

University of Groningen

## Intrapersonal factors, social context and health-related behavior in adolescence

Veselska, Zuzana

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2010

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Veselska, Z. (2010). *Intrapersonal factors, social context and health-related behavior in adolescence*. s.n.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# **Socioeconomic differences in self-esteem of adolescents influenced by personality, mental health and social support**

Zuzana Veselska, Andrea Madarasova Geckova, Beata Gajdosova,  
Olga Orosova, Jitse P. van Dijk, Sijmen A. Reijneveld

*Accepted: European Journal of Public Health, doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckp210*

## **Abstract**

Previous studies indicate that self-esteem is lower among adolescents of low socioeconomic status and is associated with a number of intrapersonal, interpersonal and sociocultural factors. Evidence on the mechanisms by which these factors contribute to the connection between socioeconomic status and developing self-esteem is incomplete, however. The purpose of this cross-sectional study is to assess whether personality, mental health and social support contribute to the relationship between socioeconomic status and self-esteem. A sample of 3,694 elementary-school students from Slovakia (mean age 14.3 years, 49% boys) filled out the Rosenberg Self-esteem scale, the Family affluence scale, the Ten-Item Personality Inventory, the 12-item General Health Questionnaire and the Perceived Social Support Scale. Hierarchical linear regression showed family affluence, personality dimensions of extroversion, emotional stability and openness to experience, as well as mental health subscales and social support from family and significant others to be associated with self-esteem. Results indicate that personality dimensions and mental health subscales contribute to the association between family affluence and self-esteem. The contribution of personality and mental problems in the relation between socioeconomic status and self-esteem may have important implications for the design of promotional programs aimed at enhancing self-esteem.

## Introduction

Socioeconomic position has a clear impact on developing self-esteem, especially during the important stage of adolescence. At this period of life, the self-esteem of young people undergoes important changes, influenced not only by the already-mentioned socioeconomic status, but also by variety of other intrapersonal, interpersonal and sociocultural determinants (Finkenauer, Engels, Meeus & Oosterwegel, 2002). Adolescence, the period of transition from childhood to adulthood, is a critical time for the development of lifelong perceptions, beliefs, values and practices. An adolescent struggles with the developmental tasks of establishing an identity, accepting changes in physical characteristics, learning skills for a healthy lifestyle and separating from family (Susman, Dron & Schiefelbein, 2003). Therefore, before entering adulthood, it is important for the adolescent to develop high self-esteem and the ability to care for the self (Anderson & Olnhausen, 1999).

Self-esteem has well-known consequences not only on current physical and mental health and health-related behavior, but also on future health and health-related behavior during adulthood (Mann, Hosman, Schaalma & de Vries, 2004). Self-esteem also plays an important role in what are currently the most frequently used cognitive models of health behavior, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991), the Attitude-Social influence-self-Efficacy (ASE) model (De Vries & Mudde, 1998), the Theory of Triadic Influence (TTI) (Flay & Petraitis, 1994) and the Precede-Proceed model (Green & Kreuter, 1999). Based on the review by Mann et al. (2004), self-efficacy in behavioral domains, according to the TPB, influences self-esteem or the evaluation of self-worth. At the same time, according to other models such as the ASE or TTI, self-esteem could be considered as a distal factor influencing self-efficacy in specific behavioral domains. In addition, to be able to change the consequences of self-esteem on future health and health-related behavior, it is important to be aware of possible correlates and associations of low or high self-esteem which are crucial during the developmental stage of adolescence. According to Harter (1999), the development and maintenance of self-esteem in childhood and adolescence is influenced by two important factors: perceived competence in areas of importance and the experience of social support. Considering other factors, correlates of self-esteem can be divided into several essential domains: (a) gender, (b) socioeconomic factors, (c) personality factors and mental health, and (d) factors from family, friends and significant others. It is also necessary to mention that in the past, researchers only investigated levels of explicit self-esteem. However, in recent decades other aspects of self-esteem have been discovered and explored, such as implicit self-esteem, contingent self-

esteem and self-esteem stability (Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper & Bouvrette, 2003; Kernis et al., 1993).

