Psychobiosocial Experiences in Physical Education: A Semantic Differential Scale

Laura Bortoli[1], Montse C. Ruiz[2], and Claudio Robazza[1*]

[1]*BIND-Behavioral Imaging and Neural Dynamics Center, Department of Medicine and Aging Sciences, "G. d'Annunzio" University of Chieti-Pescara, 66013 Chieti, Italy*

[2]*Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland*

*Contact: Claudio Robazza c.robazza@unich.it, BIND-Behavioral Imaging and Neural Dynamics Center, Department of Medicine and Aging Sciences, "G. d'Annunzio" University of Chieti-Pescara, Via dei Vestini, 31, 66013 Chieti, Italy

Laura Bortoli https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5610-4683

Montse C. Ruiz https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1116-206X

Claudio Robazza https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3639-1539

1   **Psychobiosocial Experiences in Physical Education: A Semantic Differential Scale**

2

3   **Abstract**

4   The objective of this study was to develop and validate the Psychobiosocial Experience Semantic

5   Differential in Physical Education (PESD-PE) scale, a new holistic measure of discrete emotion-

6   related feelings (i.e., psychobiosocial experiences) as conceived within the individual zones of

7   optimal functioning (IZOF) framework. A preliminary version of the PESD-PE was administered to

8   336 students (171 girls, 165 boys), while the final version was administered to a new sample of 352

9   students (186 girls, 166 boys) aged 14–19 years. Overall, findings provided evidence of factorial

10   and construct validity for a model containing 33 items loading into 11 modalities, with 3 items

11   each. Convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the PESD-PE was also found. This

12   new measure of discrete experiences will help increase our knowledge about the reciprocal effects

13   between emotion-related feelings and performance, and will also inform practical interventions

14   aimed at creating more adaptive psychobiosocial experiences in accordance with physical education

15   goals.

16   *Keywords*: assessment, emotions, IZOF model, performance, scale development

17   **Psychobiosocial Experiences in Physical Education: A Semantic Differential Scale**

18   A substantial amount of research provides compelling evidence that students' emotional

19 experiences play a key role in academic engagement, motivation, learning, social interaction,

20 behavior, and psychological health (Linnenbrink-Garcia et al., 2016; Pekrun, 2017). This research

21 has clearly established that some emotions (e.g., enjoyment, happiness, pride, satisfaction) can

22 benefit a range of relevant cognitive and motivational processes associated with academic learning,

23 including attention, memory storage and retrieval, reasoning, problem solving, and decision

24 making, while other emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety, frustration, boredom) can hamper the same

25 processes (Pekrun, 2016; Pekrun et al., 2018).

26   The main focus of physical education research has been on the effect of student emotions on

27 learning, achievement, and behavior (e.g., Simonton & Garn, 2019), and the long-term impact on

28 physical activity during leisure time, health, and wellbeing (Di Battista et al., 2019; Shephard &

29 Trudeau, 2000). Findings provide physical educators with evidence-based teaching strategies to

30 create supportive contexts in which students experience enjoyment, feel competent, and learn motor

31 skills to engage in physical activity, thus, laying the foundation for an active lifestyle (Adank et al.,

32 2021). Therefore, emotions assessment can be helpful in increasing our understanding about student

33 engagement and in stimulating exercise habits throughout life (Simonton & Garn, 2019).

34   In physical education, several measures have been developed to assess anxiety (e.g.,

35 Barkoukis et al., 2012), enjoyment (e.g., Carraro et al., 2008; Morano et al., 2019), positive and

36 negative affect (e.g., Martin & Kulinna, 2005), boredom (Karagiannidis et al., 2015), anger

37 (Simonton & Garn, 2020), and a range of emotions (e.g., Robazza & Bortoli, 2005; Simonton et al.,

38 2023). Several instruments exist for the assessment of selected discrete emotions. For instance,

39 Trigueros et al. (2019) proposed the Scale of Emotions in Physical Education (SEPE) to measure

40 embarrassment, boredom, hopelessness, anxiety, confidence, pride, calmness, and enjoyment in a

41 sample of 13–19-year-old Spanish students, while Fierro-Suero et al. (2020), proposed the

42 Achievement Emotions Questionnaire for Physical Education (AEQ-PE) to measure pride,

43   enjoyment, anger, anxiety, hopelessness, and boredom in 11–17-year-old students. Moreover,

44   Simonton et al. (2018) developed the Discrete Emotions in Physical Education Scale (DEPES)

45   targeting three emotions students experience during an activity, namely, enjoyment, boredom, and

46   anger. The scale was later expanded to distinguish between process-related or in-activity emotions,

47   and outcome-related emotions with the addition of pride, shame, and relief (Simonton et al., 2023).

48   Both process- and outcome-related emotions are theoretically based on the control-value theory of

49   achievement emotions (Pekrun, 2006). A strength of these scales is that they target the assessment

50   of selected emotions commonly experienced by students. However, one limitation is that they do

51   not consider a number of important individual manifestations associated with emotions, such as

52   cognitive, motivational, somatic, motor, performance, and communication aspects that characterize

53   the emotional experiences of physical education students.

54   According to Pekrun's (2006) control-value theory, emotions are multifaceted phenomena

55   conceptualized as a set of interrelated psychological processes involving subjective feelings

56   (affective component of emotion), cognitions, motivational tendencies, physiological processes, and

57   expressive behavior (Shuman & Scherer, 2014). In physical education, for example, a student

58   involved in thrilling activities may feel energized, focused on the task, and eager to continue the

59   experience. The resulting increase in heart rate can further enhance fun and its overt expression. On

60   the other hand, tedious activities tend to cause boredom, disinterest, withdrawal tendencies, loss of

61   energy, and related bodily expressions. Therefore, it is important to provide physical educators and

62   researchers with reliable and sound measures to evaluate the multiple and different components of

63   student emotional experiences. Self-assessment tools are easy to administer and appropriate to

64   measure emotions and thoughts, which by definition, are subjective phenomena (Pekrun et al.,

65   2018).

66   The multifaceted feature of emotions is also characteristic of the so-called psychobiosocial

67   states (or emotion-related experiences) as construed within the individual zones of optimal

68   functioning (IZOF) model initially applied to sport (Hanin, 2000, 2007, 2010). Psychobiosocial

experiences are viewed as an array of situational (state-like) or relatively stable (trait-like)

emotional and non-emotional subjective manifestations of total human functioning linked to

performance. In the most recent conceptualization, psychobiosocial experiences encompass several

interrelated modalities including enjoyment, confidence, anxiety, motivation, volition,

assertiveness, and cognitive (psychological component), bodily-somatic, motor-behavioral

(biological component), operational, communicative, and social support (social component; for

complete description and review, see Ruiz et al., 2016, 2017, 2021; Ruiz & Robazza, 2020).

Emotions are key components of psychobiosocial experiences with specific valence (i.e., pleasant

or unpleasant experience) and functionality (i.e., functional or dysfunctional effects on

performance). Four categories of emotional experiences are identified: pleasant–functional,

unpleasant–functional, pleasant–dysfunctional, and unpleasant–dysfunctional. The perceived effect

of emotions and related psychobiosocial experiences on performance depends on the meaning and

value people attribute to their interaction with the environment and others, their perceived level of

available resources to manage the situation, and the ability to self-regulate (Hanin & Ekkekakis,

2014).

The multimodal conceptualization of psychobiosocial experiences concurs with views

typically endorsed in appraisal theories (Lazarus, 2001; Scherer et al., 2001), as well as in main

theoretical frameworks of emotions, including basic (primary, fundamental, discrete) and

dimensional (e.g., valence or arousal) theories of emotions (Coppin & Sander, 2021). This

perspective is useful for both conceptualizing and measuring emotions (Mauss & Robinson, 2009)

and related experiences. Numerous studies provide support to the multimodal conceptualization and

applied advantages of measuring a range of psychobiosocial states in physical education (e.g.,

Bortoli et al., 2015, 2017; Di Battista et al., 2019) and sport (e.g., Di Corrado et al., 2015;

Middleton et al., 2017; Nateri et al., 2020; Robazza et al., 2012, 218; Ruiz et al., 2019a). In

particular, three scales have been proposed for the assessment of functional and dysfunctional

psychobiosocial experiences, one targeting physical education (Bortoli et al., 2018) and two for

95   sport (Robazza et al., 2016; Ruiz et al., 2019b). An advantage of these scales is that they provide a

96   two-dimensional evaluation of functional and dysfunctional experiences. However, factor analyses

97   indicate that these are global assessments and, thus, do not capture the specific and discrete

98   psychobiosocial modalities. For example, the functional and dysfunctional dimensions of the

99   Psychobiosocial States in Physical Education (PBS-SPE) scale (Bortoli et al., 2018) are comprised

100   of eight items each, which are then collapsed in the two dimensions. What is currently missing is a

101   measure targeting discrete or separate psychobiosocial experiences of physical education students,

102   as conceptualized within the IZOF model (Hanin, 2007, 2010) and the control-value theory of

103   emotions (Pekrun, 2006). Both theoretical perspectives view emotions as a set of interconnected

104   psychological processes entailing subjective feelings, cognitions, motivational tendencies,

105   physiological processes, and expressive behavior. The present study, therefore, aims to extend the

106   current body of work on the assessment of emotions in physical education by proposing a new tool

107   to capture separate modalities of psychobiosocial experiences and, thus, going beyond assessment

108   of two global functional and dysfunctional dimensions which are assessed through existing

109   instruments. We believe a new discrete multimodality scale can offer more detailed information on

110   the emotion-related experiences of physical education students.

111   To overcome the limitations of existing dimensional scales with a measure of discrete

112   modalities, Robazza et al. (2021) developed the Psychobiosocial Experience Semantic Differential

113   scale (PESD-Sport) for use with athletes. A preliminary version of a 53-item scale using a semantic

114   differential format was administered to a sample of athletes to attain a clear and unequivocal

115   distinction between opposite experiences along the functionality distinction (see Rosenberg &

116   Navarro, 2018). The PESD-Sport was developed following the set of procedural guidelines for

117   semantic differentials recommended by Verhagen et al. (2015). In particular, a large sample of

118   bipolar items (adjectives and their opposites) was created, and agreement was reached on which

119   items to consider representing each of the 12 modalities of psychobiosocial experiences. The

120   preliminary version of the PESD-Sport was then administered to the athletes to select the best

121   indicators that would be retained in the final version of the scale. The final version was comprised

122   of 30 items loading into 10 modalities (i.e., enjoyment, confidence, anxiety, assertiveness,

123   cognitive, bodily-somatic, motor-behavioral, operational, communicative, and social support), 3

124   items each. The final PESD-Sport scale was then administered to a new sample of athletes to

125   examine factorial, construct, convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity. Several items of

126   the PESD-Sport are also included in the dimensional scale of psychobiosocial states in physical

127   education (PBS-SPE; Bortoli et al., 2018), as both instruments are based on the conceptual

128   framework of the IZOF model (Hanin 2000, 2007). With the aim of adopting the semantic

129   differential format, in the development of the new discrete measure of psychobiosocial experiences,

130   the 53 items contained in the preliminary version of the PESD-Sport we administered to students

131   with adapted instructions to fit the physical education setting.

