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Abstract

Background: Self-compassion as a concept has only recently been incorporated to the clinical and research fields, and there are evidence that it is an important factor in reducing symptoms and increasing psychological well-being.

Methods: The purpose of this study was to adapt the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) to Spanish and to gather validity evidence for the translated instrument.

The study was conducted in three phases: In phase one, the scale was translated and linguistically adapted into Spanish under supervision of a bilingual panel of experts. During phase two, a pilot test of the instrument was conducted with a sample of 10 participants to determine if the instructions and questions were clear and understandable. After making pertinent changes, a battery of tests and an identification sheet were presented to a final sample consisting of 268 participants. Finally, a test-retest was performed 14 days later to assess internal consistency, along with a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) aimed to determine construct validity.

Results: The analysis produced a solution in four factors that explains 49.88% of the common variance. Cronbach’s α was an adequate levels of consistency (α = .89), and the four subscales achieved too adequate values (α = .809 for the first factor, α = .83 for the second, α = .71 for the third and α = .79 for four factor). Correlation between the SCS and the other scales exhibited a significant results. With Negative Affect (PANAS -) SCS has a significant negative correlation, whereas with Positive Affects (PANAS +), Mindfulness (FFMQ) and Self-Esteem (Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale) has a significant positive correlation.

Conclusion: This preliminary results showed that the Spanish Chilean version of the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) is reliable and has internal validity.
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Resumen

Marco Teórico: La auto-compasión es un concepto que ha sido incorporado recientemente en el campo clínico e investigativo, y hay evidencia que muestra que es un factor importante que puede explicar la reducción de síntomas y el incremento del bienestar psicológico.

Método: El propósito de este estudio fue adaptar la Escala de Auto-compasión (SCS en sus siglas en inglés) al español y aportar evidencias e favor de validez para la traducción del instrumento. El estudio fue desarrollado en tres fases: en la primera fase, la escala fue traducida y lingüísticamente adaptada al español, bajo la supervisión de un comité de expertos. Durante la segunda fase, se realizó un estudio piloto a una muestra de 10 participantes para determinar si las instrucciones y las preguntas eran claras y entendibles. Luego de hacer los cambios pertinentes, se aplicó una batería de test junto a una hoja de identificación a una muestra final de 268 participantes. Finalmente, se aplicó un test-retest 14 días después, para evaluar la consistencia interna, además de un análisis factorial confirmatorio para determinar la validez interna del constructo.

Resultados: El análisis realizado produjo cuatro factores que explicaban el 49,88% de la varianza común, El nivel de consistencia medido mediante el alfa de Cronbach resultó adecuado (a= .809) y para las cuatro sub-escalas se alcanzaron valores también adecuados (α = .81 para el primer factor, α = .83 para el segundo, α = .71 para el tercero y y = .79 para el cuarto). Las correlaciones entre la escala de auto-compasión y las otras escalas mostraron resultados también significativos. Con los afectos negativos (PANAS -) SCS mostró una significativa correlación negativa, mientras que con los afectos positivos (PANAS +) Mindfulness (FFMQ) y autoestima (Escala de autoestima de Rosenberg) mostró una significativa correlación positiva.
Conclusión: Estos preliminares resultados mostraron que la versión en español para Chile de la Escala de Autocompasión presenta evidencias favorables de confiabilidad y validez interna.

Palabras claves: Auto-compasión, validación, validación chilena, español, mindfulness.

Definition and relevance of Self-Compassion

Self-compassion as a practice has been present in many different cultural and spiritual traditions for thousands of years, but it is only recently that it has been approached for clinic and research purposes. The first studies aiming to clarify and systematize this concept arose in 2003; by 2013, approximately 200 scientific articles defining self-compassion and proposing methods to measure it have been published (Germer & Neff, 2013).

From an etymological perspective, the word can be divided into two Latin elements: Com (to be with) and pathos (suffering) (Neff, 2003a; Reyes, 2012). In Greco-Latin-based cultures, compassion is commonly associated with feelings of pity and sympathy; the Royal Spanish Academy, for instance, defines compassion as “a feeling of commiseration and pity for those who are stricken by penalties or misfortunes” (2001, p. 408). In contrast, the Buddhist tradition views compassion as the awareness of suffering (our own or someone else’s) coupled with the desire to relieve it (Hanh, 2004; Kornfield, 2008; Neff, 2003a). This definition includes an active will to mitigate suffering and cultivate well-being. According to Triet (2001), creativity is one of the distinctive features of self-compassionate individuals when it comes to increasing their state of well-being.

From an evolutionary perspective, Gilbert (2009) states that compassion might play an essential role in the development of human species, since it might be involved in one of our three emotional regulation systems. The first system is related to vitality and extinction; its purpose is for humans to develop and achieve different goals; dopamine is thought to be the main neurotransmitter in this system. The second emotional regulation system is in charge of dealing with perceived threat and searching for security through the activation of an inhibitory system. Intense emotions such as fear, anger and anxiety are thought to be involved, and serotonin is supposed to play an active role in these processes. The third system, common to all mammals, is related to filiation and kindness.

In this system, the hormone oxytocin and opiates allow the individual to feel calm and connected. In the same line Gilbert and Iron’s (2004) evolutionary theory, self-compassion might activate an evolutionary developed neurological system present in mammals -especially primates- whose purpose is to calm the individual and to yield basic feelings of safeness and well-being. This is supposed to favor the development of attachment bonds, thus reducing feelings of fear and isolation (Gilbert & Irons, 2004).

Along the same line, Blatt (1995) proposes that self-criticism is a strong predictor of anxiety and depression. Self-criticism is defined as the tendency to adopt a judgmental and hurtful stance towards oneself in difficult situations. It includes feelings of self-hostility and a permanent self-demanding attitude (Barnard & Curry, 2011). Since self-criticism and self-compassion are opposed to each other, cultivating the latter should reduce the emergence of the first. This is where compassion and self-compassion might play an essential evolutionary role in the survival of humanity (Gilbert, 2009) and it’s relevant to study.

Clinical evidence

The effects of practicing self-compassion have been analyzed in recent studies. The evidence shows that an increase of self-compassion correlates with a significant decrease in anxiety (r = -.61; p < .01) and depression levels (r = -.31; p < .05) (Germer & Neff, 2013, Neff, 2003a; Neff, Kirkpatrick & Rude, 2007).

Other studies have addressed the concepts of happiness and well-being. Baer, Peters and Lykins (2012) found a high correlation between self-compassion and psychological well-being in non-clinical populations (r = .67; p < .01).

Neff (2003b) found that increased self-compassion is associated with lower levels of feeling suppression and rumination, along with a greater clarity of feelings and the ability to identify negative mood states. Additionally, a study by Neff et al. (2007) suggested that self-compassion correlates with better social connection and greater life satisfaction, while Leavy, Tate, Adams, Allen and Hancock, J. (2007) and Reyes (2012) assert that self-compassionate individuals display a kinder, healthier relationship with themselves. Finally, studies by Deci and Ryan (1995) and Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi (2000) suggest that self-compassionate people show a variety of psychological strengths, such as happiness, optimism, curiosity, personal initiative and positive emotions.

In the following sentences, we can find some important statements related to the features of Self Compassion and differences between the Self-Compassion and other concepts.

Main features of Self-Compassion
Kristin Neff has been the lead researcher on the subject of self-pity, she’s academic developmental psychology at the University of Texas, and it published the first academic papers on the theme (Neff 2003a, Neff 2003b).

Kristin Neff (2003b, 2012) has pointed out that self-compassion involves offering kindness and understanding towards oneself when one is suffering or when there is a feeling of failure or incompetence. According to Germer (2011), self-compassion involves giving ourselves the same care, comfort and soothing we naturally give our loved ones when they are suffering, when they fail at something or feel inadequate. Neff (2003b, 2012) has described three interrelated elements of self-compassion. If trained, these elements might be of great help in times of emotional distress:

1. Self-kindness. Being kind and understanding with oneself rather than subjecting oneself to judgment and self-criticism.