Gender has been reported to have an influence on developing self-esteem during adolescence. Boys are more likely to have high self-esteem at this stage of life than girls (McMullin & Cairney, 2004; Robins et al., 2002; Kling, Hyde, Showers & Buswell, 1999). Gender differences have also been reported in age-related changes. Self-esteem among boys tends to increase, while self-esteem among girls tends to decrease a little during early adolescence (Birndorf, Ryan, Auinger & Aten, 2005; Robins et al., 2002).

Previous studies also show socioeconomic status to be significantly related to self-esteem. In general, those with higher socioeconomic status report higher self-esteem than those with lower socioeconomic status (Rhodes, Roffman, Reddy & Fredriksen, 2004; Francis & Jones, 1996). Among socioeconomic factors, family income seems to be most related to self-esteem among adolescents (Birndorf et al., 2005).

Mental health has been reported to be associated with self-esteem in the past. Several studies (Miyamoto et al., 2001; Bolognini, Plancherel, Bettschart, & Halfon, 1996; Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach & Rosenberg, 1995; Brown & Mankowski, 1993) have been conducted in this field, and associations have been found between self-esteem and depression and between self-esteem and anxiety. Self-esteem has been also reported to be related to eating disorders (Stice, Presnell & Spangler, 2002) and aggression (Donnellan et al., 2005; Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996). However, the relationship between self-esteem and aggression is currently being debated by researchers. Some authors argue that low self-esteem is related to aggression (Donnellan et al., 2005), whereas others indicate that high self-esteem is linked to aggression (Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996). Surprisingly, less attention has been paid to the connection between personality dimensions and self-esteem itself, though it could be hypothesized that consistent personality traits might influence the way people perceive and evaluate themselves (Robins et al., 2001).

Family, peers and significant others play a major role in the development of an adolescent's self-esteem. The family in particular, as the primary environment at this period of life, provides an important background for developing and creating the initial sense of oneself. Previous studies have found a positive relationship between supporting family relationships and self-esteem (Birndorf et al., 2005; Sweeting & West, 1995; Barrera & Garrison-Jones, 1992). On the other hand, a lack of support or a dysfunctional family environment has been described as a contributor to maladjustment, behavioral problems and drug abuse (Wentzel, 1994; McKay, Murphy, Rivinus & Maisto, 1991). In addition, support from peer groups and significant others, like teachers, could positively or negatively influence the development of one's self-esteem.

The question remains regarding how social support from family, friends and significant others contribute along with other self-esteem factors (e.g. personality, mental health) to the association between socioeconomic status and self-esteem.

Factors such as gender, socioeconomic status, personality and mental health and support from family and other relationships are all suggested as important influences in the field of the developing self-esteem during the adolescence, ultimately affecting outcomes in the area of mental health and health behavior. Understanding the associations between self-esteem and its correlates could bring new ideas to the role of self-esteem in the framework of health promotion among young people. Socioeconomic status is less strongly associated with self-esteem in comparison to personality dimensions and mental health constructs, which are very similar and strongly associated. Social support from family, friends and significant others could be seen again as conceptually more distinct in relation to self-esteem.

Therefore, based on the theoretical and empirical findings, the main aim of this study is to assess whether personality, mental health and social support contribute to the relationship between socioeconomic status and self-esteem. We will explore these variables and their associations with self-esteem. We assume that (a) socioeconomic status, personality, mental health and social support will be significantly associated with self-esteem; (b) socioeconomic status will be less strongly related to self-esteem in the model, and the explanatory power will decrease after adding personality dimensions, mental health and social support subscales; and (c) personality dimensions and mental health subscales, as similar constructs, will be strongly related to self-esteem and have a greater explanatory power.

## **Methods**

### *Sample and Procedure*

The study sample consisted of 3725 adolescents in the 8th and 9th grades of elementary schools in the major cities of Bratislava (cca 425,000 inhabitants, Western Slovakia), Zilina (cca 157,000 inhabitants, Northern Slovakia), Kosice (cca 240,000 inhabitants, Eastern Slovakia) and other smaller cities (cca 20,000 – 40,000 inhabitants) in the eastern region of Slovakia, representing different parts of the country. The study sample was fairly evenly divided by gender (49% boys, 51% girls) and ranged in age from 11 to 17 years (mean age 14.3 years SD 0.65). We decided to exclude students under 13 and over 16 years of age to make the sample more homogeneous and to avoid the influence of age extremes. After this step, the study sample consisted of 3694 students (mean age 14.3 years SD 0.62). Of the sample 24.6% came from Bratislava, 21.3% from Zilina, 32.1% from Kosice and 22% from other eastern region cities.

