

1 Running Head: MEASURING OPTIMISM AND SPORT CONFIDENCE

2

3

4

5

Evaluating Measures of Optimism and Sport Confidence

6

7

Gerard J. Fogarty and Harsha N. Perera

8

University of Southern Queensland

9

&

10

Andrea J. Furst and Patrick R. Thomas

11

Griffith University

12

13

14

Author Note

15

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gerard J. Fogarty, 17 Connell

16

St, Toowoomba, Queensland 4350, Australia.

17

18

Contact: fogarty@usq.edu.au

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Abstract

The psychometric properties of the LOT-R, the Sport Confidence Inventory (SCI), and the Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory (CSCI) were examined in a study involving 260 athletes. The study aimed to test the dimensional structure, convergent and divergent validity, and invariance over competition level of scores generated by these instruments. Exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) supported the measurement models for the SCI and CSCI but favoured a two-dimensional model for the LOT-R. ESEM analyses of the total pool of 33 items indicated satisfactory divergent validity among these optimism and sport confidence measures with the only overlap occurring between the LOT-R and CSCI measures of optimism. The SCI discriminated among athletes participating at different competitive levels and emerged as the most suitable instrument for measuring individual differences in sport confidence. The CSCI emerged as a better measure of optimism in a sporting context than the more general LOT-R.

Keywords: Optimism, sport confidence, instrument validity and reliability

1 Evaluating Measures of Optimism and Sport Confidence

2 Sport confidence was originally conceptualized as a unidimensional construct with
3 state and trait characteristics. Vealey's (1986) Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory (TSCI) and
4 State Sport-Confidence Inventory (SSCI) reflected this unidimensional view. That
5 conceptualization changed with the publication of the Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory
6 (CSCI: Manzo, Silva, & Mink, 2001), which had subscales measuring dispositional optimism
7 and sport competence, and the Sport Confidence Inventory (SCI: Vealey & Knight, 2002), an
8 instrument with subscales measuring cognitive efficiency, resilience, and confidence in
9 physical skills and training. Both instruments measure sport confidence, but with different
10 subscale structures. Two decades ago Marsh (1994) argued that, given the proliferation of
11 apparently similar measures in sport and exercise psychology, it is important to evaluate the
12 jingle fallacy (assuming that scales with the same label measure the same construct) and the
13 jangle fallacy (assuming that scales with different labels measure different constructs). This
14 paper takes up that challenge in relation to the constructs of sport confidence and optimism.
15 We begin by tracing the origins of the *optimism* construct and its associations with sport
16 confidence.

17 Dispositional Optimism and Sport Confidence

18 There are two popular ways of conceptualizing optimism. The first has its roots in
19 attribution theory (Weiner et al., 1971) and the notion of explanatory style introduced by
20 Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale (1978). Within this tradition, Peterson et al. (1982)
21 developed the Attributional Style Questionnaire (ASQ) to measure optimistic explanatory
22 style. A sports-specific version of this scale, the Sport Attributional Style Scale (SASS), was
23 developed by Hanrahan, Grove, and Hattie (1989). The second view of optimism, and the one
24 that forms the basis of the current study, comes from the work of Scheier and Carver (Carver
25 & Scheier, 2014; Scheier & Carver, 1985, 1992) who defined optimism as a personality

1 disposition characterized by an enduring belief that good things will happen and that obstacles
2 can be overcome. Persons with high levels of dispositional optimism see desired outcomes as
3 attainable and continue to strive toward those outcomes, even when progress is difficult or
4 slow (Scheier & Carver, 1992). Defined in this fashion, optimism is a disposition that can be
5 measured by self-report items that tap the respondent's expectations regarding the likelihood
6 of positive and negative outcomes. The Life Orientation Test (LOT) developed by Scheier
7 and Carver (1985) and its successor, the LOT-R (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), are
8 among the most common measures of dispositional optimism in the general psychology
9 literature (Nes & Segerstrom, 2006).