132   **Study Purpose**

133   Grounded in the IZOF model (Hanin, 2000, 2007) and extensive research on psychobiosocial

134   experiences (see Ruiz et al., 2017), the purpose of this two-study investigation was to develop a

135   multimodality scale in Italian language to assess discrete psychobiosocial experiences in physical

136   education. Similar to the scale developed in sport (Robazza et al., 2021), and building upon the

137   existing two-dimensional measure of psychobiosocial experiences in physical education (Bortoli et

138   al., 2018), the new measure was intended to separately capture specific categories of

139   psychobiosocial modalities representing a variety of meaningful student experiences. The format of

140   this measure, called the Psychobiosocial Experience Semantic Differential scale in Physical

141   Education (PESD-PE), was aimed to minimize the time and psychological burden that participants

142   are subjected to during the data collection process. Therefore, the adjectives of the PESD-PE were

143   arranged in a semantic differential format instead of using separate antonyms to create a relatively

144   short measure easily applicable in the physical education context.

145   **Method**

146   In Study 1 we administered a large pool of items to high school students to identify the best

147   indicators of each of the different psychobiosocial modalities and still maintained the expected

148   factor structure. In Study 2 we cross validated the final version of the scale in a second sample of

149   students. Construct validity of the measure was assessed through correlations with an enjoyment

150   scale and two motivation scales often used in physical education. We expected to find support for

151   the measure of discrete psychobiosocial experiences in physical education, which would reflect

152   sound convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity.

153   **Study 1**

154   Study 1 aimed to examine items characteristics, factor structure, construct validity, reliability,

155   convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the PESD-PE.

156   *Participants*

157   Participants were 336 students (171 girls, 165 boys), aged 14–19 years ($M = 16.82$, $SD =$

158   1.43), from 7 high schools in Central Italy. Students were involved in mandatory physical education

159   classes twice a week during the academic year. According to the Italian physical education

160   curriculum, a main goal is the development of physical, emotional, and cognitive skills of students

161   (Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research, 2009). Frequently proposed activities are

162   aimed at developing postural control, flexibility, resistance, speed, physical fitness, and agility, as

163   well as teaching different motor and sport skills. Girls and boys are involved in individual and

164   group tasks, including preparatory skills for acrobatic gymnastics, track and field, and team sports

165   (e.g., basketball, football, handball, and volleyball). Competitive events are held separately.

166   Students are also taught how to achieve and maintain good fitness levels and a healthy lifestyle.

167   *Measure*

168   The preliminary 53 items included in the Italian version of the PESD-Sport (Robazza et al.,

169   2021) were administered, asking participants to think about how they usually felt during physical

170   education classes. The 53 bipolar items were derived from an initial list of 93 adjectives included in

171   individualized multidimensional profiling of psychobiosocial states in sport, which was proposed to

172   assess 12 functional and dysfunctional state modalities (Ruiz et al., 2021). Most of these items were

173   also contained in the PBS-SPE scale (Bortoli et al., 2018; for more details, see Robazza et al.,

174   2021). The 12 modalities were enjoyment, confidence, anxiety, motivation, volition, assertiveness,

175   and cognitive (psychological component), bodily-somatic, motor-behavioral (biological

176   component), operational, communicative, and social support (social component; Ruiz et al., 2021).

177   The enjoyment modality comprised unhappy, sad, and dejected, and their antonyms happy, joyful,

178   and cheerful. These emotions were also included in the dejection and happiness subscales of the

179   Sport Emotion Questionnaire (SEQ; Jones et al., 2005), while tense and nervous, comprised in the

180   anxiety modality, were also included in the anxiety subscale of the SEQ.

181   Each item was rated on a 9-point, bipolar Likert-type scale ranging from 4 (*very much*) to 0

182   (*neither… nor*) on the "dysfunctional" side and from 0 to 4 on the "functional" side. The scores on

183   the dysfunctional side are transformed into negative scores. Therefore, an item score could range

184   from –4 to 4, where 0 indicates no effect. Dysfunctional adjectives were placed on the left of the

185   Likert scale while their functional antonyms were placed on the right to facilitate respondents'

186   judgments and reduce their mental effort (Rosenberg & Navarro, 2018). Examples of bipolar items

187   are Unhappy–Happy and Unconfident–Confident. In the case of anxiety and communicative

188   modalities, antonyms were not used because research results have consistently shown that some

189   performers can perceive anxiety symptoms as being functional for performance, while others can

190   appraise the same symptoms as dysfunctional (Mellalieu et al., 2006; Neil et al., 2012).

191   Idiosyncratic perceptions were also observed for communication, with some individuals preferring

192   to isolate themselves to better focus on the task, while others seek support from peers or other

193   people (Rees & Freeman, 2012). Therefore, on the anxiety and communicative modalities bipolar

194   items were formulated as either "harmful" or "useful" (e.g., "Nervous in a harmful way–Nervous in

195   a useful way", "Being sociable is harmful–Being sociable is useful").

196   ***Procedure***

197   Both studies were conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and after ethical

198   approval of the ethics committee of the local university (EC 19, 09/09/2021). School headmasters,

199   physical education teachers, and parents of minors were contacted and explained the general

200   purpose of the study. Those students who decided to participate and the parents of minors signed an

201   informed consent form. Individual assessments took place at school, in groups of four or five

202   students just before lessons, in a secluded location without the presence of the teacher. Those

203   students who were preparing for the physical education class and were not immediately involved in

204   the assessment waited briefly for their turn in the dressing room. Before scale administration,

205   students were advised that participation in the study was voluntary, they could end the session at

206   any time without any consequences, and individual responses would remain confidential. They were

207   also briefed on the overall purpose of the study and presented with instructions indicating that there

208   were no right or wrong answers. Students were then asked to complete the 53-item scale referring to

209   how they usually feel during physical education classes. For each row of items, they had to choose a

210   functional or dysfunctional descriptor representative of their experiences and evaluate its intensity

211   on the 4–0–4 scale. The whole procedure took approximately 20–30 min.

212   ***Data Analysis***

213   The factor structure of the preliminary 53-item scale was examined using exploratory

214   structural equation modeling (ESEM; Marsh et al., 2009; Morin & Maïano, 2011) and Target

215   oblique rotation relying on a priori specification of the items pertaining to the psychobiosocial

216   modalities, with all cross-loadings being freely estimated but with a target value close to zero. The

217   use of Target rotation provides a way to rely on a more confirmatory than an exploratory approach

218   to the estimation of factors, but without imposing the highly restrictive feature of exactly zero

219   loadings that typify a more restrictive confirmatory factor analysis. Target rotation is appropriate

220   when researchers are guided by a nonmechanical exploratory process and, thus, have a clear view of

221   the predicted factor structure (see Myers et al., 2013, 2015). According to Myers et al.'s (2016,

222   2018) indications, sample size for ESEM was determined using the root mean square error of

223   approximation (RMSEA). We computed the minimum sample size for RMSEA using the code

224   developed by Preacher and Coffman (2006) for the R program (https://cran.r-project.org/). A

225   sample size of 205 resulted after setting type I error rate to α = .05, power = .80, null RMSE = .05,

226   alternative RMSE = .04, and *df* = 676. Thus, the initial sample of 336 participants was adequate.

227   The parameters were estimated using the robust maximum likelihood estimator (MLR) for

228   non-normal data. Model fit was assessed using several criteria (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Schumacker &

229   Lomax, 2016), which included chi-square (χ^2) goodness-of-fit index, normed chi-square (χ^2/df),

230   comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker Lewis fit index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation

231   (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). To establish whether items were

232   reasonable indicators of latent factors, we considered statistically significant standardized values

233   above .50 (Hair et al., 2019). The fit of alternative models was compared using the Akaike's

234   Information Criterion (AIC) values and the parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI). Higher values

235   of CFI, TLI, and PCFI, and lower values of χ^2, χ^2/df, RMSEA, SRMR, and AIC indicate model fit

236   improvement. All data analyses were performed in M*plus* version 8.5 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017).

237   The internal consistency of the subscale scores was ascertained by Cronbach's alpha,

238   McDonald's omega, and composite reliability values. Alpha and omega coefficients should be at

239   least .50, preferably greater than .70 (Watkins, 2017). Convergence among a set of items

240   representing a latent construct was examined by the average variance extracted (AVE) of the latent

241   variables. AVE values close to or larger than .50 suggest adequate convergence of items (Hair et al.,

242   2019). Finally, discriminant validity was determined by comparing the AVE estimates for each

243   factor with the squared interconstruct correlations related to that factor. Discriminant validity is

244   assumed when variance extracted estimates are larger than the corresponding interconstruct squared

245   correlation values (Hair et al., 2019).

246   ***Results***

247   Eight cases were removed because of missing values or identified as outliers (Mahalanobis'

248   distance, $p < .001$). Minimum and maximum values for skewness and kurtosis of the 53 items

249   ranged from -1.625 to -0.146 and from $-.828$ to 2.777, respectively.

250   ESEM model for 12 modalities and 53 items configuration provided poor fit to the data

251   (Table 1). Several items had poor standardized factor loadings ($< .30$), cross-loadings on unintended

252   factors ($> .30$), and two or more moderate or large modification indices (over 15). Twenty items,

253   out of 53 items, were systematically removed in different iterations. The resulting final scale was

254   comprised of 33 items loading in 11 modalities consisting of 3 items each and represented in a first-

255   order factor model (see Table 1 and Supplemental Figure 1a). We retained three items in each

256   modality to ensure a relatively short measure easily applicable in the physical education context,

257   which at the same time provided coverage of the theoretical domain of a construct as well as

258   adequate identification of the construct in a factor analysis (Hair et al., 2019). The retained items

259   were the best indicators of latent factors reflecting 11 out of 12 theoretical constructs of the scale,

260   with standardized factor loadings greater than .65 (Supplemental Table 1). The 11 modalities were:

261   enjoyment, confidence, anxiety, assertiveness, cognitive, and motivational (psychological

262   modality); bodily-somatic and motor-behavioral (bodily modality); and operational,

263   communicative, and social support (social modality). The volitional modality was the only one

264   removed after inspection of the modification indices and because of cross-loadings indicating

265   substantial overlapping with the motivational modality. ESEM on the final 11-modality, 33-item

266   model showed good fit to the data. The PESD-PE is reported as Appendix 1 in the Supplemental

267   file.

268   All standardized factor loadings were above .600 ($\lambda = .662–.882$) and item residual variances

269   ranged from $\delta = .222$ to $.562$ (see Supplemental Table 1). Latent factor correlation values ranged

270   from .349 to .801. Six correlations were low (r between .20 and .39; Zhu, 2012), 24 were moderate

271   (r between .40 and .59), 24 were moderately high (r between .60 and .79), and 1 was high ($r > .80$).

272   Correlation coefficients and reliability indices are shown in Supplemental Table 2.

273 *Discussion*

274   Preliminary evidence of construct validity of the PESD-PE was found. ESEM yielded

275 satisfactory fit indices for the 11-modality, 33-item model supporting the factor structure of the

276 scale based on the theoretical conceptualization of psychobiosocial experiences. Scale reliability

277 was demonstrated via internal consistency values (α, ω, and CR), which were all higher than .70.

278 Adequate convergent validity of the scale modalities was also shown with standardized loading

279 estimates and AVE values higher than .50, with the exception of the AVE value for the

280 communicative modality that was .499. Taking as a reference this minimum AVE value, AVE

281 estimates were greater than the squared correlations between two modalities for 45 correlations out

282 of 55. The discriminant validity of the scale modalities was thus proved.