Trained researchers and research assistants collected the data between October and December 2006. The set of questionnaires was administered during two regular 45-minute lessons in a complete 90-minute period of time on a voluntary and anonymous basis in the absence of teachers. An overall response rate of 93.5% was achieved. Non-response was due to illness or other types of school absence. The local Ethics Committee approved the study.

### *Measures*

Self-esteem was assessed with the Rosenberg Self-esteem scale RSES (Rosenberg, 1965). The 10 items of the RSES assess a person's overall evaluation of his/her worthiness as a human being (Rosenberg, 1979). Responses range on a 4-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Global self-esteem factor can then be calculated, with the sum score ranging from 10 to 40. A higher score indicates higher self-esteem. Cronbach's alpha for global self-esteem was 0.76.

Socioeconomic status was measured by the Family affluence scale, which was developed for the HBSC surveys (Currie et al., 2004) as a measure of family wealth. It comprises four items about family car ownership, bedroom occupancy, computer ownership and family holidays. The composite FAS score (ranging from 0 to 7) was calculated, with a higher score indicating higher family affluence. Cronbach's alpha was 0.60.

Personality was measured using the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI), which is a very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains, with only 10 items being assessed. Each item consists of two descriptors, separated by a comma, using the common stem "I see myself as:" (e.g. "I see myself as: extroverted, enthusiastic"). Five dimensions were calculated within this scale, with the higher score indicating a higher level of each dimension: extroversion (2 items), agreeableness (2 items), emotional stability (2 items), conscientiousness (2 items), and openness to experience (2 items). Responses range on a 7-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), with the sum score ranging from 2 to 14 for each subscale (Gosling, Rentfrow & Swann Jr., 2003). Correlations between subscales were significant and are presented in Table 2. The strongest correlations are between extroversion and openness to experience (0.31) and between emotional stability and agreeableness (0.27).

Psychological well-being was measured using the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12), with a higher score indicating worse psychological well-being (Goldberg, 1972). With this scale, 2 factors could be computed: depression/anxiety (6 items) and social dysfunction (6 items). Responses range on a 4-point scale from 1 to 4, with the sum score ranging from 6 to 24 for each factor (Sarkova et al., 2006). Cronbach's alpha was 0.82 for the depression/anxiety subscale and 0.65 for social dysfunction. Correlation between the subscales is 0.53 (Table 2).

Support from family, friends and significant others was measured using the Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS), with a higher score indicating higher social support. With this scale, consisting of 12 items, 3 possible subscales could be calculated: perceived support from family (4 items), perceived support from friends (4 items), and perceived support from significant others (4 items), with the sum score ranging from 4 to 28 for each subscale. Responses range on a 7-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (Dahlem, Zimet & Walker, 1991; Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet & Farley, 1988; Blumenthal et al., 1987). Cronbach's alphas for the perceived support from family, friends, and significant others subscales were 0.91, 0.91, and 0.85, respectively. Correlations between the subscales are rather strong (0.59, 0.67, 0.78) and are presented in Table 2.

#### *Statistical procedure and analysis*

Standard descriptive analyses (mean, standard deviation, and range of sum score) were performed in the first step. All the scales used in this study were also checked for their distributional properties, and normal distributions were found. Next, we explored the correlations between all the variables. Finally, linear regression was used to analyze the data and to explore associations between self-esteem and other variables, with self-esteem as the dependent variable, adjusted for gender. We did this in both a bivariate and multivariate way. In the multiple regression the variables were entered hierarchically in the following order: Model 0 gender; Model 1 family affluence; in Model 2 the TIPI subscales were added; in Model 3 the GHQ-12 subscales were added; in Model 4 the PSSS subscales were added. The present study focused on the association between socioeconomic status and self-esteem and on the other factors (e.g. personality, mental health, social support) contributing to this association. Therefore family affluence as an indicator of socioeconomic status was added in Model 1. Variables were then added in an order from the proximal to the distal factors in three additional steps (Model 2 to 4): that is, starting with personality as the most proximal factor, via mental health, to social support as the most distal factor. We also explored in an additional analysis whether the associations of personality, mental health with global self-esteem were moderated by socioeconomic status, as measured by family affluence. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 12.

