

■ Table 34.1 ■

Psychometric Information on Coping Instruments and Questionnaires

Measure	Source	Sample	Reliability	Validity
MCOPE (situational)	Crocker & Graham (1995)	377 adolescent and adult competitive athletes (169 women, 208 men)	For all scales, reliability is above $\alpha = .60$, except for the denial scale ($\alpha = .42$)	<i>Construct validity</i> For problem-focused scales related to positive affect, $r = .26-.46$ ($p < .01$) For emotion-focused scales (except humor) related to negative affect, $r = .22-.46$ ($p < .01$)
MCOPE (dispositional)	Eklund, Grove, & Heard (1998)	621 adolescent and adult athletes	For all scales, reliability is above $\alpha = .67$	<i>Factorial validity</i> <i>Indexes of fit</i> (2 samples reported, each with a calibration and cross-validation component):
12-factor model				MCOPE-12: CFI = .88, .88, .89, .87 NNFI = .86, .86, .87, .86
10-factor model				MCOPE-10: CFI = .88, .87, .88, .86 NNFI = .86, .86, .87, .86
Athletic Coping Skills Inventor-28 (ACSI-28)	Smith, Schultz, Smoll, & Ptacek (1995)	Male and female athletes in high school and college (sample sizes vary across studies)	<i>Subscale 1 wk test-retest reliabilities</i> (94 college athletes) $r = .63-.87$, except for coachability ($r = .47$) <i>Subscale internal consistency</i> (594 male and 433 female high school athletes) All scales reliabilities above $\alpha = .66$	<i>Factor validity</i> All factor loadings were significant for subscales (.46-.77) <i>Indexes of fit</i> (579 male and female high school athletes; 135 NCAA Division I football players): CFI = .91 (.90 males, .90 females) RMSEA = .044 (.043 males, .051 females) <i>Construct validity</i> (295-771 high school athletes): Significant relationships ($p < .05$) between ACSI-28 subscales and the following: Self-control, $r = .13-.42$ Self-efficacy, $r = .17-.47$

(continued)

■ **Table 34.1** ■

(continued)

Measure	Source	Sample	Reliability	Validity
Coping Function Questionnaire (CFQ)	Kowalski & Crocker (2001)	683 high school students (344 boys, 339 girls)	<p><i>Internal consistency reliabilities for composite coping scales</i></p> <p>Problem-focused coping = .84 (boys) and .83 (girls)</p> <p>Emotion-focused coping = .80 (boys) and .84 (girls)</p> <p>Avoidance = .91 (boys) and .92 (girls)</p>	<p><i>Factor validity</i></p> <p>All factor loadings were greater than .40 for both genders</p> <p><i>Fit indexes:</i></p> <p>TLI = .898 (boys), .882 (girls); CFI = .912 (boys), .898 (girls); robust CFI = .920 (boys), .909 (girls); RMSEA = .074 (boys), .083 (girls)</p> <p><i>Convergent validity</i></p> <p>Problem-focused function scale significantly related to COPE active coping ($r = .61$) and planning ($r = .38$)</p> <p>Avoidance function scale related to avoidance ($r = .38$) and resignation ($r = .25$) on the Life Situations Inventory</p> <p>emotion-focused function scale significantly related to COPE acceptance ($r = .31$), restraint coping ($r = .26$), and seeking social support ($r = .25$)</p>
Coping Inventory for Competitive Sport (CICS)	Gaudreau & Blondin (2002)	306 French Canadian athletes (aged 14-28 y)	<p><i>Internal consistency reliabilities</i></p> <p>Thought control: $\alpha = .72$</p> <p>Mental imagery: $\alpha = .74$</p> <p>Relaxation: $\alpha = .80$</p> <p>Effort expenditure: $\alpha = .79$</p> <p>Logical analysis: $\alpha = .67$</p> <p>Seeking social support: $\alpha = .70$</p> <p>Social withdrawal: $\alpha = .71$</p> <p>Mental distraction: $\alpha = .76$</p> <p>Disengagement and resignation: $\alpha = .68$</p> <p>Venting of unpleasant emotion: $\alpha = .87$</p>	<p><i>Indexes of fit</i></p> <p>CFI = .931, TLI = .921, RMSEA = .036</p> <p><i>Construct validity</i></p> <p>Many meaningful significant correlations between CICS task-focused subscales and problem-focused scales on the MCOPE and ways of coping questionnaire (WOCQ)</p> <p>Many meaningful significant correlations between CICS emotion-focused subscales and emotion-focused scales on the MCOPE and WOCQ</p> <p>Subscales of the CICS correlated in the expected direction with perceived relevance of the competition, sense of control, perceived goal attainment, positive affect, negative affect, cognitive state anxiety, and somatic state anxiety</p>

There are some instruments, such as sport modifications of the Ways of Coping Checklist (Madden, Kirkby, & McDonald, 1989), that are now used only rarely and are covered in previous measurement reviews (see Crocker & Graham, 1995).

From G. Tenenbaum, R. Eklund, and A. Kamata, 2012, *Measurement in sport and exercise psychology* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics).