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This manuscript explores the psychometric properties of a scale measuring self-curiosity, a facet of general curiosity, consisting of the attitude and interest people have in understanding themselves better. In this study, we provide data on the comparison between the Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest Scale in an Italian and a Mexican sample, paired for gender, age, and education. The scale reliability was satisfactory, and the two-factor structure of the scale showed a good fit in the Mexican sample. Multigroup confirmatory factor analysis showed configural, metric, partial scalar, and strict invariance between samples. Overall, results indicated that the concept of self-curiosity is meaningfully measured by the SCAI items. In line with previous studies, construct validity of the scale highlighted the expected correlations with measures of trait openness, awareness, and general curiosity. In conclusion, the results show that the two-factor model of the Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest Scale is similarly adequate in both countries.

Keywords: Self-curiosity; Cultural differences; Cross-cultural comparison; Invariance testing; Scale psychometric properties.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Filippo Aschieri, Ph.D., European Center for Therapeutic Assessment, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Via Nirone 15, 20123 Milano (MI), Italy.
Email: filippo.aschieri@unicatt.it

The quality of curiosity has been studied across a broad swath of psychology, with a variety of working definitions. Berylyne (1960, 1971) states that curiosity manifests itself in any potentially novel, uncertain, complex, surprising, or conflicting context. Most theories have agreed that curiosity leads one to explore, learn, and know since Berlyne (1954) conceptualized it as an epistemic inquisitiveness fundamental to the observation and validation of new knowledge. As a personality trait, curiosity is present in people open to experience with a strong desire to know about something or someone from rapid clues or “thin slices” of experience (Carney et al., 2007; Sinha et al., 2017), that is, perceptual curiosity. It has also been
related to psychological flexibility, adaptability in the face of change, and the fluidity of shifting perspectives (McCrae, 1996; McCrae & Costa, 1997).

In education, Bowler (2010) considers it a metacognitive strategy that allows one to remain focused through the continuum of the information search, controlling, channeling, before finally knowing when to stop, while Silvia (2008) calls interest the curious emotion that moves one to learn and explore. Curious students ask more questions in the classroom (Peters, 1978), have more academic success (Hidi & Berndorff, 1998), and challenge themselves more (Kashdan & Silvia, 2008). López and Snyder (2009) believe that curiosity, more than purely academic mastery, is crucial in developing the desire to increase personal knowledge, and is unrestrictedly associated with social and psychological well-being. Undoubtedly, the role of curiosity research is highly important for the planning and development of the field of education.

In the social field, curiosity is visible to others (Kashdan et al., 2013) and is relevant to healthy social interactions and relationships (McCrae & Sutin, 2009), but also when challenging and, at times, violating social norms (Kashdan et al., 2013). Curiosity has been associated with: a) self-efficacy to potentially overcome challenging environments (Bandura, 1997); b) a coping potential based on greater confidence (Silvia, 2008; Silvia et al., 2009); c) a competence motive to master one’s environment (White, 1959); d) better adaptiveness to all sorts of situational demands (Matsumoto et al., 2000); e) less defensive reactions (Kashdan et al., 2011); f) motivation to have new experiences with peers (García & Valdez, 2017). Finally, Loewenstein (1994) considers that lack of curiosity has serious social implications, that is, social stereotyping arises when people fail to recognize their ignorance or understanding gaps with regard to others.

In clinical settings, curiosity is mostly related to self-awareness and introspection. Kashdan and Fincham (2004) link curiosity with self-regulation, and propose interventions aimed at developing enduring curiosity for its concomitant effects, life satisfaction and meaning. In the context of mindfulness, curiosity has been analyzed in relation to reactions to social events in real time (Lau et al., 2006), rather than as the motivation to inquisitively explore the intrapersonal knowledge that comprises the inner self. Wandenerghe et al. (2011) report that it can prevent the development of personality disorders, such as eating disorders, through mindfulness-based interventions. Meanwhile, Finn (2007) proposes to engage clients in defining their assessment questions (i.e., the questions about themselves or about their problems that they wish to find answers to from the assessment) from the onset of the consultation, stressing that promoting clients’ curiosity about themselves and about the origins of their problems increases clients’ participation and utility of the assessment.