## Results

Table 3.1 and 3.2 show the descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and range of sum score) and correlation matrix for the variables.

**Table 3.1** Descriptive statistic of the study variables

	Mean (SD)	Range
Self-esteem		
global self-esteem	28.07 (4.45)	10-40
positive self-esteem	15.06 (2.40)	5-20
negative self-esteem	12.01 (2.80)	5-20
Family affluence	3.91 (1.66)	0-7
TIP1		
extroversion	9.34 (2.85)	2-14
agreeableness	9.21 (2.42)	2-14
conscientiousness	9.49 (2.51)	2-14
emotional stability	8.77 (2.68)	2-14
openness to experience	9.83 (2.62)	2-14
GHQ-12		
depression/anxiety	11.80 (4.30)	6-24
social dysfunction	11.72 (2.61)	6-24
PSSS		
support from family	21.70 (5.48)	4-28
support from friends	21.65 (5.44)	4-28
support from others	22.07 (5.29)	4-28

In the next step the regression analyses of the associations of the study variables with global self-esteem and the crude effect of all the variables was performed. All of the variables are associated significantly with global self-esteem, but separately they explain just a small part of the total variance. Higher family affluence, a higher level of extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness to experience as well as a higher amount of perceived support from family, friends, and significant others are all associated with higher global self-esteem. On the contrary, higher levels of depression/anxiety and social dysfunction are associated with lower global self-esteem. Among the study variables, both GHQ-12 subscales have the highest standardized  $\beta$  coefficients and the highest explained variance. Other variables, with the small exceptions of emotional stability and perceived support from family subscales, stay at the approximately same level of explained variance.



Table 3.2 Correlation matrix of the study variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 global self-esteem	1											
2 family affluence	.16**	1										
3 TIPI extroversion	.18**	.11**	1									
4 TIPI agreeableness	.11**	-.00	-.03*	1								
5 TIPI conscientiousness	.07**	-.01	.06**	.13**	1							
6 TIPI emotional stability	.28**	.08**	.12**	.27**	.04*	1						
7 TIPI openness to experience	.18**	.11**	.31**	.15**	.17**	.12**	1					
8 GHQ depression anxiety	-.55**	-.07**	-.06**	-.08**	-.00	-.29**	-.02	1				
9 GHQ social dysfunction	-.39**	-.09**	-.08**	-.09**	-.04**	-.19**	-.09**	.53**	1			
10 PSSS support from family	.26**	.05**	.13**	.11**	.10**	.13**	.12**	-.19**	-.18**	1		
11 PSSS support from friends	.13**	.04*	.22**	.11**	.07**	.09**	.20**	-.04*	-.10**	.59**	1	
12 PSSS support from others	.15**	.05**	.21**	.12**	.09**	.07**	.22**	-.02	-.09**	.67**	.78**	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 3.3** Associations of SES, personality dimensions, mental health and perceived social support with global self-esteem: standardized beta coefficients from hierarchical linear regression.

	<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>	<b>Model 4</b>
gender <sup>a</sup>	-0.19***	-0.22***	-0.10***	-.12***
family affluence	0.14***	0.09***	0.07***	0.07***
TIPI extroversion		0.15***	0.11***	0.10***
TIPI agreeableness		0.05**	0.03	0.02
TIPI conscientiousness		0.05**	0.05**	0.04**
TIPI emotional stability		0.22***	0.09***	0.09***
TIPI openness to experience		0.10***	0.10***	0.08***
GHQ-12 depression/anxiety			-0.44***	-0.43***
GHQ-12 social dysfunction			-0.09***	-0.07***
PSSS support from family				0.08***
PSSS support from friends				0.01
PSSS support from others				0.07*
R - square	0.06***	0.18***	0.38***	0.40***