283 **Study 2**

284   The objectives of Study 2, in which a new sample was involved, were (a) to cross validate the

285 11-modality, 33-item solution resulting from Study 1, (b) to assess convergent and discriminant

286 validities through correlations with an emotion related measure, and (c) determine nomological

287 validity (i.e., the extent to which a scale relates to existing theory-based concepts) in comparison

288 with a perceived motivational climate scale and a motivational scale often used in physical

289 education.

290 *Participants*

291   Participants in Study 2 had similar demographic characteristics to those who took part in

292 Study 1. The sample consisted of 352 students (186 girls, 166 boys), aged 14–19 years ($M = 16.86$,

293 $SD = 1.41$), from 7 high schools in Central Italy.

294 *Measures*

295   The measures administered were the 11-modality, 33-item solution of the PESD-PE obtained

296 in Study 1 (see Appendix 1 in Supplemental file), the Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale (PACES;

297 Kendzierski & DeCarlo, 1991), the Teacher-Initiated Motivational Climate in Physical Education

298 Questionnaire (TIMCPEQ; Papaioannou, 1998), and the Basic Psychological Needs in Physical

299   Education scale (BPN-PE; Vlachopoulos et al., 2011). The PACES was used to evaluate convergent

300   and discriminant validity of the PESD-PE, while the TIMCPEQ and the BPN-PE were used to

301   evaluate nomological validity.

302   The PACES comprises 16 items gauging enjoyment feelings related to physical activity. Nine

303   items load onto a pleasant-feelings factor (e.g., "I enjoy it") and other seven load onto an

304   unpleasant-feelings factor (e.g., "I dislike it"). Students rated the items on a 5-point Likert scale

305   ranging from 1 = *totally disagree* to 5 = *totally agree*, based on the feelings they usually experience

306   during physical education classes. Support to the two-factor solution was provided in Italian girls

307   and boys aged from 11 to 19 years (Carraro et al., 2008).

308   The TIMCPEQ includes 12 items assessing student perceptions of task-involving and ego-

309   involving motivational climates. Six items are designed to measure the task-involving climate

310   created when the teacher's emphasis is placed on skill mastery and effort (e.g., "The physical

311   education teacher is most satisfied when every student learns something new"), and other six items

312   assess the ego-involving climate when the teacher's emphasis is on social comparison and

313   competition (e.g., "Only the students with the best records are rewarded"). Students were asked to

314   think about the climate their teachers create in physical education classes and rate the items on a 5-

315   point scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. Confirmatory factor analysis

316   (CFA) supported the two-dimensional structure of the questionnaire translated and adapted into the

317   Italian language (Bortoli et al., 2008, 2017).

318   The BPN-PE consists of 12 items to measure student perceptions of autonomy, competence,

319   and relatedness. These are central constructs in self-determination theory and believed to be innate,

320   universal, and capable of affecting wellness and thriving outcomes (Ryan & Deci, 2017). The three

321   4-item subscales reflect the theorized constructs of autonomy (e.g., "I feel like the activities we are

322   doing have been chosen by me"), competence (e.g., "I feel that I improve even in the tasks

323   considered difficult by most of my peers"), and relatedness (e.g., "I feel like a valued member of a

324   group of close friends"). Ratings were made on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = *does not*

325   *correspond at all* to 7 = *corresponds exactly*, thinking about themselves while engaging in physical

326   education classes. The factor structure, reliability, and nomological validity of the BPN-PE was

327   supported across samples of elementary, middle, and high school Greek students (Vlachopoulos et

328   al., 2011). For the purposes of this study, the items were adapted to the Italian language using the

329   backward translation procedures.

330   ***Procedure***

331   Assessment was conducted using the same procedure described in Study 1 (i.e., institutional

332   approval and administration of questionnaires). Students were asked to complete the measures by

333   thinking about their usual experiences and feelings during physical education classes.

334   ***Data Analysis***

335   The factorial validity of the PESD-PE resulting from Study 1 was assessed through CFA

336   using the maximum likelihood parameter estimates (MLM) with standard errors and a mean-

337   adjusted chi-square test statistic that is robust to non-normality (Byrne, 2012). CFA is more

338   restrictive than ESEM because cross-loadings are constraint to zero. A minimum sample size of 165

339   for RMSEA was found with $\alpha = .05$, power $= .80$, null RMSE $= .05$, alternative RMSE $= .02$, and *df*

340     $= 154$.

341   According to Robazza et al. (2021), and in line with theoretical assumptions, the

342   psychobiosocial modalities were expected to be correlated. As a consequence, different competing

343   first-order, higher-order, and nested-factor measurement models could represent the structure of the

344   instrument (Brunner et al., 2012; Canivez, 2016). We therefore tested several competing

345   measurement models that fall within the IZOF conceptual framework (Hanin, 2000, 2007) and

346   could reasonably reflect distinct structures of the new measure (see Supplemental file). In

347   particular, we compared seven competing measurement models possibly representing the final

348   version of the scale structure: (1) a first-order factor model with correlated psychobiosocial

349   modalities with paths leading to the observed variables (this model was tested using ESEM in Study

350   1 and CFA in Study 2; see Supplemental Figures 1a and 1b); (2) a second-order factor model with

paths specified from a second-order factor (i.e., global psychobiosocial experiences) to the first-

order factors (i.e., the psychobiosocial modalities) with paths leading to the observed indicators

(Supplemental Figure 2); (3) a second-order factor model with paths specified from three second-

order factors representing psychological, biological, and social components leading to the first-

order factors (Supplemental Figure 3a); (4) a second-order factor model with three second-order

factors in which the operational modality is included in the biological component rather than the

social component (Supplemental Figure 3b); (5) a nested-factor model (i.e., bifactor measurement

model) in which both a general factor and the first-order factors had direct paths to the observed

indicators (Supplemental Figure 4); (6) a nested-factor model with three factors, representing

psychological, biological, and social states, and the first-order factors having direct paths to the

observed indicators (Supplemental Figure 5a); and (7) a nested-factor model with three factors in

which the operational modality of the social component is included in the biological component

(Supplemental Figure 5b).

  After computing descriptive statistics, correlation coefficients, and reliability values of the

study variables, we examined measurement and structural invariance of the scale across the two

study samples. To this purpose, multigroup CFAs were conducted increasing parameter constraints

one at a time (Byrne, 2012; Wang & Wang, 2020). Analysis began with an unconstrained or

configural model and continued step by step toward more restricted (nested) models so to evaluate

measurement and structural invariance between groups (Farmer & Farmer, 2014). Measurement

invariance was assessed through configural (i.e., same number of factors and factor loading patterns

across groups), weak or metric (i.e., equivalence of factor loadings), strong or scalar (i.e., equality

of factor loadings and intercepts), and strict (i.e., equality of factor loadings, intercepts, and error

variances) invariance. Structural invariance was ascertained through factor variance (i.e., equality of

variance of factor scores) and factor covariance (i.e., equality of covariance of factor scores)

invariance. The Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square difference (ΔS-B χ^2) between models was used to

test model comparisons (i.e., configural model vs. a specified model). Non-significant ΔS-B χ^2 and

377   differences in CFI < .010, RMSEA < .015, and SRMR < .030 are considered criteria of invariance

378   (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002).

379   Invariance across gender and age categories (14-16 vs. 17-19 years) and their interaction was

380   assessed using a multiple indicator, multiple cause (MIMIC) model, also known as CFA with

381   covariates (Brown, 2015). The first and second age categories roughly correspond to early

382   adolescence and late adolescence, respectively (Haywood & Getchell, 2020). We were interested in

383   examining whether gender and age had an effect on the latent means and item intercepts. Following

384   Morin et al.'s (2016) indications, in a first step we performed a MIMIC model (null) in which the

385   predictors had no effect on the latent means and item intercepts. In a second (saturated) model, the

386   predictors were allowed to influence the item intercepts only. In a third (invariant) model, the

387   predictors were allowed to influence the latent means only. Gender and age were coded to represent

388   group membership (i.e., girl = 0, boy = 1; and 14-16 yrs. = 0, 17-19 yrs. = 1). We conducted

389   MIMIC modeling instead of multi-group CFA because of the relatively unbalanced sample sizes

390   across gender and age (i.e., girls, $n = 186$; boys, $n = 166$; 14-16 yrs., $n = 129$; 17-19 yrs., $n = 223$).

391   MIMIC modeling provides a robust and parsimonious test of measurement invariance (indicator

392   intercepts) and population heterogeneity (factor means) between groups.

393   Finally, we ascertained the factorial validity of the PACES, TIMCPEQ, and BPN-PE. Then,

394   the PACES was used to establish convergent and discriminant validity of the PESD-PE, while the

395   TIMCPEQ and BPN-PE served to determine its nomological validity.

396   ***Results***

397   Data screening led to the removal of nine cases from further analyses due to missing values or

398   values identified as outliers (Mahalanobis' distance, $p < .001$). Minimum and maximum values for

399   skewness and kurtosis of the 33 items ranged from -1.571 to -0.164 and from -0.702 to 2.845,

400   respectively. Also, in this Study we used the robust maximum likelihood method for factor analysis.

401   CFA results supported the 11-modality, 33-item solution of the PESD-PE found in Study 1

402   (Table 1). Higher-order and nested-factor models did not fit the data well. All standardized factor

403   loadings were above .600 (λ = .640–.863) and item residual variances ranged from δ = .255 to .591

404   (Supplemental Table 1). In both studies, mean item intensity ratings of the anxiety modality were

405   lower than mean item ratings of other modalities. Item mean values ranged from 0.66 to 2.34 in

406   Sample 1, and from 0.52 to 2.49 in Sample 2 (Supplemental Table 1). Latent factor correlation

407   values ranged from .365 to .837. (Supplemental Table 2). Four correlations were low (r between .20

408   and .39), 28 were moderate (r between .40 and .59), 21 were moderately high (r between .60 and

409   .79), and 2 were high (r > .80). Supplemental Table 2 contains correlation coefficients and

410   reliability values.

411   The adequate fit indices observed for the CFA configural model (Supplemental Table 3)

412   indicate a same factor structure (i.e., same number of factors and same patterns of free and fixed

413   factor loadings) of the PESD-PE across the two study samples. Full measurement and structural

414   invariance of the scale was also demonstrated with ΔCFI, ΔRMSEA, and ΔSMR values smaller

415   than their thresholds (i.e., .010, .015, and .030 respectively) and non-significant ΔS-B χ^2 tests.

416   The null MIMIC model using gender, age (14-16 vs. 17-19 years), and their interaction as

417   covariates showed acceptable fit to the data. The saturated and invariant models provided small

418   improvements, indicating limited effects of the grouping variables (Supplemental Table 3). Results

419   suggest same factor structure and item functioning by gender and age even though significant

420   effects (p < .01) were observed for gender on all modalities, with boys reporting higher mean scores

421   than girls.

422   To examine convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of PESD-PE, we first verified

423   the factorial validity and reliability of the PACES, TIMCPEQ, and BPN-PE (Supplemental Table

424   4). The hypothesized two-factor structure of the PACES was improved after specification of two

425   correlated errors on both the pleasant and unpleasant experiences subscales. Support for the two-

426   factor structure of the TIMCPEQ was also found after removal of two items with poor standardized

427   factor loadings from the performance climate subscale and then correlating two errors on the same

428 subscale. Finally, the four-factor structure of the BPN-PE was confirmed. Overall, acceptable fit

429 indices and reliability values of the three measures were shown (Supplemental Table 4).