Finally, in the field of personality psychology, where Peterson (2006) defined character strengths as individual dimensional traits that are displayed through thoughts, feelings, and/or actions, curiosity is classified as a trait of the cognitive strength of wisdom and knowledge. At the same time, courage is understood by Peterson as the corresponding emotional strength that implies the will to accomplish goals through persistence — “taking pleasure in completing tasks” — and authenticity — “taking responsibility for one’s feelings and actions” (p. 32). In this regard, clinicians focus “on the openness of clients to new information about themselves” (cognition; Aschieri et al., 2020, p. 9), facing the world and oneself alone (Ugazio & Salamino, 2016), persisting (Ginevra et al., 2020), making decisions (Magnano et al., 2021), and confronting their difficulties with courage (emotion; Seleman, 2005) in order to change (action). As has often been said, nothing great in this world can be accomplished without curiosity and courage.

**SELF-CURIOSITY**

Recently, Aschieri and Durosini (2015) proposed and measured a new psychological construct, self-curiosity, which refers to people’s disposition to explore their inner world and their interest in under-
standing themselves better. The Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest Scale (SCAI) is a short self-report questionnaire that was later studied with regard to its factor structure, reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and cross-cultural applicability (e.g., Aschieri et al., 2016; Durosini et al., 2018; Triberti et al., 2017).

A recent review of the empirical research on the concept (Aschieri et al., 2020) documented the structure of the SCAI as consisting of two positively correlated factors, attitude toward self-curiosity and interest in increasing knowledge of self (r ranging from .35 to .50); an acceptable reliability coefficient for such a short scale (α ranging from .62 to .72); and large convergent validity coefficients with reflection, moderate ones with openness, awareness, and motivation toward knowledge, and small yet significant ones with general curiosity, interest, and desire for stimulating experiences. Interest in increasing knowledge of self is also more sensitive to changes in respondent well-being, while attitude toward self-curiosity seems to be a more stable trait-like feature.

Discriminant validity analyses showed that self-curiosity seems to be unrelated to fluid intelligence (Aschieri et al., 2016) and to current emotional states (Aschieri & Durosini, 2015). Recently, the SCAI demonstrated similar results in a Colombian sample (Durosini et al., 2018) and in a Czech sample (Friedlová et al., 2018), suggesting that research on the development of the self can benefit from exploring invariance of self-curiosity across different cultures. The relevance of testing a new measure in different countries allows cross-cultural comparisons of subjects in those countries and eventually the development of increasingly culturally equal instruments measuring psychological functioning (Byrne & van de Vijver, 2014), yielding to more specific, tailor-made intervention strategies.

To date, in Mexico, there are no studies focusing on curiosity measurement and little research focused on related constructs. Merino et al. (2015) tested the Mexican version of the Positive Psychological Functioning Scale, which includes a curiosity subscale. However, the total scale model fit was only moderate — CFI = .926; NFI = .888; RMSEA = .093, 90% CI [.071, .114] — and no convergent validity data were presented for the curiosity subscale. Lopez-Mayà et al. (2015) assessed model fit and convergent validity of the Mexican version of the Mindfulness Attention and Awareness Scale (Brown & Ryan, 2003), finding moderate model fit — CFI = .913; χ²/df = 4.81; RMSEA = .078, 90% CI [.071, .086] — and moderate construct validity coefficients. The paucity of studies on curiosity and the absence of data on self-curiosity set the stage to understand more how self-curiosity can be conceptualized and measured in Mexico.

To this end, this manuscript provides data on the validity of the Mexican version of the SCAI, comparing data from two samples, one Mexican and one Italian. Since the SCAI was originally developed in Italy (Aschieri & Durosini, 2015), we first tested the fit of the model to the new data using Italian results as baseline for cross-cultural comparisons. We assessed the two-factor structure of the SCAI Scale in Mexico following a typical cross-cultural scale adaptation process and the recommended methodological and statistical procedures (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2001): measurement invariance analysis (MI) within confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) framework. Additionally, the scale reliability and the construct validity were evaluated, correlating the SCAI Scale with other conceptually related scales, several of which were already validated for Spanish speaking participants. To increase control over potentially confounding variables in the cross-cultural adaptation of the SCAI we controlled, as closely as possible, other potentially confounding variables by matching the two samples on key demographic features such as gender, age, and years of education. Additionally, we hypothesized that SCAI Scale would positively correlate with openness, awareness and general curiosity and have no or a weak correlation with transient affective states.
METHOD