<sup>a</sup> 1 = female

\* p < .05 \*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001

Model 1 = gender, family affluence

Model 2 = gender, family affluence, TIPI subscales

Model 3 = gender, family affluence, TIPI subscales, GHQ-12 subscales

Model 4 = gender, family affluence, TIPI subscales, GHQ-12 subscales, PSSS subscales

Table 3.3 shows the results of hierarchical regression analysis for global self-esteem, adjusted for gender, with 4 models. Altogether, the study variables accounted for 40% of the total variance, and from Model 1 to Model 4 the explained variance increased from 6% to 40%. Model 1 contains family affluence, representing socioeconomic status with a rather low explained variance of 6%. The standardized  $\beta$  coefficient for family income decreased in subsequent models, which may, along with the variables added, be mediators in a causal chain. Similarly, the explained variance increased both after adding personality dimensions and after the additional inclusion of depression/anxiety and social dysfunction. Adding social support (Model 4) hardly affected other betas and explained the variance.

We also explored in an additional analysis whether the associations of personality and mental health with global self-esteem were moderated by socioeconomic status, as measured by family affluence. No moderating effect of socioeconomic status was found on the association between personality and self-esteem or mental health and self-esteem.

## Discussion

Self-esteem is an influential factor in both physical and mental health (Mann et al., 2004). Our findings reveal that an association exists between low socioeconomic status and lower self-esteem. This association changed after adjustment for personality and mental health, but not after additional adjustment for social support.

Family affluence as an indicator for socioeconomic status remained significantly associated with self-esteem from the first to the final model, but its explanatory power decreased after adding personality dimensions and mental health variables (depression/anxiety and social dysfunction). At the same time, family affluence itself explained only 6% of the variance in self-esteem. This indicates the existence of other influential factors contributing to the association between socioeconomic status and self-esteem and could be explained by the mediating role of the personality dimension of emotional stability and even more so by the mental health subscale of depression and anxiety. Also, previous studies on the mediating processes between socioeconomic status, personality and self-esteem and socioeconomic status, family processes and self-esteem indicate such a possibility (Riuz, Roosa & Gonzales, 2002; Bergman & Scott, 2001; Robins et al., 2001; Pullman & Allik, 2000). Our findings imply that lower socioeconomic status is an indicator of lower feelings of self-worth among adolescents, but at the same time such a connection is mediated by young people's personality and mental health.

Depression and anxiety as mental health factors explained the greatest part of the total variance, and in the model this variable took its

explanatory power from family affluence, as has been already mentioned. After adding in this factor, the explanatory power of the personality dimension emotional stability decreased rapidly as well. This may be due to the fact that both of them, emotional stability as well as depression and anxiety, are of a rather similar construct. Their connection has been revealed by previous studies. Neuroticism has been shown to be associated with depression or anxiety (Steunenberg, Beekman, Deeg & Kerkhof, 2006). Moreover, depression and anxiety are frequently associated with self-esteem (Rosenberg et al., 1995). With social support, we moved from the internal to the external determinants of self-esteem. During adolescence, young people have to struggle with developing their self-identity. Family members are those who could primarily influence the perception of self-worth, providing positive feedback and appraisal of an adolescent's behavior, and consequently influence also relationships outside the family environment, which again shape the feelings of self-worth (Kerr, Stattin, Biesecker & Ferrer-Wreder, 2003). As can be seen, social support did not remarkably change the relationship between socioeconomic status and adolescent self-esteem.

#### *Strengths and limitations*

This study has several important strengths, the most important being its large nationally representative sample and its high response rates. It also has limitations. First, only subjective self-reports were used for measuring individual aspects. However, previous studies support the validity of such self-reports (Reijneveld, Crone, Verhulst & Verloove-Vanhorick, 2003). A second limitation is the cross-sectional design of our study, which makes conclusive statements about causality in our findings impossible. They thus need to be confirmed in a longitudinal design. However, as is discussed in Mann et al. (2004) and Flay, Allred and Ordway (2001), there is a lack of clarity regarding the direction of the causal relations between self-esteem and mental problems and disorders (e.g. depression, anxiety or social dysfunction measured in the present study). Finally, it needs to be mentioned that other aspects of self-esteem (e.g. implicit self-esteem, contingent self-esteem) were not measured.