430   The pattern of relationships between the PESD-PE and the criterion-related measures was in

431 the expected direction (see latent factor correlations in Supplemental Table 5). Psychobiosocial

432 modality scores related positively with scores of pleasant, mastery, competence, autonomy, and

433 relatedness subscales, and negatively with scores of unpleasant and performance subscales. In the

434 relationship with the PACES subscales, 5 correlations were moderately high, 12 were moderate, and

435 5 were low (Zhu, 2012). This pattern of correlations suggests convergent validity (i.e., the degree of

436 the relationship between two measures of similar concepts). The low to moderately high range of

437 correlation coefficients also suggests discriminant validity (i.e., the PESD-PE taps unique

438 constructs).

439   To examine nomological validity, two structural equation modeling (SEM) analyses were

440 performed by entering the TIMCPEQ and BPN-PE separately as antecedents of the PESD-PE

441 modalities. The measurement models yielded acceptable fit to the data: PESD-PE and TIMCPEQ,

442 χ^2/df = 1.686, CFI = .932, TLI = .921, RMSE = .044 (.040–.048), SMR = .033; PESD-PE and BPN-

443 PE, χ^2/df = 1.766, CFI = .928, TLI = .916, RMSE = .047 (.043–.050), SMR = .054. Significant

444 paths ($p < .01$) were observed between: mastery climate and emotion, assertiveness, cognitive,

445 motivational, bodily-somatic, communicative, and social support modalities (β ranging from .163 to

446 .398); competence and all modalities (β ranging from .252 to .791); autonomy and enjoyment,

447 cognitive, motivational, and support modalities (β ranging from .204 to .405); and relatedness with

448 enjoyment, cognitive, motivational, communicative, and social support modalities (β ranging from

449 .152 to .457).

450 ***Discussion***

451   Study 2 findings supported the factor structure, full measurement invariance, and structural

452 invariance of the final 33-item PESD-PE. Gender and age variable scores included as covariates in

453 CFA did not alter the factor structure or influence item functioning, although boys reported higher

454   mean scores than girls in six modalities. Construct validity and reliability of the PESD-PE was

455   found, with acceptable CFA fit indices and internal consistency values (α, ω, and CR) all above .70.

456   Standardized loading estimates higher than .60 and AVE values higher than .50 on all modalities,

457   except one, indicated adequate convergent validity of the scale modalities. The discriminant validity

458   of the PESD-PE modalities was also supported. Taking as a reference the minimum AVE value of

459   .445 for the communicative modality, AVE estimates were higher than the squared correlations

460   between two modalities for 42 correlations out of 55.

461   The low to moderate correlation values between the PESD-PE modalities and the subscales of

462   the criterion-related measure (i.e., the PACES) suggest both convergent validity and discriminant

463   validity. Finally, mastery climate, competence, autonomy, and relatedness scores were significant

464   predictors of most of the psychobiosocial modalities, thereby indicating nomological validity.

465   **General Discussion**

466   Emotions and related feelings are widely acknowledged as an inherent part of the academic

467   setting and continue to receive extensive research attention (Pekrun, 2016; Pekrun et al., 2011,

468   2018; Simonton & Garn, 2019). In physical education and sport contexts, psychobiosocial

469   experiences have been previously assessed using two-dimensional measures of functional and

470   dysfunctional experiences, one in physical education (Bortoli et al., 2018) and two in sport

471   (Robazza et al., 2016; Ruiz et al., 2019b). A further instrument (the PESD-Sport; Robazza et al.,

472   2021) was later proposed for the assessment of discrete modalities of psychobiosocial experiences

473   of athletes. An equivalent measure to be used in physical education was missing. Therefore, the aim

474   of this study was to integrate the existing dimensional measure (Bortoli et al., 2018) with a new

475   measure of discrete modalities of students' psychobiosocial experiences. The scale was constructed

476   in agreement with the multimodal view emphasized in the IZOF model (Hanin, 2007) as applied to

477   sport, as well as in appraisal, basic emotion, and dimensional theories of emotions in mainstream

478   psychology (see Coppin & Sander, 2021).

PESD-PE Modalities

In the construction of the PESD-PE, we administered the preliminary 53-item version of the PESD-Sport (Robazza et al., 2021), which included the adjectives proposed by Ruiz et al. (2021) for individualized assessments of 12 functional and dysfunctional modalities of psychobiosocial experiences. The final version of the PESD-PE deriving from both ESEM and CFA consists of 33 items loading into 11 modalities (see Appendix 1 in Supplemental file). Ten of these are the same contained in the PESD-Sport, plus the motivational modality. The volitional modality was removed because of substantial overlapping with items contained in the motivational modality. Although motivational and volitional aspects entail different processes related to predecisional states (e.g., unmotivated–motivated) or postdecisional states (e.g., undetermined–determined) of the course of action, respectively, participants in this study were not able to discern such a subtle distinction, and therefore may have perceived feelings included in the motivation and volition modalities as comparable.

Based on the IZOF model (Hanin, 2007, 2010), which informed the instrument development, we examined several first-order, higher-order, and nested-factor models to identify the best structure of the scale. In line with Robazza et al.'s (2021) study, we found the correlated first-order model to yield the best fit to the data compared to a second-order factor representing global psychobiosocial experiences and three second-order factors representing global psychological, biological, and social components. Thus, inclusion of psychobiosocial experiences in higher-order psychological, biological, and social latent factors as conceived in the IZOF model was not supported. On the other hand, support was found for the multimodal representation of emotion and related feelings as construed in the IZOF model. For practical purposes, the scores of the three items comprised in each of the 11 modalities of the PESD-PE can be used to form complete or aggregated multimodal profiles displaying the level of psychobiosocial experiences at the individual or group level (see Appendix 1 in Supplemental file). PESD-PE data and their display can help teachers

504   identify potential areas of intervention aimed at creating, developing, and maintaining adaptive

505   psychobiosocial experiences in their students.

506   Among the 11 interrelated modalities, the enjoyment modality is a key component of

507   psychobiosocial experiences (Hanin, 2000, 2007) deriving from the interaction between valence

508   (i.e., pleasant or unpleasant experience) and functionality (i.e., adaptive or maladaptive effect). This

509   interaction leads to pleasant–adaptive feelings or unpleasant–maladaptive feelings reflecting the

510   meaning students attribute to their interaction with the physical education environment and their

511   perceived resources to manage the situation. In this view, pleasant–adaptive feelings can be useful

512   in mobilizing resources to face a physical education task, while unpleasant–maladaptive feelings

513   (e.g., dejected, worried) may indicate low energy or failure to activate resources.

514   It is interesting to note that the item intensity scores of the anxiety modality were positive and

515   low in magnitude. They were lower than those of all other modalities across the two samples of

516   students (Supplemental Table 1), indicating that a low level of worry, tension, and nervousness was

517   perceived as useful for performance at the group level. This finding concurs with empirical

518   evidence in sport showing that athletes can perceive anxiety as either functional or dysfunctional

519   based on the individual perception of the impact of the symptoms on performance (Mellalieu et al.,

520   2006; Neil et al., 2012). It is also noteworthy that the mean scores of all PESD-PE items were

521   positive at the group level, meaning that adaptive experiences of students involved in physical

522   education classes prevail over maladaptive ones. These findings are consistent with the objectives

523   of the national physical education curriculum (Ministry of Education, University, and Research,

524   2009) and previous studies conducted within the Italian physical education context, which found

525   students reporting higher scores in functional versus dysfunctional psychobiosocial experiences

526   (e.g., Bortoli et al., 2015, 2018).

527   Along with emotions, functionality (i.e., helpful vs. harmful effects) is inherent in all

528   modalities of psychobiosocial experiences included in the PESD-PE. Feelings of confidence (or

529   self-confidence) share similarities with the notion of self-efficacy, with the two terms (confidence

530   and self-efficacy) being often used interchangeably. In particular, self-confidence refers to the

531   degree of certainty individuals possess about their capability to be successful in a domain (Feltz &

532   Moss, 2019), such as physical education and sport, while self-efficacy refers to the belief of being

533   successful in performing an activity to achieve a certain result, and therefore is more task-specific

534   (Bandura, 1977, 1997). Self-efficacy has been identified as an important correlate of physical

535   activity and fitness in supporting achievement strivings of youngsters (Barnett et al., 2011;

536   McAuley & Blissmer, 2000). Confidence and self-efficacy can relate to feelings of motivation and

537   assertiveness. These can manifest themselves overtly, for example in a fighting spirit and a gritty

538   attitude aimed at energizing achievement behavior toward the mastery of a task and goal attainment

539   (Strycharczyk et al., 2020).

540   The cognitive, bodily-somatic, motor-behavioral, and operational modalities of the PESD-PE

541   are also instrumental to enable students to achieve the goals of school physical education. Indeed,

542   being focused on the task and feeling physically ready, coordinated, and skillful are key conditions

543   for motor learning and performance. Finally, being communicative and feeling supported are

544   fundamental components of the emotional experience. It is widely acknowledged that emotions and

545   related feelings are social phenomena that are experienced, expressed, and regulated within social

546   contexts in interaction with significant others, such as teachers and peers (Tamminen & Gaudreau,

547   2014; Tamminen & Neely, 2021). Social support has been found to exert beneficial effects on self-

548   confidence (Freeman & Rees, 2010), burnout and self-determined motivation (DeFreese & Smith,

549   2013), well-being (DeFreese & Smith, 2014), and performance (Freeman & Rees, 2009).

550   **Measurement Invariance and Construct Validity**

551   Support was found to the factor structure, full measurement invariance, and structural

552   invariance of the PESD-PE across the two study samples. Substantial differences in item responses

553   with the inclusion of gender and age categories as covariates were not found, although boys

554   reported higher mean scores than girls in some modalities (i.e., enjoyment, confidence,

555   assertiveness, bodily-somatic, motor-behavioral, and social support) suggesting they experience

556 higher levels of adaptive feelings. These differences are similar to those shown in the PESD-Sport

557 scores (Robazza et al., 2021). They likely derive from gender-stereotyped beliefs and behaviors

558 formed during the socialization process mediated by significant others, such as parents, peers, and

559 teachers, which shape emotions and perceived competence (Gill, 2020).

560   Convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the PESD-PE was also supported.

561 Convergent and discriminant validity was determined in both studies with high standardized

562 loading estimates, cross-loadings on unintended factors smaller than the target factor loadings, and

563 AVE values greater than the squared correlation between two modalities for most correlations.

564 Moreover, the pattern from low to moderately high correlations of the PESD-PE modalities with the

565 PACES subscales observed in Study 2 was in the expected direction, thus indicating both

566 convergent and discriminant validity. In particular, the latent factor correlations between the PESD-

567 PE and the PACES (i.e., the criterion-related measure) were as expected, with all psychobiosocial

568 modalities correlating positively and negatively with the pleasant and unpleasant scales of the

569 PACES, respectively.

570   Nomological validity was established in the relationship of the TIMCPEQ and the BPN-PE

571 with the PESD-PE. Indeed, mastery climate scores from the TIMCPEQ, and competence,

572 autonomy, and relatedness scores from the BPN-PE were found to predict most of the

573 psychobiosocial modalities. These findings are consistent with the extant research showing a clear

574 relationship between functional psychobiosocial experiences and mastery climate in physical

575 education (Bortoli et al., 2015, 2018; Di Battista et al., 2019) as well as basic psychological needs

576 of competence, autonomy, and relatedness in young athletes (Morano et al., 2020).