2. Common humanity. Being aware that all people go through similar painful experiences, and acknowledging our interdependence as human beings. It is the opposite of feeling isolated.

3. Mindfulness. Being aware of our own feelings and thoughts and being able to observe them from a distanced, equilibrated stance. Its opposites are over-identification and experiential avoidance.

As shown in figure 1, these elements interact with each other, and all of them are necessary for the emergence of self-compassion.

Main differences between the Self-Compassion and other concepts

Since self-compassion as a concept has only recently been incorporated to the clinical and research fields, it is important to define it and distinguish it from other concepts with which it is often confused (Barnard & Curry, 2011). First of all, researchers have differentiated between self-compassion and self-esteem; the latter involves self-evaluation, whereas self-compassion is based on the acknowledgment of shared human nature (Barnard & Curry, 2011).

Secondly, self-compassion is not the same as self-pity. In this line Germer and Siegel (2012) argue that self-pitying individuals become immersed in their own problems and forget about others, while self-compassionate individuals tend to be available for others even when they are facing personal problems. Finally, self-compassion is also very different from self-indulgence. Barnard and Curry (2011) point out that, unlike self-indulgence, self-compassion allows to acknowledge and accept one’s mistakes without suppressing or downplaying them.

Characteristics and validation of Self-Compassion Scale

Regarding the measuring of self-compassion, most of the studies on this subject have relied on Neff’s Self-Compassion Scale, [SCS] (2003a). This instrument is a self-report Likert type scale, composed by 26 items depicting different attitudes to be rated on a 5 point scale (“almost never”, “occasionally”, “about half of the time” “most of the time” and “almost always”).

Figure 1 Six Dimensions of Self-Compassion (Neff, 2003a)
The original version of the scale (see Figure 1) consists in six sub-scales, which are conceptually gathered into 3 pairs of opposites: Self-kindness/Self-judgment, Common Humanity/Perceived Isolation and Mindfulness/Over-identification. The original scale in English shows a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$) and high levels of reliability confirmed using a test-retest design with a 3 week interval ($r = .93$) (Neff, 2003a).

Due to its practical usefulness and low application costs, the SCS has been translated and validated in different countries; a brief description of those studies and their main results is presented below:

**Turkey.** In 2008, Deniz, Kesici & Sumer translated the SCS from English to Turkish and reported some evidence regarding its psychometric properties. The study -conducted on college students- consisted in four phases:

1. The instrument was translated –and validated- from English to Turkish.
2. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were carried out.
3. Calculations of indicators of validity evidence were conducted through the comparison between the SCS scores and those obtained in others tests such as Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (1965), the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985) and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule [PANAS] (Watson, Clark & Tellegen 1988).
4. Reliability was assessed using a test-retest procedure with a three-week interval.

**Germany.** Jörg Hupfeld & Nicole Ruffieux (2011) adapted and validated the Self Compassion Scale through a study where two groups of participants (of 396 and 165 participants) assessed the dimensionality and reliability of the online version of the scale (in German). The SCS scores were compared with those obtained by the same participants in the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale [MAAS] (Brown & Ryan, 2003), the Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (1965), the Narcissistic Personality Inventory [NPI-16] (Ames, Rose & Anderson, 2006) and the Trait Meta-Mood Scale [TMMS] (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey & Palfai, 1995). The Cronbach alpha coefficient was then used to test the internal consistency of the scale, and a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in order to assess construct dimensionality.

**Greece.** In 2013, Mantzios, Wilson and Giannou translated the SCS and the MAAS to Greek language. The process was developed in four phases:

1. The SCS was translated from English to Greek.
2. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on both the SCS and the MAAS.
3. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated in order to assess internal consistency.
4. The relation between the SCS results and the results from the other scales was calculated using the following tests: the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (Buchheld, Grossman & Walach, 2001); the Barrat Impulsiveness Scale (Patton, Stanford & Barratt, 1995); the Ego-Control Scale (Block & Kremen (1996); the Ego-Resiliency Scale (Block & Kremen, 1996); and the Subjective Happiness Scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper 1999).

**Spain.** In 2014, Garcia-Campayo, Navarro-Gil, Montero-Martín, López-Artal and Demarzo (2014) translated Spanish versions of the SCS in Spain. The process include two independent samples: Sample 1 was comprised of university students ($n = 268$) who were recruited to validate the long form, and Sample 2 was comprised of Aragon Health Service workers ($n = 271$) who were recruited to validate the short form. In addition to SCS, the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS), the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory Trait (STAI-T), the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) were administered. Construct validity, internal consistency, test retest reliability and convergent validity were tested.

The main results obtained in the aforementioned studies are shown in table 1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deniz, Kesici &amp; Sumer (2008)</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>6 Factor model: $\chi^2 = 1523.02$ (df = 299, $p &lt; .01$); $\chi^2$/df = 5.09; RMSEA = .12; RMS = .13; SRMS = .26; GFI = .69; AGFI = .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>KMO = .92; BTS = 3321.57, $p &lt; .00$; factor loading between .04 y .71; 5 factors considering only the eigenvalues higher than one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlations among SCS and other tests</td>
<td>Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale: $r = .62, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction With Life Scale: $r = .45, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>$r_n = .83, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupfeld &amp; Ruffieux (2011)</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>2 factors: RMSEA = .08; SRMR = .06; CFI = .82; $\chi^2$ = 1154.91 (df = 274; $p &lt; .01$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 factors: RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .05; CFI = .88; $\chi^2$ = 835.45 (df = 250; $p &lt; .01$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 factors: RMSEA = .03; SRMR = 02; CFI = .98; $\chi^2$ = 280.98 (df = 284; $p &lt; .01$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlations among SCS and other tests</td>
<td>MAAS: $r = .43; p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale: $r = .75; p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NPI-16: $r = .16; p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TMMS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TMMS-A: $r = .29; p &lt; .001$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TMMS-K: $r = .58; p &lt; .001$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TMMS-B: $r = .72; p &lt; .001$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Consistency</td>
<td>$\alpha = .91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantzios,</td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>KMO = .84; BTS = 4999.60, $p &lt; .001$; factor loading between .32 y .60; 6 factors, considering only the eigenvalues higher than one; 3 factors through scree plot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based in this background, the aim of this research was to translate, adapt and test the psychometric properties of Neff's Self-Compassion Scale in a Chilean population.

### Method

#### Participants

The total sample was composed of 268 Chilean psychology students from one public university: Universidad de Chile, and three private universities: Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, Universidad Central and Universidad Bernardo O'Higgins.

The universities were chosen considering convenience and proximity criteria, members of the research team had access to this universities. The students were invited to participate at the end of a class. With full university studies 0, 4% and uncompleted university studies 93, 2% and 6, 0% with post-degree, full post-graduate studies 1,1% and uncompleted post-graduate studies 4,9%.

Participants were selected through non-probabilistic convenience sampling, 69.7% of them were female and 30.3% were males. The mean age for the group was 20.6 years, the age range was between 17 and 36 years.

#### Procedural and ethical aspects

The Self Compassion Scale was translated and linguistically adapted into Spanish under supervision of a bilingual panel of experts, who were three native English professors. A pilot test of the instrument was then conducted with a sample of 10 participants in order to determine if the questions and instructions were clear and understandable. After making pertinent changes, a battery of tests and an identification sheet were presented to a final sample consisting of 268 participants. Finally, a test-retest was performed 14 days later.

Concerning the safeguarding of the identity and confidentiality, all the participants signed an informed consent, which was guaranteed through a careful management of the database. Only team members had access to the data. Physical questionnaires are stored in a locked cabinet, which had access only the principal investigators.