10 Researchers in the field of sport and exercise psychology with an interest in optimism
11 have either adopted the attributional approach and used the SASS (e.g., Parkes & Mallett,
12 2011) or followed the dispositional approach and used the LOT-R (e.g., Albinson & Petrie,
13 2003; Brewer et al., 2007; Chen, Kee, & Tsai, 2008; De la Vega, Ruiz, Batista, Ortin, &
14 Giesnow, 2012; Gaudreau & Blondin, 2004; Gordon, 2008; Gould, Dieffenbach, & Moffett,
15 2002; Nicholls, Polman, Levy, & Backouse, 2007; Venne, Laguna, Walk, & Ravizza, 2006).
16 One of the distinguishing features of the two approaches is apparent in the studies just cited.
17 Measuring causal attributions is a way of measuring optimism but, within this tradition,
18 interventions designed to improve optimism tend to focus on ways of changing the
19 attributions themselves. This is a cyclical process wherein attributions are measured, then
20 challenged, then re-assessed (Rees, Ingledeu, & Hardy, 2005). In the dispositional optimism
21 tradition, on the other hand, the measure of optimism is typically used to assess the effect of
22 an independent intervention, as illustrated by the De la Vega et al. (2012) study.

23 The dispositional optimism approach was considered more suitable for the current
24 project which was motivated by a need to identify measures suitable for tracking change in

1 positive thinking over the course of a psychological skills program (Furst, Thomas, &
2 Fogarty, in preparation). The LOT-R was an instrument that could be used for this purpose.
3 However, a disadvantage of the LOT-R in a sporting context is that it is very general in nature
4 and an item such as “Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad” may not
5 give a true indication of an athlete’s expectation of success in a sporting context. There is also
6 a question mark concerning the structure of the scale. A body of evidence has accumulated
7 suggesting that it is not unidimensional but bidimensional with one factor representing
8 optimism, the other pessimism (e.g., Appaneal, 2012; Herzberg, Glaesmer, & Hoyer, 2006).
9 This uncertainty about the structure of the LOT-R is reflected in the sport-related publications
10 cited above where four studies extracted a single measure from the LOT-R and five studies
11 extracted measures of optimism and pessimism. The present study will explore the structure
12 of the LOT-R.

13 In the same timeframe that measures of optimism began to appear, researchers in sport
14 psychology were showing interest in the construct of sport confidence. Like optimism, sport
15 confidence has its theoretical underpinnings in expectancy frameworks (Bandura, 1977;
16 Vealey, 1986) and is associated with peak performance. Although sport confidence is now
17 recognized as a multidimensional construct (Thomas, Lane, & Kingston, 2011; Vealey &
18 Chase, 2008), early conceptualizations saw it as a unidimensional construct capturing the
19 degree of certainty individuals possess about their ability to be successful in sport (Vealey,
20 1986). That conceptualization was quickly broadened to promote the notion that sport
21 confidence, like Bandura’s self-efficacy construct, is multidimensional with optimism and
22 resilience among its dimensions.

23 In keeping with this expanded view, Manzo et al. (2001) presented a dispositional
24 model of sport confidence. Within this model, athletes form a relatively enduring belief
25 system that is the result of the interaction between sport competence and dispositional

1 optimism. To operationalize this construct, they developed the 13-item CSCI. The CSCI is of
2 interest here because it contains two subscales, one of which is designed to measure
3 dispositional optimism. The description of the dispositional optimism subscale suggests that it
4 should correlate highly with the LOT-R. This is an instance of the “jingle” in Marsh’s (1994)
5 metaphor: two measures with the same label, purportedly measuring the same construct.

6 Another inventory from the sport confidence field that highlights the close connection
7 between optimism and sport confidence is Vealey and Knight’s (2002) SCI. The SCI, along
8 with the CSCI, was one of the first instruments to attempt to capture the complex nature of
9 sport confidence, a complexity that is now much more widely recognized (e.g., Thomas et al.,
10 2011; Vealey & Chase, 2008). This instrument was developed to capture three important
11 ways in which confidence is manifested in sport settings. The three dimensions are: (a) Sport
12 Confidence-Physical Skills and Training (hereafter shortened to Physical Skills), which
13 assesses confidence in the ability to execute physical skills and the level of physical training
14 needed to succeed; (b) Sport Confidence-Cognitive Efficiency, which assesses confidence in
15 the ability to make decisions, maintain focus, and effectively use strategies to succeed; and (c)
16 Sport Confidence-Resilience, which assesses confidence in the ability to overcome problems,
17 setbacks, and doubts, allowing the individual to bounce back and perform successfully.

18 The similarities between optimism, resilience, and sport confidence have long been
19 acknowledged (e.g., Grove & Heard, 1997) but the nature of their relationship, how they
20 interact with each other, and what differentiates them, is not clear. There are no studies that
21 have examined all three constructs simultaneously. The LOT-R, the CSCI, and the SCI offer
22 that opportunity. Of particular interest to the current study was the relationship between
23 dispositional optimism, as measured by a general inventory, and the same construct measured
24 by a sport-specific instrument.