577 **Limitations and Future Research**

578   The validity of the scale developed in Italian language should be examined across students of

579 different cultures, also taking into consideration factors that can influence psychobiosocial

580 experiences, such as the possible amount of sport experience and different competitive levels.

581 Convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity should be further investigated in comparison

582   with other measures specifically developed to assess relevant discrete emotions in the physical

583   education domain, such as the SEPE (Trigueros et al., 2019), the AEQ-PE (Fierro-Suero et al.,

584   2020), and the DEPES (Simonton et al., 2023). It would be also worth investigating the

585   commonalities and differences between the current scale, developed as a discrete measure of

586   psychobiosocial experiences, and the PBS-SPE scale (Bortoli et al., 2018) developed as a

587   dimensional measure of same experiences. Longitudinal data collection and intervention studies are

588   also recommended to evaluate trends and reciprocal relationships between psychobiosocial

589   experiences, learning, and behavior of physical education students, and the predictive validity of the

590   single and interactive effects of the psychobiosocial modalities on performance process and

591   outcome.

592   **Conclusion**

593   The PESD-PE was developed to assess relevant psychobiosocial experiences of students

594   participating in physical education classes. Grounded in a substantive theoretical framework (i.e.,

595   the IZOF model; Hanin, 2000, 2007), the purpose of this study was to provide researchers and

596   teachers with a new tool to evaluate a range of discrete emotion-related feelings. With this new

597   measure, we intend to contribute to the current body of knowledge on psychobiosocial experiences,

598   stimulate further research in this area, and provide teachers with useful information about their

599   students. Indeed, data collected through the PESD-PE could deepen our understanding of the

600   reciprocal effects of emotions and performance, and also inform applied interventions aimed at

601   creating adaptive psychobiosocial experiences aligned with physical education objectives. The

602   overall findings support the construct, convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the

603   measure, as well as the invariance across gender and age categories, but further research is

604   warranted.

References

Adank, A. M., Van Kann, D. H., Remmers, T., Kremers, S. P., & Vos, S. B. (2021). Longitudinal perspectives on children's physical activity patterns: "Do physical education-related factors matter?" *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, *18*(10), 1199–1206. https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2020-0859

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Barkoukis, V., Rodafinos, A., Koidou, E., & Tsorbatzoudis, H. (2012). Development of a scale measuring trait anxiety in physical education. M*easurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *16*(4), 237–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367x.2012.716724

Barnett, L. M., Morgan, P. J., Van Beurden, E., Ball, K., & Lubans, D. R. (2011). A reverse pathway? Actual and perceived skill proficiency and physical activity. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, *43*(5), 898–904. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181fdfadd

Bortoli, L., Bertollo, M., Filho, E., di Fronso, S., & Robazza, C. (2017). Implementing the TARGET model in physical education: Effects on perceived psychobiosocial and motivational states in girls. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(1517). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01517

Bortoli, L., Bertollo, M., Vitali, F., Filho, E., & Robazza, C. (2015). The effects of motivational climate interventions on psychobiosocial states in high school physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *86*(2), 196–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.999189

Bortoli, L., Colella, D., Morano, M., Berchicci, M., Bertollo, M., & Robazza, C. (2008). Teacher-Initiated Motivational Climate in Physical Education questionnaire in an Italian sample. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *106*(1), 207-214. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.106.1.207-214

630   Bortoli, L., Vitali, F., Di Battista, R., Ruiz, M. C., & Robazza, C. (2018). Initial validation of the

631   Psychobiosocial States in Physical Education (PBS-SPE) scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*,

632   *9*(2446). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02446

633   Brown, T. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.

634   Brunner, M., Nagy, G., & Wilhelm, O. (2012). A tutorial on hierarchically structured constructs.

635   *Journal of Personality*, *80*(4), 796–846. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00749.x

636   Byrne, B. M. (2012). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus: Basic concepts, applications, and*

637   *programming*. Routledge.

638   Canivez, G. L. (2016). Bifactor modeling in construct validation of multifactored tests: Implications

639   for multidimensionality and test interpretation. In K. Schweizer & C. DiStefano (Eds.),

640   *Principles and methods of test construction: Standards and recent advancements* (pp. 247–

641   271). Hogrefe.

642   Carraro, A., Young, M. C., & Robazza, C. (2008). A contribution to the validation of the Physical

643   Activity Enjoyment Scale in an Italian sample. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *36*(7), 911–

644   918. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2008.36.7.911

645   Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance.

646   *Structural Equation Modeling*, *14*(3), 464–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834

647   Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing

648   measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*(2), 233–255.

649   https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

650   Coppin, G., & Sander, D. (2021). Theoretical approaches to emotion and its measurement. In H. L.

651   Meiselman (Ed.), *Emotion measurement* (2nd ed., pp. 3–37). Woodhead Publishing.

652   https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-821124-3.00001-6

653   DeFreese, J. D., & Smith, A. L. (2013). Teammate social support, burnout, and self-determined

654   motivation in collegiate athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *14*(2), 258–265.

655   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.10.009

656   DeFreese, J. D., & Smith, A. L. (2014). Athlete social support, negative social interactions, and

657   psychological health across a competitive sport season. *Journal of Sport and Exercise*

658   *Psychology*, *36*(6), 619–630. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2014-0040

659   Di Battista, R., Robazza, C., Ruiz, M. C., Bertollo, M., Vitali, F., & Bortoli, L. (2019). Student

660   intention to engage in leisure-time physical activity: The interplay of task-involving climate,

661   competence need satisfaction and psychobiosocial states in physical education. *European*

662   *Physical Education Review*, *25*(3), 761–777. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X18770665

663   Di Corrado, D., Vitali, F., Robazza, C., & Bortoli, L. (2015). Self-efficacy, emotional states, and

664   performance in carom billiards. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *121*(1), 14-25.

665   https://doi.org/10.2466/30.PMS.121c11x6

666   Farmer, A. Y., & Farmer, G. L. (2014). *Research with diverse groups: Research designs and*

667   *multivariate latent modeling for equivalence*. Oxford University Press.

668   Feltz, D. L. & Moss, T. (2019). Self-confidence. In D. Hackfort, R. J. Schinke, & B. Strauss (Eds.),

669   *Dictionary of sport psychology: Sport, exercise, and performing arts* (pp. 257–258).

670   Academic Press.

671   Fierro-Suero, S., Almagro, B. J., & Sáenz-López, P. (2020). Validation of the Achievement

672   Emotions Questionnaire for Physical Education (AEQ-PE). *International Journal of*

673   *Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(12), 4560.

674   http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124560

675   Freeman, P., & Rees, T. (2009). How does perceived support lead to better performance? An

676   examination of potential mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*(4), 429–441.

677   https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200903222913

678   Freeman, P., & Rees, T. (2010). Perceived social support from team-mates: Direct and

679   stressbuffering effects on self-confidence. *European Journal of Sport Science*, *10*(1), 59–67.

680   https://doi.org/10.1080/1746139903049998

681   Gill, D. L. (2020). Gender and culture. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport*

682   *psychology* (4th ed., pp. 1131–1151). Wiley.

683   Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th

684   ed.). Cengage.

685   Hanin, Y. L. (Ed.). (2000). *Emotions in sport*. Human Kinetics.

686   Hanin, Y. L. (2007). Emotions in sport: Current issues and perspectives. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C.

687   Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 31–58). John Wiley & Sons.

688   Hanin, Y. L. (2010). Coping with anxiety in sport. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Coping in sport: Theory,*

689   *methods, and related constructs* (pp. 159–175). Nova Science Publishers.

690   Hanin, J., & Ekkekakis, P. (2014). Emotions in sport and exercise settings. In A. G. Papaioannou &

691   D. Hackfort (Eds.), *Routledge companion to sport and exercise psychology: Global*

692   *perspectives and fundamental concepts* (pp. 83–104). Routledge.

693   Haywood, K. M., & Getchell, N. (2020). *Life span motor development* (7th ed.). Human Kinetics.

694   Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:

695   Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1–55.

696   https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

697   Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research (2009). *Linee guida per le attività di*

698   *educazione fisica, motoria e sportiva nelle scuole secondarie di primo e secondo grado*

699   [Physical education and sport guidelines in primary and secondary school]. Rome: Italian

700   Ministry of Education, University, and Research.

701   Jones, M., Lane, A., Bray, S., Uphill, M., & Catlin, J. (2005). Development and validation of the

702   sport emotion questionnaire. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *27*(4), 407–431.

703   https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.27.4.407

704   Karagiannidis, Y., Barkoukis, V., Gourgoulis, V., Kosta, G., & Antoniou, P. (2015). The role of

705   motivation and metacognition on the development of cognitive and affective responses in

706   physical education lessons: A self-determination approach. *Motricidade*, *11*(1), 135–150.

707   https://doi.org/10.6063/motricidade.3661

708   Kendzierski, D., & DeCarlo, K. J. (1991). Physical activity enjoyment scale: Two validation

709   studies. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *13*(1), 50–64.

710   https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.13.1.50

711   Lazarus, R. S. (2001). Relational meaning and discrete emotions. In K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr, & T.

712   Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal processes in emotion* (pp. 37–67). Oxford University Press.

713   Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Patall, E. A., & Pekrun, R. (2016). Adaptive motivation and emotion in

714   education: Research and principles for instructional design. *Policy Insights from the*

715   *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*(2), 228–236. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732216644450

716   Marsh, H. W., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Morin, A. J. S., &

717   Trautwein, U. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling, integrating CFA and EFA:

718   Application to students' evaluations of university teaching. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*

719   *Multidisciplinary Journal*, *16*(3), 439–476. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903008220

720   Martin, J. J., & Kulinna, P. H. (2005). A social cognitive perspective of physical-activity-related

721   behavior in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *24*(3), 265–281.

722   https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.24.3.265

723   Mauss, I. B., & Robinson, M. D. (2009). Measures of emotion: A review. *Cognition and Emotion*,

724   *23*(2), 209–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930802204677

725   McAuley, E., & Blissmer, B. (2000). Self-efficacy determinants and consequences of physical

726   activity. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, *28*(2), 85-88.

727   Mellalieu, S. D., Hanton, S., & Fletcher, D. (2006). A competitive anxiety review: Recent directions

728   in sport psychology research. In S. Hanton & S. D. Mellalieu (Eds.), *Literature reviews in*

729   *sport psychology* (pp. 1–145). Nova Science.

730   Middleton, T. R. F., Ruiz, M. C., & Robazza, C. (2017). Regulating preperformance

731   psychobiosocial states with music. *The Sport Psychologist*, *31*(3), 227–1236.

732   https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2016-0081

733   Morano, M., Bortoli, L., Ruiz, M. C., & Robazza, C. (2020). Psychobiosocial states as mediators of

734   the effects of basic psychological need satisfaction on burnout symptoms in youth sport.

735   *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(12), 4447.

736   https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124447

737   Morano, M., Bortoli, L., Ruiz, M. C., Vitali, F., & Robazza, C. (2019). Self-efficacy and enjoyment

738   of physical activity in children: Factorial validity of two pictorial scales. *PeerJ*, *7*, e7402.