#### Instruments

In order to fulfill the objectives of the study, participants were asked to fill a questionnaire regarding demographical data such as gender, occupation, marital

### Table

| Wilson & Giannou (2013) | Correlations among SCS and other tests | Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory: $r = .54; p < .001$
| | | Barrat Impulsiveness Scale: $r = -.23; p < .001$
| | | Ego-Control Scale: $r = .35; p < .001$
| | | Ego-Resiliency Scale: $r = .34; p < .001$
| | | Subjective Happiness Scale: $r = .60; p < .001$
| Garcia-Campayo, Navarro-Gil, Montero-Martin, López-Artal & Demarzo (2014) | Reliability $r_{tt} = .89; p < .01$
| | Confirmatory Factor Analysis | 6 Factor model: Fit indices: $CFI = .95$, $GFI = .93$, $SRMR = .05$, $RMSEA = .06 [.05-.08]$. |
| | Internal Consistency | $\alpha = .87$
| | Correlations among SCS and other tests | Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) $r = -.43; p < .01$
| | | STAI-Trait (Anxiety trait) $r = -.54; p < .01$
| | | PSQ (Perceived stress) $r = -.58; p < .01$
| | | MAAS (Mindfulness) $r = .41; p < .01$
status, children and nationality along with four instruments needed for measuring the various theoretical variables. The questionnaires were applied face to face with a distance of two weeks, and it was made simultaneously in the same universities while participants were explained about the purpose of the study.

PANAS. A 20-item scale describing different feelings and emotions in terms of 10 positive and 10 negative affective descriptors. Participants were to rate them on a five point scale (1 meaning “I feel this way very slightly or not at all” and 5 being “I feel this way extremely”). This instrument has been found to be psychometrically appropriate in Chilean samples, showing adequate test-retest reliability, construct validity and external validity (Dufey & Fernández, 2012).

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ). This questionnaire measures a person’s mindfulness ability. Its 39 items are divided into 5 facets of mindfulness: a) observe b) describe c) act-aware d) no-judge and e) no-react. The instrument is currently undergoing a preliminary validation in Chile; preliminary results suggest it to be psychometrically appropriate in Chilean samples and a useful instrument to differentiate between meditation practitioners and non-practitioners (Schmidt & Vinet, 2013).

Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale. A 10 item self-administered Licker-type scale designed to measure personal self-esteem, defined as the ensemble of feelings of personal worth and self-respect. It was validated to measure self-esteem in Chilean population by Rojas, Zegers and Förster in 2009, showing good reliability levels and appropriate construct and convergent validity evidence.

Self-Compassion Scale (SCS). A Likert-type scale composed of 26 items depicting different attitudes to be rated on a 5 point scale, from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). The SCS measures six dimensions representing the constructs proposed by Neff (2003a). The following sentences are representatives for each construct: Self-Kindness item: (eg., “I try to be loving towards myself when I’m feeling emotional pain.”); Self-Judgment item: (eg., “I’m disapproving and judgmental about my own flaws and inadequacies”); Common Humanity item: (eg., “When things are going badly for me, I see the difficulties as part of life that everyone”); Isolation item: (eg., “When I think about my inadequacies, it tends to make me feel more separate and cut off from the rest of the world”); Mindfulness item: (eg., “When something upsets me I try to keep my emotions in balance ”); Over-identified item: (eg., “When I’m feeling down I tend to obsess and fixate on everything that’s wrong”).

Results are obtained from the summation of the different items (see table 2). High scores on Self-Kindness, Common Humanity and Mindfulness sub-scales reflect high levels of self-compassion, while high scores on Self-Judgment, Isolation and Over Identification are indicative of less self-compassion.

Table 2

| Items corresponding to each sub-scale of the Self-Compassion Scale |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| SCS sub-scale           | Items               |
| Self-Kindness           | 5, 12, 19, 23, 26   |
| Self-Judgment           | 1, 8, 11, 16, 21    |
| Common Humanity         | 3, 7, 10, 15        |
| Isolation               | 4, 13, 18, 25       |
| Mindfulness             | 9, 14, 17, 22       |
| Over Identification     | 2, 6, 20, 24        |
Analysis

All statistical analyses were done using SPSS v.20 software. It was conducted two analyses, first an Exploratory Factor Analysis [EFA] were performed. EFA is a statistical method capable to represent the underlying relations among a set of variables. It is used to uncover relations that can be explained by a series of non-observable or latent variables called factors, where the number of factors is substantially lower that the total number of variables (Ferrando & Anguino, 2010). Existing correlations were then calculated, and Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was calculated to assess internal consistency of the instrument. Second, the test-retest correlation was also measured in order to achieve a more accurate idea of the scale’s reliability.