#### *Implications and Conclusion*

The contribution of personality and mental problems on the relation between socioeconomic status and self-esteem may have important implications for the design of health-promotion programs aimed at the reduction of socioeconomic differences in adverse health behavior. Family affluence is clearly associated with adolescent self-esteem and has an impact on the way young people evaluate themselves. Adolescents of low socioeconomic status seem to be a more vulnerable group in the comparison to their peers of higher socioeconomic status and were

identified as a target group for health-promotion programs. The review of Haney and Durlak (1998) about self-esteem interventions provides evidence for the effectiveness of these interventions. However, the authors indicate that such interventions, even though potentially effective, need a better theoretical foundation and should take into account possible differences between participants (e.g. age, ethnicity or type of their problems). Longitudinal studies are needed, however, to support the causal chain we have inferred from our cross-sectional study.

## References

- Ajzen I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
- Anderson, J.A., Olnhausen, K.S. (1999). Adolescent self-esteem: a foundational disposition. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 12, 62-67.
- Barrera, M., Garrison-Jones, C. (1992). Family and peer social support as specific correlates of adolescent depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 20, 1-16.
- Baumeister, R.F., Smart, L., Boden, J.M. (1996). Relation of Threatened Egotism to Violence and Aggression: The Dark Side of High Self-Esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103, 5-33.
- Bergman, M.M., Scott, J. (2001). Young adolescents' wellbeing and health-risk behaviours. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 183-197.
- Birndorf, S., Ryan, S., Auinger, P., Aten, M. (2005). High self-esteem among adolescents: Longitudinal trends, sex differences, and protective factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 37, 194–201.
- Blumenthal, J. A., Burg, M. M., Barefoot, J., Williams, R. B., Haney, T., Zimet, G. (1987). Social support, type A behavior, and coronary artery disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 49, 331-340.
- Bolognini, M., Plancherel, B. , Bettschart, W. , Halfon, O. (1996). Self-esteem and mental health in early adolescence: development and gender differences. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19, 233–245.
- Brown, J.D., Mankowski, T.A. (1993). Self-Esteem, Mood, and Self-Evaluation: Changes in Mood and the Way You See You. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 421-43.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R.K., Cooper, M.L., Bouvrette, A. (2003). Contingencies of self-worth in college students: theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 894-908.

- Currie, C., Roberts, C., Morgan, A., Smith, R., Settertobulte, W., Samdal, O. (eds.). (2004). *Young people's health in context. Health behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study: international report from the 2001/2002 survey. Health Policy for Children and Adolescents.*
- Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, G.D., Walker, R.R. (1991). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support: a confirmation study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47*, 756-761.
- De Vries H., Mudde AN. (1998). Predicting stage transitions for smoking cessation applying the Attitude–Social influence–Efficacy Model. *Psychology and Health, 13*, 369–385.
- Donnellan, M.B., Trzesniewski, K.H., Robins, R.W., Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A. Low self-esteem is related to aggression, antisocial behavior, and delinquency. *Psychological Science, 16*, 328-335.
- Finkenauer, C., Engels, R.C.M.E., Meeus, W.S., Oosterwegel, A. (2002). Self and identity in early adolescence. The pains and gains of knowing who and what you are. In T.M. Brinthaupt & R.P. Lipka (Eds.), *Understanding early adolescent self and identity. Applications and interventions* (pp. 25-56). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Flay, B.R., Petraitis, J. (1994). The theory of triadic influence: a new theory of health behavior with implications for preventive interventions. *Advances in Medical Sociology, 4*, 19–44.
- Flay, B.R., Alled, C.G., Ordway, N. (2001). Effects on the Positive Action program on achievement and discipline: Two matched-control comparisons. *Prevention Science, 2*, 71-89.
- Francis, L.J., Jones S.H. (1996). Social class and self-esteem. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136*, 405-406.
- Goldberg, D. (1972). The General Health Questionnaire. In McDowell I, Newell C Eds. *Measuring Health*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Gosling, S.D., Rentfrow, P.J., Swann, W.B. Jr. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 504-528.
- Green, L.W., Kreuter, M.W. (1999). *Health promotion planning: an educational and ecological approach*. Mountain View, CA, Mogfield.
- Haney, P., Durlak, J.A. (1998). Changing self-esteem in children and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 27*, 423-433.
- Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of the self. A developmental perspective*. Guilford Press, New York.