739   https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.7402

740   Morin, A. J. S., Arens, A. K., & Marsh, H. W. (2016). A bifactor exploratory structural equation

741   modeling framework for the identification of distinct sources of construct-relevant

742   psychometric multidimensionality. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary*

743   *Journal*, *23*(1), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.961800

744   Morin, A. J. S., & Maïano, C. (2011). Cross-validation of the short form of the Physical Self-

745   Inventory (PSI-S) using exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM). *Psychology of*

746   *Sport and Exercise*, *12*(5), 540–554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.04.003

747   Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2017). *Mplus user's guide* (8th ed.). Muthén & Muthén.

748   Myers, N. D., Ahn, S., & Jin, Y. (2013). Rotation to a partially specified target matrix in

749   exploratory factor analysis: How many targets? *Structural Equation Modeling: A*

750   *Multidisciplinary Journal*, *20*(1), 131-147. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2013.742399

751   Myers, N. D., Celimli, S., Martin, J. J., & Hancock, G. R. (2016). Sample size determination and

752   power estimation in structural equation modeling. In N. Ntoumanis & N.D. Myers (Eds.), *An*

753   *introduction to intermediate and advanced statistical analyses for sport and exercise*

754   *scientists* (pp. 267-284). Wiley.

755   Myers, N. D., Jin, Y., Ahn, S., Celimli, S., & Zopluoglu, C. (2015). Rotation to a partially specified

756   target matrix in exploratory factor analysis in practice. *Behavior Research Methods*, *47*(2),

757   494-505. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0486-7

758   Myers, N. D., Ntoumanis, N., Gunnell, K. E., Gucciardi, D. F., & Lee, S. (2018). A review of some

759   emergent quantitative analyses in sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of*

760   *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*(1), 70-100.

761   https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317356

762   Nateri, R., Robazza, C., Tolvanen, A., Bortoli, L., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., & Ruiz, M. C. (2020).

763   Emotional intelligence and psychobiosocial states: Mediating effects of intra-team

764   communication and role ambiguity. *Sustainability*, *12*(21), 9019.

765   https://doi.org/10.3390/su12219019

766   Neil, R., Wilson, K., Mellalieu, S. D., Hanton, S., & Taylor, J. (2012). Competitive anxiety

767   intensity and interpretation: A two-study investigation into their relationship with

768   performance. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *10*(2), 96-111.

769   https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197x.2012.645134

770   Papaioannou, A. (1998). Students' perceptions of the physical education class environment for boys

771   and girls and the perceived motivational climate. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*

772   *Sport*, *69*(3), 267-275. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1998.10607693

773   Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries,

774   and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review*,

775   *18*(4), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

776   Pekrun, R. (2016). Academic emotions. In K. R. Wentzel & D. B. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of*

777   *motivation at school* (2nd ed., pp. 120–144). Routledge.

778   https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315773384-8

779   Pekrun, R. (2017). Emotion and achievement during adolescence. *Child Development Perspectives*,

780   *11*(3), 215–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12237

781 Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Barchfeld, P., & Perry, R. P. (2011). Measuring emotions in

782   students' learning and performance: The Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ).

783   *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*(1), 36–48.

784   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.10.002

785 Pekrun, R., Muis, K.R., Frenzel, A.C., & Goetz, T. (2018). *Emotions at school*. Routledge.

786   https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315187822

787 Preacher, K. J., & Coffman, D. L. (2006, May). *Computing power and minimum sample size for*

788   *RMSEA* [Computer software]. http://quantpsy.org/

789 Rees, T., & Freeman, P. (2012). Coping in sport through social support. In J. Thatcher, M. Jones, &

790   D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Coping and emotion in sport* (2nd ed., pp. 102–117). Routledge.

791 Robazza, C., Bertollo, M., Ruiz, M. C., & Bortoli, L. (2016). Measuring psychobiosocial states in

792   sport: Initial validation of a trait measure. *PLoS One*, *11*(12), e0167448.

793   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167448

794 Robazza, C., & Bortoli, L. (2005). Changing students' attitudes towards risky motor tasks: An

795   application of the IZOF model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *23*(10), 1075–1088.

796   https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500128205

797 Robazza, C., Gallina, S., D'Amico, M. A., Izzicupo, P., Bascelli, A., Di Fonso, A., Mazzaufo, C.,

798   Capobianco, A., & Di Baldassarre, A. (2012). Relationship between biological markers and

799   psychological states in elite basketball players across a competitive season. *Psychology of*

800   *Sport and Exercise*, *13*(4), 509-517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.02.011

801 Robazza, C., Izzicupo, P., D'Amico, M. A., Ghinassi, B., Crippa, M. C., Di Cecco, V., Ruiz, M. C.,

802   Bortoli, L., & Di Baldassarre, A. (2018). Psychophysiological responses of junior orienteers

803   under competitive pressure. *PLoS One*, *13*(4), e0196273.

804   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196273

805   Robazza, C., Ruiz, M. C., & Bortoli, L. (2021). Psychobiosocial experiences in sport: Development

806   and initial validation of a semantic differential scale. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *55*,

807   101963. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101963

808   Rosenberg, B. D., & Navarro, M. A. (2018). Semantic differential scaling. In B. B. Frey (Ed.), *The*

809   *SAGE encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluatio*n (pp. 1503–1507).

810   SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139.n624

811   Ruiz, M. C., Bortoli, L., & Robazza, C. (2021). The multi-states (MuSt) theory for emotion- and

812   action-regulation in sports. In M. C. Ruiz & C. Robazza (Eds.), *Feelings in sport: Theory,*

813   *research, and practical implications for performance and well-being* (pp. 3–17). Routledge.

814   https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003052012-2

815   Ruiz, M. C., Hanin, Y., & Robazza, C. (2016). Assessment of performance-related experiences: An

816   individualized approach. *The Sport Psychologist*, *30*(3), 201-218.

817   https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2015-0035

818   Ruiz, M. C., Raglin, J. S., & Hanin, Y. L. (2017). The individual zones of optimal functioning

819   (IZOF) model (1978-2014): Historical overview of its development and use. *International*

820   *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 15*(1), 41–63.

821   https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2015.1041545

822   Ruiz, M. C., & Robazza, C. (2020). Emotion regulation. In D. Hackfort & R. J. Schinke (Eds.), *The*

823   *Routledge international encyclopedia of sport and exercise psychology: Volume 2: Applied*

824   *and practical measures* (pp. 263–280). Routledge.

825   Ruiz, M. C., Robazza, C., Tolvanen, A., Haapanen, S., & Duda, J. L. (2019a). Coach-created

826   motivational climate and athletes' adaptation to psychological stress: Temporal motivation-

827   emotion interplay. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(617).

828   https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00617

829   Ruiz, M. C., Robazza, C., Tolvanen, A., & Hanin, J. (2019b). The Psychobiosocial States (PBS-S)

830   scale: Factor structure and reliability. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *35*(5),

831   658–665. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000454

832   Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in*

833   *motivation, development, and wellness*. The Guilford Press.

834   Scherer, K. R., Schorr, A., & Johnstone, T. (Eds.) (2001). Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory,

835   methods, research. Oxford University Press.

836   Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R.G. (2016). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (4th

837   ed.). Routledge.

838   Shephard, R. J., & Trudeau, F. (2000). The legacy of physical education: Influences on adult

839   lifestyle. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, *12*(1), 34-50. https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.12.1.34

840   Shuman, V., & Scherer, K. R. (2014). Concepts and structures of emotions. In R. Pekrun & L.

841   Linnenbrink- Garcia (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 13– 35).

842   Routledge.

843   Simonton, K. L., Mercier, K., & Garn, A. C. (2018). *Development of the Discrete Emotions in*

844   *Physical Education Scale (DEPES)* [Paper presentation]. National Conference of the Society

845   of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America, Nashville, TN.

846   Simonton, K. L., & Garn, A. (2019). Exploring achievement emotions in physical education: The

847   potential for the control-value theory of achievement emotions. *Quest*, *71*(4), 434–446.

848   https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2018.1542321

849   Simonton, K. L., & Garn, A. C. (2020). Negative emotions as predictors of behavioral outcomes in

850   middle school physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, *26*(4), 764–781.

851   https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X19879950

852   Simonton, K. L., Garn, A. C., & Mercier, K. J. (2023). Expanding the Discrete Emotions in

853   Physical Education Scale (DEPES): Evaluating emotions with behavior and learning.

854   *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 94(1), 35–44.

855   https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2021.1935434

856   Strycharczyk, D., Clough, P., Wall, T., & Perry, J. (2020). Mental toughness. In W. L. Filho, T.

857   Wall, A. M. Azul, L. Brandli, & P. G. Özuyar (Eds.), *Good health and well-being* (pp. 471–

858   483. Springer.

859   Tamminen, K. A., & Gaudreau, P. (2014). Coping, social support, and emotion regulation in teams.

860   In M. R. Beauchamp & M. A. Eys (Eds.), *Group dynamics in exercise and sport psychology*

861   (2nd ed., pp. 222–239). Routledge.

862   Tamminen, K. A., & Neely, K. C. (2021). We're in this together: Dyadic and interpersonal aspects

863   of emotions, coping, and emotion regulation in sport. In M. C. Ruiz & C. Robazza (Eds.),

864   *Feelings in sport: Theory, research, and practical implications for performance and well-*

865   *being* (pp. 58–69). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003052012-8

866   Trigueros, R., Aguilar-Parra, J. M., Cangas, A. J., & Álvarez, J. F. (2019). Validation of the scale of

867   emotional states in the physical education context. *Sustainability*, *11*, 5006.

868   https://doi.org/10.3390/su11185006

869   Verhagen, T., van den Hooff, B., & Meents, S. (2015). Toward a better use of the semantic

870   differential in IS research: An integrative framework of suggested action. *Journal of the*

871   *Association for Information Systems*, *16*(2), 108–143. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00388

872   Vlachopoulos, S. P., Katartzi, E. S., & Kontou, M. G. (2011). The Basic Psychological Needs in

873   Physical Education scale. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *30*(3), 263–280.

874   https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.30.3.263

875   Wang, J., & Wang, X. (2020). *Structural equation modeling: Applications using Mplus* (2nd ed.).

876   John Wiley & Sons.

877   Watkins, M. W. (2017). The reliability of multidimensional neuropsychological measures: From

878   alpha to omega. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, *31*(6–7), 1113–1126.

879   https://doi.org/10.1080/13854046.2017.1317364

880   Zhu, W. (2012). Sadly, the earth is still round (p < 0.05). *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, *1*(1),

881   9–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2012.02.002

Table 1

Fit Indices for the Factor Models of the PESD-PE from Study 1 (N = 336) and Study 2 (N = 352)

Model	χ^2 (df)	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR	AIC	PCFI
Study 1								
12 mod, 53 items, ESEM	1880.070 (808)	2.327	.885	.805	.063 (.059–.067)	.019	59722.400	.740
11 mod, 33 items, ESEM	303.990 (220)	1.382	.984	.962	.034 (.024–.043)	.013	36106.398	1.673
Study 2								
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – first-order	806.731 (440)	1.833	.936	.923	.049 (.043–.054)	.042	37877.589	.328
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – higher-order	1358.540 (495)	2.745	.850	.840	.070 (.066–.075)	.082	38590.280	.170
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – 3 higher-order	1372.935 (495)	2.774	.847	.837	.071 (.067–.075)	.171	38601.896	.169
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – 3 higher-order[1]	1369.261 (495)	2.766	.848	.838	.071 (.066–.075)	.147	38599.230	.170
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – nested-factor	1186.764 (473)	2.509	.876	.861	.065 (.061–.070)	.070	38372.906	.224
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – 3 nested-factor	1096.340 (470)	2.333	.891	.877	.062 (.057–.066)	.075	38241.022	.235
11 mod, 33 items, CFA – 3 nested-factor[1]	1032.420 (470)	2.197	.902	.890	.058 (.053–.063)	.065	38148.726	.238

Note. Mod = modalities, ESEM = Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling, CFA = Confirmatory Factor Analysis, χ^2(df) = chi-square (degrees of freedom), CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker Lewis fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion, PCFI = Parsimony comparative fit index. [1]The operational modality of the social component is included in the biological component.

Supplemental Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loadings of the PESD-PE for Study 1 and Study 2

Modality Item	Sample 1 (*N* = 336)						Sample 2 (*N* = 352)					
	M	*SD*	SK	K	*λ*	*δ*	*M*	*SD*	SK	K	*λ*	*δ*
Enjoyment												
1	2.300	1.845	-1.555	2.364	.845	.286	2.290	1.701	-1.254	1.466	.863	.255
12	2.110	1.651	-1.234	1.868	.882	.222	2.110	1.525	-0.950	0.899	.859	.261
23	2.290	1.636	-1.462	2.651	.861	.258	2.200	1.608	-1.232	1.366	.858	.263
Confidence												
2	2.140	1.804	-1.625	2.667	.798	.364	2.110	1.746	-1.462	2.080	.846	.284
13	1.740	1.948	-1.168	0.698	.827	.316	1.760	2.067	-1.170	0.611	.815	.335
24	1.790	1.872	-1.105	0.702	.761	.420	1.740	1.919	-0.979	0.284	.832	.308
Anxiety												
3	0.890	1.534	-0.183	0.311	.756	.429	0.780	1.566	-0.232	0.626	.751	.435
14	0.990	1.499	-0.199	-0.139	.782	.388	0.760	1.666	-0.283	0.144	.839	.297
25	0.660	1.644	-0.502	0.558	.690	.524	0.520	1.772	-0.357	0.294	.833	.306
Assertiveness												
4	1.910	1.776	-1.033	0.973	.747	.442	1.920	1.671	-0.614	-0.351	.655	.571
15	2.040	1.802	-1.135	0.908	.769	.409	1.890	1.825	-1.001	0.582	.819	.329
26	1.580	1.750	-0.627	0.061	.727	.471	1.510	1.920	-0.682	-0.073	.690	.524
Cognitive												
5	1.420	2.169	-0.970	0.025	.792	.373	1.430	2.003	-0.878	-0.062	.721	.480
16	1.960	1.934	-1.433	1.610	.852	.274	1.910	1.808	-1.339	1.310	.856	.268
27	1.860	1.823	-1.526	2.174	.809	.346	1.970	1.659	-1.453	2.055	.828	.314
Motivational												
6	2.000	1.812	-1.260	1.464	.826	.318	1.970	1.850	-1.136	0.700	.767	.411
17	2.040	1.911	-1.582	2.145	.831	.310	2.090	1.752	-1.470	2.304	.852	.275
28	2.030	1.877	-1.469	1.932	.852	.275	2.190	1.709	-1.571	2.744	.856	.267

Supplemental Table 1 Continued

	M	SD	SK	K	λ	δ	M	SD	SK	K	λ	δ
Bodily-somatic												
7	1.690	2.050	-0.868	-0.113	.823	.323	1.770	2.017	-0.940	0.135	.814	.337
18	1.820	1.934	-0.983	0.329	.882	.223	1.970	1.797	-1.166	1.120	.831	.309
29	2.050	1.622	-1.454	2.777	.786	.383	2.040	1.677	-1.335	1.947	.813	.339
Motor-behavioral												
8	1.870	1.974	-1.137	0.561	.817	.332	1.930	1.964	-1.156	0.704	.831	.309
19	2.080	1.476	-1.148	1.470	.794	.370	2.080	1.572	-1.133	1.307	.826	.318
30	1.830	1.835	-1.172	0.985	.776	.398	1.820	1.924	-1.271	1.059	.784	.385
Operational												
9	1.900	1.752	-1.429	1.891	.799	.361	1.910	1.719	-1.116	0.914	.842	.292
20	1.970	1.639	-1.270	1.777	.857	.265	1.990	1.642	-1.079	0.973	.846	.284
31	1.920	1.576	-1.211	1.663	.778	.395	1.950	1.618	-1.361	1.971	.782	.388
Communicative												
10	1.990	1.787	-1.222	1.336	.706	.502	2.120	1.607	-1.020	0.882	.670	.551
21	1.600	1.491	-0.642	0.640	.662	.562	1.540	1.576	-0.412	0.021	.691	.523
32	2.340	1.620	-1.298	1.839	.748	.441	2.490	1.513	-1.467	2.845	.640	.591
Social support												
11	2.050	1.379	-1.006	0.928	.839	.296	1.810	1.667	-1.091	0.953	.842	.292
22	1.960	1.434	-0.916	1.120	.785	.384	1.870	1.595	-0.962	1.079	.789	.377
33	2.130	1.551	-1.147	1.462	.818	.331	1.990	1.662	-1.036	0.853	.794	.369

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation, SK = skewness, K = kurtosis, λ = standardized factor loading, δ = standardized residual variance.

Supplemental Table 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Latent Factors and Reliability Indices

Modality	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	Sample 1 (N = 336)				Sample 2 (N = 352)			
												α	ω	CR	AVE	α	ω	CR	AVE
(1) Enjoyment	—	.792§	.636§	.587$^\#$	.552$^\#$	.711§	.643§	.588$^\#$	.677§	.481$^\#$	.695§	.895	.896	.897	.744	.894	.895	.895	.740
(2) Confidence	.780§	—	.639§	.740§	.565$^\#$	.696§	.761§	.724§	.780§	.434$^\#$	.619§	.837	.843	.838	.633	.872	.880	.870	.691
(3) Anxiety	.514$^\#$	.523$^\#$	—	.582$^\#$	.444$^\#$	.457$^\#$	.469$^\#$	.394*	.466$^\#$	.510$^\#$	.468$^\#$	.785	.785	.787	.553	.848	.852	.850	.654
(4) Assertiveness	.540$^\#$	.700§	.461$^\#$	—	.487$^\#$	.606§	.654§	.576$^\#$	.617§	.375*	.484$^\#$	.794	.796	.792	.559	.773	.773	.767	.525
(5) Cognitive	.656§	.624§	.480$^\#$	.540$^\#$	—	.745§	.552$^\#$	.523$^\#$	.597$^\#$	.424$^\#$	.548$^\#$	.855	.856	.858	.669	.841	.843	.845	.646
(6) Motivational	.746§	.741§	.472$^\#$	.644§	.797§	—	.626§	.557$^\#$	.659§	.432$^\#$	.637§	.874	.877	.875	.700	.861	.861	.865	.682
(7) Bodily-somatic	.558$^\#$	.723§	.406$^\#$	.684§	.575$^\#$	.692§	—	.796§	.809†	.405$^\#$	.568$^\#$	.861	.875	.870	.691	.856	.861	.860	.671
(8) Motor-behavioral	.538$^\#$	.694§	.349*	.609§	.592$^\#$	.665§	.801†	—	.837†	.365*	.481$^\#$	.829	.835	.838	.633	.849	.852	.855	.662
(9) Operational	.627§	.737§	.432$^\#$	.655§	.694§	.736§	.782§	.799§	—	.428$^\#$	.583$^\#$	.850	.853	.853	.659	.861	.864	.864	.679
(10) Communicative	.487$^\#$	.415$^\#$	.360*	.358*	.386*	.411$^\#$	.375*	.399*	.412$^\#$	—	.398*	.746	.752	.748	.499	.704	.709	.706	.445
(11) Social support	.691§	.633§	.441$^\#$	.421$^\#$	.548$^\#$	.628§	.450$^\#$	.457$^\#$	.543$^\#$	.402$^\#$	—	.853	.855	.855	.663	.848	.850	.850	.654

Note. Sample 1 correlations are below the diagonal and Sample 2 correlations are above; α = Cronbach's alpha values, ω = omega values, CR = composite reliability, AVE = average variance extracted. Correlation *low, $^\#$moderate, §moderately high, †high.

Supplemental Table 3

Fit Indices for Multi-group Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the PESD-PE

Independent variable	Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	ΔCFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% CI)	ΔRMSEA	SRMR	ΔSMR	ΔS-B χ^2 (Δdf)	p value
Study group	Configural	1597.344 (880)	1.815	.936		.923	.049 (.045–.052)		.042			
	Weak measurement	1623.707 (902)	1.800	.935	.001	.924	.048 (.044–.052)	.001	.046	.004	22.900 (22)	.407
	Strong measurement	1664.371 (935)	1.780	.935	.001	.926	.048 (.044–.051)	.001	.047	.005	64.123 (55)	.187
	Strict measurement	1677.388 (957)	1.753	.935	.001	.929	.047 (.043–.050)	.002	.047	.005	76.361 (77)	.499
	Factor variance	1665.793 (934)	1.784	.934	.002	.926	.048 (.044–.051)	.001	.053	.011	65.779 (54)	.131
	Factor covariance	1712.233 (979)	1.749	.934	.002	.929	.047 (.043–.050)	.002	.059	.017	111.822 (99)	.178
Gender, Age, Gender × Age from Study 2	MIMIC Null	996.711 (539)	1.849	.926		.914	049 (.044–.054)		.068			
	MIMIC Saturated	813.435 (440)	1.849	.940		.914	049 (.044–.054)		.038			
	MIMIC Invariant	914.328 (506)	1,807	.934		.918	048 (.043–.053)		.041			

Note. $\chi^2(df)$ = chi-square (degree of freedom), χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, CFI = comparative fit index, ΔCFI = CFI difference, TLI = Tucker Lewis fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, ΔRMSEA = RMSEA difference, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, ΔSMR = SRMR difference, ΔS-B χ^2 (Δdf) = Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square difference test (degree of freedom difference), MIMIC = multiple indicator, multiple causes model.

Supplemental Table 4

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices and Reliability Values from Study 2

Instrument	Factor	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR	α	ω	CR	AVE
PACES[1]		236.027 (101)	2.337	.951	.941	.062 (.051–.072)	.050				
	Pleasant experience (9 items)							.941	.941	.941	.640
	Unpleasant experience (7 items)							.866	.878	.868	.495
TIMCPEQ[2]		37.719 (33)	1.143	.996	.994	.020 (.000–.046)	.031				
	Mastery climate (6 items)							.883	.885	.886	.570
	Performance climate (4 items)							.794	.796	.770	.461
BPN-PE		146.775 (51)	2.878	.955	.942	.073 (.059–.087)	.075				
	Competence (4 items)							.891	.897	.811	.690
	Autonomy (4 items)							.876	.882	.818	.665
	Relatedness (4 items)							.885	.890	.872	.677

Note. PACES = Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale, TIMCPEQ = Teacher-Initiated Motivational Climate in Physical Education Questionnaire, BPN-PE = Basic Psychological Needs in Physical Education Scale, $\chi^2(df)$ = chi-square (degrees of freedom), CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker Lewis fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, α = Cronbach's alpha values, ω = omega values, CR = composite reliability, AVE = average variance extracted. [1]Two correlated errors on the Pleasant experience scale and two correlated errors on the Unpleasant experience scale. [2]Two correlated errors on the Performance climate scale.