Participants

All participants voluntarily agreed to participate in the study without incentives. Participants in both samples were recruited through mailing lists and social networks. Five-hundred twenty-three adults participated in this study: 257 were Mexican and 266 were Italian. The two samples were predominantly composed by young adults (Mexico: $M_{age} = 26.24, SD = 7.38$; Italy: $M_{age} = 26.02, SD = 6.89$), female participants (Mexico: female = 181, male = 76; Italy: female = 201, male = 65), with a high level of education (Mexico: $M_{years of study} = 15.85, SD = 2.98$; Italy: $M_{years of study} = 15.71, SD = 3.22$). The two groups were paired for gender, $\chi^2(1) = 1.751, p = .186$, age, $t = .349, df = 521, p = .727$, and years of education, $t = .521, df = 519, p = .602$.

Procedure

The SCAI Scale was translated into Mexican Spanish by three native interpreters. The back-translation into Italian allowed us to compare the versions and resolve inconsistencies by discussion among translators with the first and last authors. The representativeness, understanding, interpretation, and clarity of items of the Mexican version of the SCAI (SCAI-M) were evaluated by a panel of experts composed of researchers at the University of Monterrey (UDEM). Subsequently, the SCAI-M was pilot tested with a sample of 30 Mexican participants of both sexes and with an age range between 18 to 25 years and different socioeconomic statuses. Participants answered open-ended questions (cognitive interview; Smith & Molina, 2011; Willis, 2005) to evaluate the cognitive mechanisms that underlie how individuals respond to items in controlled environments. The interview focused on whether item elements facilitate understanding, recovery of information, estimation, choice and marking of the response. Through questions such as: “What did you think when you read the item?” and “How did you choose your answer?” we explored what specific item words mean, how is relevant information retrieved from autobiographical memory, and through what process of decision or judgment the answer was conceived and submitted. Afterwards, the Qualtrics platform was used for the administration of the SCAI-M and of the other measures.

Measures

Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest Scale (SCAI; Aschieri & Durosini, 2015). The SCAI is a 7-item scale, composed by two factors: attitude toward self-curiosity (F1; four items, “I like to listen to music because it teaches me what I am like as a person); interest in increasing knowledge of self (F2; three items, “I get bored when I have to talk about my feelings”). All items are answered on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 = completely disagree and 7 = completely agree. In this study only two missing items were found among the Italian sample.

All construct validity scales were administered only to Mexican participants.

Big Five Inventory (BFI; Goldberg, 1993). The BFI is a 44-item inventory that measures human personality through five dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. In this study, we used the Mexican version developed by Zamorano et al. (2014).
In their study, the BFI factor structure was confirmed, but the agreeableness factor showed relatively low consistency. In this study, apart from agreeableness, factors showed good to excellent internal reliability coefficients: extraversion (α = .82); conscientiousness (α = .75); neuroticism (α = .77); and openness to experience (α = .70). The consistency of agreeableness was relatively low (α = .64) considering the length of the scale (11 items).

Interest and Deprivation Scale (ID; Litman, 2008). A brief 10-item self-report instrument was developed to measure two specific dimensions of epistemic curiosity: interest and deprivation. The factor interest is related to how people enjoy learning new ideas (e.g., “I find the new information fascinating”), whereas the factor deprivation focused on the way in which people find solutions to specific problems (e.g., “I can spend hours with only one problem, because I cannot rest until I know the answer”). In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients of the ID Scale were .70 for interest and .79 for deprivation.

Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale (PHLMS; Cardaciotto et al., 2008). The PHLMS is a 20-item self-report questionnaire that evaluates mindfulness in adults through two key components: awareness, which refers to the continuous operation of internal and external stimuli (i.e., “I am aware of what thoughts are passing through my mind”), and acceptance, which concerns the person’s nonjudgmental disposition toward one’s experience (i.e., “There are aspects of myself I don’t want to think about”). In this study, we used the Spanish version by Tejedor et al. (2014). The internal consistency coefficients were .80 for awareness and .84 for acceptance.

Positive and Negative Affectivity Scale (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988). The PANAS is a 20-item scale that evaluates positive and negative affective states through two factors. In this study, we used the Spanish version by Moriondo et al. (2012). The PANAS showed excellent Cronbach’s alphas for both positive emotions (α = .82) and negative emotions (α = .90).