Results

According to the exploratory factor analysis- that was both well-adjusted and theoretically appropriate for the Chilean context- the model adjustment was assessed by evaluating the amount of explained variance, item commonality and factor loading, which resulted in the removal of items 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 20 and 22.

Due the factorial analysis the items were organized in four factor factors, that explains 49.88% of the common variance using the principal axis extraction method and Oblimin rotation (where delta = 0); this method was used under the hypothesis of a correlation among factors.

The first factor explained 33.64% of the common variance. It was called “Isolation” because it points to perceiving suffering and disconnection from others, and it includes items 2, 4, 13, 18, 24 and 25. The second factor explained 7.83% of the common variance; it was called “Self-Kindness”, since its items (5, 12 and 19) are designed to describe the tendency to be kind and caring with oneself. The third factor (items 1, 11, 16 and 21) was called “Self-Judgment” because it reflects a critical judgment towards our own attitudes and behaviors, and it explained the 5.39% of the common variance. Finally, the fourth factor -called “Self Understanding“- explained 3.02% of the variance. It includes the items 15, 17, 23 and 26, which all point to having a wide perspective towards our own errors. It implies being self-kind when a mistake has been committed. This factor has some components from the original model related to mindfulness and self-kindness.

Commonalities and corresponding factor loading are shown in table 3. They are grouped by factor and arranged in descending order of factor weight. Taking in consideration the indications of Ferreres-Traver, Hernandez-Baeza, Lloret-Segura and Thomas-Marco (2014) and Pérez and Medrano (2010) the commonality and factor loading values for all the items are higher than 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Commonalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Afterwards, correlations were calculated between the SCS and the aforementioned scales. The results are displayed on Table 4. The table show a direct correlation between the SCS and the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (r = .609; p < .001) and between the SCS and the Negative Affect sub-scale of the PANAS (PANAS -) (r = -.554 p < .005). All SCS sub-scales correlate significantly with the PANAS for both positive (PANAS +) and negative affects (PANAS -). Also, the correlation with the positive affects appears when the complete version of the SCS is taken into analysis (r = -.554; p < .005). The SCS to show a statistically significant correlation with the total Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (r = .639; p > .005) or its sub-scales.

Finally, the Cronbach’s Alpha index of internal consistency was used to test the reliability of the total scale and its subscales. The results showed that the total scale had adequate levels of consistency (α = .89), and the four subscales achieved too adequate values (α = .809 for the first factor, α = .83 for the second, α = .712 for the third and α = .786 for four factor).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCS Total</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
<th>Factor4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (+)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (-)</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlation significance values under .05 are highlighted

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to translate and adapt the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) (Neff, 2003a) to Spanish version in Chilean context and test its psychometric properties in Chilean context. The sample was composed of 268 students from four public and private Chilean universities.

From the results obtained, it is possible to assert that the preliminary adaptation of the Self-Compassion Scale to the Chilean context has been successful and that the adapted items are linguistically similar to those in the original scale.

With regard to its factor structure, the SCS seems to consist of four significant dimensions that correspond almost exactly to the theoretical factors proposed by Neff (2003a) in the original instrument: three of them correspond exactly to the original factors (Isolation, Self-Kindness and Self-Judgment), while the fourth emerging factor –designated by the authors as Self-Understanding- mixes elements from both Mindfulness and Self-Kindness. This allows to hypothesize that even though the original theoretical factors are present in the adapted scale, participants were not able to identify them clearly, possibly due to underlying cultural factors. It must be noted that idiosyncratic Chilean language does not include a linguistically shared concept to refer to common humanity.