Supplemental Table 5

Latent Variable Correlations Between the PESD-PE Modalities and Measures from Study 2

Modality	PACES		TIMCPEQ		BPN-PE		
	Pleasant	Unpleasant	Mastery	Performance	Competence	Autonomy	Relatedness
Enjoyment	.720[†]	-.572[§]	.325*	-.285*	.602[†]	.532[§]	.463[§]
Confidence	.580[§]	-.413[§]	.155	-.170	.752[†]	.371*	.308*
Anxiety	.411[§]	-.266*	.099	-.077	.475[§]	.302*	.248*
Assertiveness	.608[†]	-.418[§]	.218*	-.168	.677[†]	.373*	.334*
Cognitive	.491[§]	-.445[§]	.274*	-.121	.456[§]	.415[§]	.337*
Motivational	.758[†]	-.629[†]	.382*	-.208*	.516[§]	.595[§]	.399*
Bodily-somatic	.603[†]	-.334*	.157	-.085	.724[†]	.376*	.356*
Motor-behavioral	.531[§]	-.283*	.135	-.133	.773[†]	.341*	.295*
Operational	.558[§]	-.372*	.192	-.213*	.747[†]	.365*	.330*
Communicative	.541[§]	-.372*	.282*	-.179	.451[§]	.364*	.568[§]
Social support	.584[§]	-.519[§]	.391*	-.313*	.494[§]	.499[§]	.559[§]

Note. PACES = Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale, TIMCPEQ = Teacher-Initiated Motivational Climate in Physical Education Questionnaire, BPN-PE = Basic Psychological Needs in Physical Education Scale. Correlation *low, [§]moderate, [†]moderately high.

Supplemental Figure 1a

First-Order Factor Model, Exploratory Form

First-Order Factor Model, Confirmatory Form

Supplemental Figure 2

Second-Order Factor Model

Supplemental Figure 3a

*Three-second-Order Factor Model*

Supplemental Figure 3b

Modified Three-second-Order Factor Model

Supplemental Figure 4

Nested-factor Model

Supplemental Figure 5a

Nested Three-factor Model

Supplemental Figure 5b

Modified Nested Three-factor Model

Appendix 1

Psychobiosocial Experiences in Physical Education (PESD-PE)

Below you can find adjectives (descriptors) or sentences that people usually use to describe how they feel about their experience in physical education. For each row there are two opposing descriptors. Read them carefully and for each row choose one descriptor, **one only** (e.g., the descript on the left or the one on the right), which best reflects **how you usually feel during physical education classes**. Then mark the intensity of the descriptor on the scale ranging from 1 (**a little**) to 4 (**very much**). If none of the descriptors in a row reflect how you feel in your experience during physical education classes, check the middle box 0 (**neither… nor**). There are no right or wrong answers. Please, make sure to complete all rows.

Example:
"I feel quite satisfied with myself". In this case you check box 2 on the right side.

Unsatisfied	4	3	2	1	0	1	✗	3	4	Satisfied

On the other hand, if for you it is true: "I feel much dissatisfied with myself", then you have to check box 3 on the left side.

Unsatisfied	4	✗	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Satisfied

		Very much	Much	Moderate	A little	neither… nor	A little	Moderate	Much	Very much	
1	Unhappy	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Happy
2	Incapable	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Capable
3	Worried in a harmful way	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Worried in a helpful way
4	Submissive	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Fighting spirit
5	Distracted	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Alert
6	Unmotivated	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Motivated
7	Physically weak	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Physically vigorous
8	Uncoordinated in my movements	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Coordinated in my movements
9	Ineffective in my performance	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Effective in my performance
10	Being communicative is harmful	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Being communicative is useful
11	I feel ignored	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	I feel considered
12	Sad	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Joyful
13	Insecure	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Secure
14	Mentally tense in a harmful way	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Mentally tense in a helpful way
15	Fragile	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Gritty
16	Unfocused	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Focused
17	Disengaged	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Engaged
18	Physically fatigued	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Full of energy
19	Lethargic in my movements	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Dynamic in my movements
20	Unskillful in my performance	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Skillful in my performance
21	Being expansive is harmful	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Being expansive is useful
22	I feel neglected	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	I feel supported

		Very much	Much	Moderate	A little	neither... nor	A little	Moderate	Much	Very much	
23	Dejected	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Cheerful
24	Uncertain	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Certain
25	Nervous in a harmful way	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Nervous in a helpful way
26	Surrendered	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Combative
27	Inattentive	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Attentive
28	Uninterested	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Interested
29	Physically drowsy	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Physically charged
30	Clumsy in my movements	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Smooth in my movements
31	Inconsistent in my performance	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Consistent in my performance
32	Being sociable is harmful	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Being sociable is useful
33	I feel rejected	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	I feel accepted

Scoring

Scores on the dysfunctional side (i.e., left side) are transformed into negative scores. Thus, the score of an item could range from −4 to 4, and the total score of each modality could range from −12 to 12. It is also possible to calculate a total score by adding the scores of the individual items. The total score could range from −132 to 132.

Mean scores of each modality:

Enjoyment = (1 + 12 + 23)/3
Confidence = (2 + 13 + 24)/3
Anxiety = (3 + 14 + 25)/3
Assertiveness = (4 + 15 + 26)/3
Cognitive = (5 + 16 + 27)/3
Motivation = (6 + 17 + 28)/3
Bodily-somatic = (7 + 18 + 29)/3
Motor-behavioral = (8 + 19 + 30)/3
Operational = (9 + 20 + 31)/3
Communicative = (10 + 21 + 32)/3
Social support = (11 + 22 + 33)/3

Note: The English version here presented is a translation of the Italian version (see last page) and has not been validated.

Complete Psychobiosocial Profile of two Students

#	Maladaptive experiences	Very much	Much	Moderate	A little	neither... nor	A little	Moderate	Much	Very much	Adaptive experiences
1	Unhappy			X						X	Happy
12	Sad				X				X		Joyful
23	Dejected			X						X	Cheerful
2	Incapable			X						X	Capable
13	Insecure		X					X			Secure
24	Uncertain	X							X		Certain
3	Worried in a harmful way		X				X				Worried in a helpful way
14	Mentally tense in a harmful way			X					X		Mentally tense in a helpful way
25	Nervous in a harmful way		X						X		Nervous in a helpful way
4	Submissive				X					X	Fighting spirit
15	Fragile			X					X		Gritty
26	Surrendered			X						X	Combative
5	Distracted		X						X		Alert
16	Unfocused		X							X	Focused
27	Inattentive			X					X		Attentive
6	Unmotivated		X							X	Motivated
17	Disengaged			X					X		Engaged
28	Uninterested				X					X	Interested
7	Physically weak			X						X	Physically vigorous
18	Physically fatigued				X					X	Full of energy
29	Physically drowsy			X					X		Physically charged
8	Uncoordinated in my movements		X							X	Coordinated in my movements
19	Lethargic in my movements			X						X	Dynamic in my movements
30	Clumsy in my movements			X					X		Smooth in my movements
9	Ineffective in my performance		X						X		Effective in my performance
20	Unskillful in my performance			X						X	Skillful in my performance
31	Inconsistent in my performance			X						X	Consistent in my performance
10	Being communicative is harmful			X						X	Being communicative is useful
21	Being expansive is harmful		X						X		Being expansive is useful
32	Being sociable is harmful				X				X		Being sociable is useful
11	I feel ignored			X					X		I feel considered
22	I feel neglected			X				X			I feel supported
33	I feel rejected				X				X		I feel accepted

Note. A Maladaptive Profile of a Student is Displayed on the Left Side (in red) and an Adaptive Profile of Another Student is Displayed on the Right Side (in blue).

Aggregated Psychobiosocial Profile of two Students

Maladaptive experiences　　　**Adaptive experiences**

-4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4

| Maladaptive	Adaptive
Enjoyment	Enjoyment
Confidence	Confidence
Anxiety	Anxiety
Assertiveness	Assertiveness
Cognitive	Cognitive
Motivation	Motivation
Bodily-somatic	Bodily-somatic
Motor-behavioral	Motor-behavioral
Operational	Operational
Communicative	Communicative
Social support	Social support

Note. A Maladaptive Profile of a Student is Displayed on the Left Side (in red) and an Adaptive Profile of Another Student is Displayed on the Right Side (in blue).

Esperienze Psicobiosociali in Educazione fisica (PESD-PE)

Di seguito sono riportati aggettivi o frasi che le persone di solito usano per descrivere come si sentono in relazione alle attività motorie. Per ogni riga vi sono due descrittori opposti. Leggili attentamente e per ciascuna riga scegli uno dei due, **uno solo** (quello nella parte sinistra oppure quello nella parte destra), che riflette **come ti senti di solito durante le lezioni di scienze motorie**; indicane poi l'**intensità** con una X sulla scala che va da 1 (**poco**) a 4 (**moltissimo**). Se in una riga nessuno dei due descrittori è presente nella tua esperienza durante le lezioni di scienze motorie, segna la casella centrale 0 (**né…né**). Non ci sono risposte giuste o sbagliate. Per favore, accertati di rispondere a tutte le descrizioni.

Esempio:
"Mi sento abbastanza soddisfatto di me stesso". In tal caso devi contrassegnare la casella 2 nella parte destra.

Insoddisfatto	4	3	2	1	0	1	✗	3	4	Soddisfatto

Se invece per te è vero: "Mi sento molto insoddisfatto di me stesso", in tal caso devi contrassegnare la casella 3 nella parte sinistra.

Insoddisfatto	4	✗	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Soddisfatto

		Moltissimo	Molto	Abbastanza	Poco	Né…né	Poco	Abbastanza	Molto	Moltissimo	
1	Infelice	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Felice
2	Incapace	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Capace
3	Preoccupato in modo dannoso	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Preoccupato in modo utile
4	Remissivo	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Combattivo
5	Distratto	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Vigile
6	Demotivato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Motivato
7	Fisicamente affaticato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Pieno di energia
8	Fiacco nei movimenti	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Attivo nei movimenti
9	Inefficace nella mia prestazione	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Efficace nella mia prestazione
10	Essere comunicativo mi danneggia	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Essere comunicativo mi è utile
11	Mi sento ignorato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Mi sento considerato
12	Triste	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Gioioso
13	Insicuro	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Sicuro
14	Mentalmente teso in modo dannoso	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Mentalmente teso in modo utile
15	Fragile	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Grintoso
16	Deconcentrato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Concentrato
17	Disimpegnato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Coinvolto
18	Fisicamente scarico	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Fisicamente carico
19	Inerte nei movimenti	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Dinamico nei movimenti
20	Scadente nella mia prestazione	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Abile nella mia prestazione
21	Essere espansivo mi danneggia	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Essere espansivo mi è utile
22	Mi sento trascurato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Mi sento supportato

		Moltissimo	Molto	Abbastanza	Poco	Né…né	Poco	Abbastanza	Molto	Moltissimo	
23	Avvilito	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Allegro
24	Incerto	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Certo
25	Nervoso in modo dannoso	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Nervoso in modo utile
26	Arrendevole	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Agguerrito
27	Disattento	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Attento
28	Disinteressato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Interessato
29	Fisicamente non reattivo	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Fisicamente reattivo
30	Goffo nei movimenti	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Fluido nei movimenti
31	Instabile nella mia prestazione	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Stabile nella mia prestazione
32	Essere socievole mi danneggia	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Essere socievole mi è utile
33	Mi sento rifiutato	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	Mi sento accettato