Data Analysis

As a first step, we qualitatively explored the understanding of a small sample of 30 Mexican subjects using the respondent debriefing technique of the cognitive interview; that is, after completing the questionnaire, the interviewer probed for specific information on the response basis for each item and the difficulties experienced while answering, and then summarized the comments for each of the seven items. Two reviewers determined issues with instructions, item comprehension, and response options (Willis, 2005).

Second, we checked missing data and tested multivariate normality. Third, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to test the fit of the two-factor correlated model of the SCAI (Aschieri & Durosini, 2015). Results of Italian respondents were used as baseline data. Then, an analysis of measurement invariance (MI) was conducted to determine whether and how the factor structure of the SCAI-M differed between the Mexican and Italian samples. MI analyses were realized by increasingly restrictive models: the first model tested configural invariance, assessing if the factor structure was the same between groups; the second model tested the metric invariance by constraining the factor loading to be equal between groups and testing whether the meaning of dimensions is the same in the two groups; the third model tested scalar invariance by constraining the loading and the intercepts of individual items to be the same across groups; the last model tested strict invariance, adding to the previous model also item residuals as equal between groups. Model fit was examined using χ² statistics, the normal χ²/(df), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1998), and the comparative fit index (CFI; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Model fit was evaluated as good when model testing showed nonsignificant χ² coefficients, a ratio χ²/df lower than
3.0, RMSEA and CFI coefficients respectively lower than .08 and higher than .95. Fit of the increasingly restrictive models was assessed calculating changes in $\chi^2$ using the Satorra-Bentler scaled, as suggested in MPLUS website (http://www.statmodel.com/chidiff.shtml), RMSEA, and CFI coefficients. Nonsignificant $\Delta\chi^2$ testing and $\Delta$RMSEA and $\Delta$CFI lower than .01 indicated no significant differences among nested models (Brown, 2006; Byrne, 2001). Finally, we calculated scale reliability using Omega coefficient and Pearson’s correlations to determine the construct validity of the Mexican version of the SCAI Scale. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS AMOS 22.0, SPSS Statistical Software 20.0, and M-Plus 7.

RESULTS

Cognitive Interview

Seven items were revised as a result of the cognitive interview (see Appendix A). There were no comments on formatting, instructions, item tense, and response options. In terms of comprehension, there were no problematic words or phrases, only on Item 1 — “I like to listen to music because it teaches me what I am like as a person” — two participants mentioned the phrase was ambiguous: “People may like music and that this can give them an idea of their preferences, but maybe not all of them listen to know themselves.” As personal preferences are specific likes or dislikes related to behavior, we decided to keep the original wording. The SCAI-M showed consistency across item stems and wording.

Item Analyses

There were only two missing values within the Italian sample (one for Item 3 and one for Item 6; 0.19% of missingness for each of the two items). The data collection conducted in Mexico requested participants to answer all the items, thus no missing data were present. Little’s (1988) test conducted on the Italian sample revealed that the pattern of missingness did deviate from missing completely at random (MCAR) — $\chi^2(12) = 30.42, p < .01$. Thus, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was used in MPLUS 7.11 to handle missingness in all the models tested.

Table 1 shows means, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis, and items-total correlations of each item of the SCAI Scale in the total sample. The values ranged from -.38 to −1.50 for skewness and −.53 and 2.21 for kurtosis. Multivariate normality was tested through MANOVA with Shapiro-Wilk multivariate normality test, and the distribution resulted to be not normal ($W = .97, p < .001$). Thus, the robust maximum likelihood (MLR) estimator was used to deal with data distribution.

Measurement Invariance

The measurement invariance analysis was conducted to determine if SCAI-M Scale presented similar structure and parameters in the Mexican and Italian samples. A baseline model of fit was calculated on the whole sample and showed excellent fit to the data — $\chi^2(15) = 21.059, p = .135; \chi^2/df = 1.404; \text{RMSEA} = .028; 90\% \text{ CI} [.000, .053]; \text{CFI} = .987$. Moreover, a CFA conducted only on the Italian data showed excellent fit — $\chi^2(15) = 11.244, p = .735; \chi^2/df = .750; \text{RMSEA} = .000; 90\% \text{ CI} [.000, .043]; \text{CFI} = 1.000$ — confirming the goodness of the structure already found in Aschieri and Durosini (2015).
TABLE 1
Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest (SCAI) Scale item means, standard deviations, distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>−.51</td>
<td>−.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>−.86</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>−.38</td>
<td>−.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>−1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>−1.24</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>−.62</td>
<td>−.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>−1.49</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, measurement invariance analysis was conducted to determine if SCAI-M Scale presented similar structure and parameters in the Mexican and Italian samples. Configural invariance model revealed an excellent fit to the data: χ²(26) = 33.203, p = .156; χ²/df = 1.277; RMSEA = .033, 90% CI [.000, .062]; CFI = .984. Data indicated that the factorial structure was equivalent between Italian and Mexican participants. Items loading standardized estimates ranged between .53-.70 (attitude Mexican sample); .56-.70 (interest Mexican sample); .43-.67 (attitude Italian sample); .55-.76 (interest Italian sample). The two factors appeared only weakly and not significantly correlated (standardized estimated correlation coefficient: Mexican sample r = .16, p = .153; Italian sample r = .01, p = .879).

