13.77	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Failure	-.66	-.38	-8.55	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Insufficient Self-Control	-.66	-.27	-11.04	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Mistrust	-.66	-.43	-8.00	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Pessimism	-.66	-.59	-3.18	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Punitiveness	-.66	-.32	-10.17	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Self-Sacrifice	-.66	-.09	-13.88	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Social Isolation	-.66	-.40	-8.21	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Subjugation	-.66	-.36	-9.16	<.01
Basic Health and Safety / Optimism	Vulnerability	Unrelenting Standards	-.66	-.20	-11.72	<.01

Note: Scale j and scale k below are the counterpart scales, scale j and scale h are the non-counterpart scales from the positive YPSQ and negative YSQ-S3.

-
- ¹ Firstpost. (2016, August 26). *India has 79.8% Hindus, 14.2% Muslims, says 2011 census data on religion*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <http://www.firstpost.com/india/india-has-79-8-percent-hindus-14-2-percent-muslims-2011-census-data-on-religion-2407708.html>
- ² Department of Statistics Singapore. (2016). General Household Survey 2015. Retrieved July 13, 2017, from <http://www.singstat.gov.sg/publications/publications-and-papers/GHS/ghs2015content>
- ³ Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2011). *Population Distribution and Basic Demographic Characteristic Report 2010 (Updated: 05/08/2011)*. Retrieved July 13, 2017, from <https://www.statistics.gov.my>.
- ⁴ Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, And Labor. (2014, July 28). *2013 Report on international religious freedom: Philippines*. U.S. Department of State. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <https://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/irf/2013/eap/222161.htm>
- ⁵ Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). *Culture and the self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation*. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253; Kim, H. S., & Markus, H. R. (1999). *Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 785-800.
- ⁶ Dacumos, R. (2015, August). Philippine Colonial Education System. *Researchgate*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2507.7600
- ⁷ Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a Medium of Instruction in East and Southeast Asian Universities. In: N. Murray & A. Scarino A. (Eds.), *Dynamic Ecologies. Multilingual Education, Vol. 9*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- ⁸ Wee, R. Y. (2017, March 15). The Economies Of Southeast Asian Nations. *Worldatlas*. Retrieved July 13, 2017, from <http://www.worldatlas.com/articles/the-economy-of-the-southeast-asian-nations.html>