- Kernis, M.H., Cornell, D.P., Chien-Ru, S., Berry, A., Harlow, T. (1993). There's more to self-esteem than whether it is high or low: the importance of stability of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1190-1204.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., Biesecker, G., Ferrer-Wreder L. (2003). Relationships With Parents and Peers in Adolescence. In Lerner RM, Easterbrooks MA, Mistry J. Eds., *Handbook of psychology, Volume 6, Developmental psychology*. New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons.
- Kling, K. C., Hyde, J. S., Showers, C. J., Buswell, B. N. (1999). Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 470-500.
- Mann, M., Hosman, C. M., Schaalma, H. P., de Vries, N. K. (2004). Self-esteem in a broad-spectrum approach for mental health promotion. *Health Education Research*, 19, 357-372.
- McKay, J. R., Murphy, R. T., Rivinus, T. R., Maisto, S. A. (1991). Family dysfunction and alcohol and drug use in adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 30, 967-972.
- McMullin, J.A., Cairney, J. (2004). Self-esteem and intersection of age, class, and gender. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 18, 75-90.
- Miyamoto, R. H., Hishinuma, E. S., Nishimura, S. T., Nahulu, L. B., Andrade, N. N., Goebert, D. A., Carlton, B. S. (2001). Path models linking correlates of self-esteem in multi-ethnic adolescent sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 701-712.
- Pullman, H., Allik, J. (2000). The Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale: its dimensionality, stability and personality correlates in Estonian. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 701-715.
- Reijneveld, S.A., Crone, M.R., Verhulst, F.C., Verloove-Vanhorick, S.P. (2003). The effect of a severe disaster on the mental health of adolescents: a controlled study. *Lancet*, 362, 691-696.
- Rhodes, J., Roffman, J., Reddy, R., Fredriksen K. (2004). Changes in self-esteem during the middle school years: a latent growth curve study of individual and contextual influences. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42, 243-261.
- Robins, R.W., Tracy, J.L., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., Gosling, S.D. (2001). Personality correlates of self-esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 463-482.
- Robins, R.W., Trzesniewski, K., Tracy, J.L., Gosling, S.D., Potter, J. (2002). Global self-esteem across the life span. *Psychology and Aging*, 17, 423-434

- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York, Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., Schoenbach, C., Rosenberg, F. (1995). Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: different concepts, different outcomes. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 141-156.
- Ruiz, S.Y., Roosa, M.W., Gonzales, N.A. (2002). Predictors of self-esteem for Mexican American and European American youths: a reexamination of the influence of parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16, 70-80.
- Sarkova, M., Nagyova, I., Katreniakova, Z., Madarasova Geckova, A., Orosova, O., Middel, B., van Dijk, J.P., van den Heuvel, W. (2006). Psychometric Evaluation of the General Health Questionnaire-12 and Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale in Hungariona and Slovak Early Adolescents. *Studia Psychologica*, 48, 69-79.
- Steunenberg, B., Beekman, A.T.F., Deeg, D.J.H., Kerkhof A.J.F.M. (2006). Personality and the onset of depression in late life. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 92, 243–251.
- Stice, E., Presnell, K., Spangler, D. (2002). Risk Factors for Binge Eating Onset in Adolescent Girls: A 2-Year Prospective Investigation. *Health Psychology*, 21, 131-138.
- Susman, E.J., Dorn, L.D., Schiefelbein, V.L. (2003). Puberty, sexuality, and health. In Lerner RM, Easterbrooks MA, Mistry J. Eds., *Handbook of psychology*, Volume 6, Developmental psychology. New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons.
- Sweeting, H., West, P. (1995). Family life and health in adolescence: a role for culture in the health inequalities debate? *Social Science and Medicine*, 40, 163-175.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1994). Family functioning and academic achievement in middle school: a social-emotional perspective. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14, 268-291.
- Zimet, G.D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S.G., Farley, G.K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assesment*, 52, 30-41.