Metric invariance testing revealed that factor loadings were equal between the two groups: χ²(33) = 44.358, p = .089; χ²/df = 1.344; RMSEA = .036, 90% CI [.000, .062]; CFI = .975; ∆χ² = 10.860, ∆df = 7, p = .145; ∆RMSEA = .003; ∆CFI = −.009. Constraining also items’ intercepts to be equal between the two groups yielded an excessive loss in model fit: χ²(38) = 66.169, p < .01; χ²/df = 1.741; RMSEA = .053, 90% CI [.031, .074]; CFI = .938; ∆χ² = 23.33, ∆df = 5, p < .001; ∆RMSEA = .017; ∆CFI = −.037, suggesting that full scalar invariance was not supported and partial scalar invariance should have been examined. Following modification indices, Item 6’s intercepts were responsible for the lack of invariance. The partial scalar model showed an excellent fit: χ²(37) = 49.826, p = .077; χ²/df = 1.347; RMSEA = .036, 90% CI [.000, .060]; CFI = .972; ∆χ² = 5.47, ∆df = 4, p = .242; ∆RMSEA = .000; ∆CFI = .003.

Finally, we tested strict invariance model by constraining also items’ residuals as equal between groups. Results showed that the model had excellent fit to the data, so full strict invariance was found: χ²(44) = 56.274, p = .102; χ²/df = 1.492; RMSEA = .033, 90% CI [.000, .056]; CFI = .973; ∆χ² = 7.060, ∆df = 7, p = .423; ∆RMSEA = -.020; ∆CFI = −.035.

The scale composite reliability of the SCAI was calculated using Omega coefficient (ω) on all respondents since the scale showed full metric and strict invariance. The results showed acceptable values: ω = .69 for the first factor (attitude towards self-curiosity), and ω = .69 for the second factor (interest in increasing knowledge of self).

Scale Construct Validity

The construct validity coefficients of the SCAI-M Scale are reported in Table 2. As expected, openness correlated with the SCAI-M total scale (r = .24, p < .001), with attitude toward self-curiosity (r =
.20, p = .001) and, to a smaller extent, with interest to increase knowledge of self (r = .14, p = .024). The SCAI-M total scale also showed a small correlation with agreeableness (r = .14, p = .026). Expectedly, interest to increase knowledge of self is correlated with neuroticism (r = .18, p = .004), suggesting that, in this sample, sensitivity to internal clues is accompanied by interest in understanding oneself better.

The interest and deprivation factors of the ID Scale showed small and significant correlations with the SCAI-M total scale (r = .26, p < .001; r = .12, p = .047, respectively). The relatively larger correlation coefficient between the SCAI-M and the ID interest factor, along with small significant correlations between attitude toward self-curiosity and interest in increasing knowledge of self and ID interest factor (r = .23, p < .001; r = .15, p = .019), indicate that, in this sample, the desire to increase self-understanding is more connected to a drive than to the need to fill a knowledge gap about the self.

Regarding the PHLMS, the SCAI-M total scale showed a small yet significant correlation with awareness (r = .20, p = .010). Additionally, the attitude toward self-curiosity and the interest in increasing knowledge of self factors showed small correlations with awareness (r = .15, p = .021; r = .14, p = .020, respectively), suggesting that the SCAI-M is connected to the extent to which respondents are aware of their own emotional reactions. Acceptance of feelings seems to be unrelated to self-curiosity, suggesting that exploration of self and acceptance of what is found during the exploration are two unrelated processes. Finally, the SCAI-M total scale and the interest in increasing knowledge of self showed very small negative yet significant correlations with the negative emotions of the PANAS (r = -.14, p = .023; r = -.15, p = .018, respectively), suggesting that — in this sample — the more respondents are involved in self-curiosity the less they feel subjective distress.