An interesting topic for discussion is the non-emergence of Common Humanity as a factor, even though it is described in the theoretical model behind the instrument. Although it is not possible to exactly determine the reasons for its absence, there is room for hypothesis. One possibility is the existence of cultural
variables that might be rendering Common Humanity invisible, since this is not a linguistically shared concept in Chilean culture. For example, in this Chilean validation an item in the original scale associated with common humanity, such as the item 15: “I try to see my failings as part of the human condition”, it is associated with the Self-Understanding. This fact might be preventing the factor from emerging, in contrast to the individual dimension, which is sharply preset (as is reflected in the other four emerging factors).

It would be interesting to further investigate the influence of social and cultural aspects on psychological concepts such as the ones here studied (self-compassion, common humanity, etc.), especially since such concepts were developed in a different cultural tradition and are not originally present in the Chilean culture.

These results seem novel when compared to those reported in previous studies (Deniz et al., 2008; Garcia-Campayo et al., 2014; Hupfeld & Ruffieux, 2011; Mantzios et al., 2013) where underlying structures of the SCS showed a different number and composition of factors. This fact raises the question of a possible role of the context factor, since participants from different socio-cultural realities seem to identify different configurations of self-compassion. The possibility of comparing samples from different countries and contexts opens new lines of investigation for future research. For instance, make more reflections about how complementary is this study with the Spanish research of García-Campayo et al. (2014) because there are several comparison that can be interesting: two Spanish spoken sample in different cultural context (In Spain and Chile), it were used two main different analysis (Confirmatory Factorial Analysis [CFA] and Exploratory Factorial Analysis [EFA]), and the construct validity of the SCS in Spanish version was compared with different instruments.

Another aim of this study was to analyze the relations among self-compassion and other related psychological constructs by comparing the SCS to the PANAS, the FFMQ and Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale. The Spanish version of the Self-Compassion Scale in a Chilean context showed significant relations with the Mindfulness scale, the negative and positive subscales of the PANAS and Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale.

With respect to the relation between the SCS and the FFMQ, Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi (2000) propose that self-compassionate individuals show high levels of psychological strengths such as curiosity and exploration –essential for self-compassion; the findings here exposed seem to be consistent with this assertion. In addition, Mantzios, Wilson & Giannou (2013) found a significant relation between the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory and the SCS (r = .54; p < .001), thus strengthening the theoretical association between both variables.

About the relation between the SCS and the PANAS, a study carried on by Baer Peters & Lykins (2012) concerning self-compassion, happiness and psychological well-being reported a high correlation among self-compassion and psychological well-being in non-clinical populations. These results are consistent with the correlations obtained in the Chilean sample, which suggest the existence of a relation between feeling good and the ability to experience feelings of kindness, care and understanding towards someone who is suffering, including oneself. These findings could be indicating that the SCS is able to recognize the affective elements and to the ability to pay attention to the present moment. Hence, a higher self-compassion would be associated with a higher ability to accept and pay attention to the present moment, higher levels of positive emotions and lower presence of negative emotions.

The results in this preliminary study suggest a significant correlation between self-compassion and self-esteem; the evidence drawn from this study is thus consistent with the results obtained in previous research (Deniz et al., 2008, Hupfeld & Ruffieux, 2011).

The principal strength of this study is that it was made with a general sample and not with a clinical population which is eventually generalizable. One of the mains limitations of this study, in methodological terms, is that participants were university students, being necessary to diversify the type of population, so it remains for future research include greater age diversity and sociocultural level, allowing deliver more reliable evidence within the validity of the scale of self-compassion in Chilean population. For future investigations will be necessary the description of possible differences among specific groups –for example between students from public and private universities, between individuals from different regions of the country, etc. - or considering sociodemographic variables such as sex, age, political preferences and other factors that could not be taken into account in the present study due to its purely descriptive character and the reduced sample size.

In summary, the importance of the current work lies in providing preliminary evidence on the psychometric properties of the SCS. Due this was a preliminary study it is not possible to generalize the results hereby obtained to larger populations. Thereby, to give more validation evidences it is deemed essential to increase not only the sample size but its diversity regarding variables such as region of origin, sex, age, occupation, etc.
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