### Table 2
Correlation coefficients for the SCAI-M, BFI, PHLMS, ID, and PANAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward self-curiosity</th>
<th>Interest in increasing knowledge of self</th>
<th>SCAI total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFI Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Interest</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHLMS Awareness</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Positive emotions</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SCAI-M = Self-Curiosity Attitude-Interest Scale, Mexican version; BFI = Big Five Inventory; PHLMS = Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale; ID = Interest and Deprivation Scale; PANAS = Positive and Negative Affectivity Scale.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p ≤ .001.
DISCUSSION

In this study we present the SCAI-M Scale adaptation and assessment of psychometric properties in Mexico using both qualitative and quantitative procedures. From a methodological standpoint, we expanded the analytic strategy used in similar studies on the adaptation of measurement scales to new populations (Khaleque, 2016; Mishra & Dixit, 2017). In fact, in this study, we both assessed the fit of the SCAI-M in the new group and assessed its functioning (invariance) between Italian and Mexican samples.

Results indicated that the concept of self-curiosity is meaningfully measured also in Mexico by the SCAI items. The only systematic difference is that Mexican participants showed a tendency to score higher in one item of the scale. From scalar invariance analysis, we found that Item 6 (“I get bored when I have to talk about my feelings,” R) has higher intercepts. This indicated a tendency in Mexican participants to value talking about their feelings more than Italian participants. Also, in line with previous studies, the construct validity of the SCAI-M Scale highlighted the expected correlations with measures of trait openness, awareness, and general curiosity. However, the size of such correlations was small, though relatively larger with attitude toward self-curiosity than with interest in increasing knowledge of self. This finding, along with the systematic differences between the Italian and Mexican respondents, suggests that more studies should address the self-curiosity nomologic network in Mexico.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this study, we did not take into account the moderating role of cultural differences within each national sample. While this strategy of research is viable when the aim of the study is to emphasize potential differences in a construct cross-culturally (He & van de Vijver, 2017), future studies should measure individual level variables such as respondent orientation in terms of collectivism, power distance, and masculinity (Hofstede, 2001) and include such variables in the analysis of the scale factor structure and construct validity. Also, along the same lines, a future research direction may be testing invariance across other groups: gender, age classes, or other individual variables within the same or different cultural backgrounds.
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APPENDIX A

Instructions for participants are: “Please rate the extent to which you agree with following items.”
The response format ranges from 1 = completely disagree to 7 = completely agree.

1. Me gusta escuchar música porque, sobre todo, me enseña como soy. [Mi piace ascoltare la musica soprattutto perché mi insegna come sono fatto.] [I like to listen to music because it teaches me what I am like as a person.]

2. La mejor parte de viajar es lo que nos enseña sobre nosotros mismos. [La parte migliore del viaggiare e ciò che può insegnarci su di noi.] [The best part of traveling is what it teaches us about ourselves.]

3. Mis películas favoritas son aquellas que me hicieron descubrir nuevos aspectos de mí. [I film che ho preferito sono quelli che mi hanno fatto scoprire aspetti nuovi di me.] [My favorite movies are those that taught me new things about myself.]

4. Elio a mis mejores amigos entre aquellos con quienes puedo crecer como persona. [I miei migliori amici sono quelli con cui posso crescere come persona.] [I select my best friends among those with whom I can grow as a person.]

5. No me interesa entender cómo mis experiencias del pasado impactan mi vida actual. [Non mi interessa capire l’impatto che le mie esperienze passate hanno su quello che succede oggi nella mia vita.] [I am not interested in understanding how my past experiences impact my current life.]

6. Me aburro cuando tengo que hablar sobre mis sentimientos. [Mi annoiano i discorsi in cui devo parlare dei miei sentimenti.] [I get bored when I have to talk about my feelings.]

7. No estoy interesado en saber qué hay detrás de mi comportamiento. [Non mi interessa conoscere ciò che sta alla base dei miei comportamenti.] [I am not interested in understanding what motivates my behaviors.]

Scoring:
Attitude toward self-curiosity: Item 1, 2, 3, 4.
Interest in increasing knowledge of self: Item 5 (R), 6 (R), 7 (R).