25 Aims of Study

1 *Strongly agree*. An example item is: “I am always optimistic about my future”. Four of the
2 ten items are filler items and therefore ignored when scoring. Three (items 3, 7, and 9) of the
3 remaining six items are reverse-scored. Responses to the six core items were summed to yield
4 an overall dispositional optimism score ranging from 0-24 with higher scores indicating
5 greater expectancy for positive outcomes. Scheier et al. (1994) reported a Cronbach alpha
6 coefficient of .78 and test-retest correlations of .68, .60, .56 and .79 over four time intervals.

7 Sport Confidence Inventory (SCI; Vealey & Knight, 2002). The SCI is a 14-item
8 inventory that requires respondents to indicate how certain they are that they can execute
9 nominated physical, cognitive, or mental skills over a specified time period (e.g., how you
10 feel right now, how you felt last week, how you feel about the upcoming season). The 14
11 items employ a seven-point Likert-type scale with anchors of (1) *Can't do it at all* and (7)
12 *Totally certain I can do it*. As a frame of reference, participants in this study were asked to
13 indicate how confident they typically felt about executing these skills in a competitive
14 sporting context. The SCI contains the three subscales described earlier: Cognitive Efficiency
15 (SCI-CEF); Resilience (SCI-RES); and Physical Skills (SCI-PST). Internal consistency
16 reliability estimates for the three subscales ranged from .78 to .87 and test-retest reliability
17 coefficients from .73 to .78 (Vealey & Knight, 2002). There were five marker items for each
18 of the first two subscales and four items for the third. To accommodate the fact that subscales
19 contained different numbers of items, responses to individual items were averaged to yield
20 three subscale scores with higher scores indicating higher levels of each construct.

21 Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory (CSCI; Manzo et al., 2001). The CSCI is a 13-
22 item inventory where each item requires participants to choose between two contrasting
23 statements (e.g., *I feel I am not very good when it comes to playing sports OR I feel I am*
24 *really good at many sports*). Having selected the statement that is most applicable,
25 respondents then rate whether the statement is (1) *Very true for me* or (2) *Somewhat true for*

1 *me.* Several items are reverse-scored. With two contrasting statements per item and two rating
2 options associated with each statement, individual item scores range from 1 to 4. The CSCI
3 contains two subscales. Seven items contribute to the Dispositional Optimism (CSCI-OPT)
4 subscale, which yields scores ranging from 7 to 28 with high scores indicating a high degree
5 of dispositional optimism. The other six items contribute to the Sport Competence (CSCI-
6 COMP) subscale, which yields scores ranging from 6 to 24 and measures the belief in one's
7 ability to successfully fulfil the demands of a sport task. Manzo et al. reported Cronbach alpha
8 coefficients of .86 for the Dispositional Optimism subscale (CSCI-OPT), and .92 for the Sport
9 Competence subscale (CSCI-COMP). Convergent validity of the CSCI-TOT is indicated by
10 its strong correlation ($r > .50$) with other measures of sport confidence (Manzo et al., 2001).

11 Procedure

12 Ethics approval for the study was granted by the Griffith University Human Research
13 Ethics Committee. The first group of participants completed a package consisting of three
14 questionnaires including the LOT-R, SCI, and CSCI. An information sheet informed the
15 respondents that the purpose of the study was to look at the relationship between sporting
16 performance and both confidence and optimism. The questionnaires were distributed in
17 person to the participants and they either completed them at the time of presentation or
18 returned them to the researcher in person or via mail. The response rate was 49%.

19 Statistical Analysis

20 Following preliminary data screening, analyses were conducted in three phases in
21 accordance with the study aims. In the first phase, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was
22 used to test expected and alternative measurement models for each of the instruments. Where
23 fit could not be established using CFA, exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM)
24 procedures were used. These procedures have been advocated in cases where construct-
25 relevant multidimensionality due to item fallibility makes it difficult to satisfy the

1 independent cluster models (ICM) restriction that underpins CFA (Asparouhov & Muthén,
 2 2009; Morin & Maïano, 2011; Myers, 2013). For the congeneric CFA models, estimates from
 3 the final measurement solutions were used to compute factor reliability coefficients in line
 4 with McDonald's (1970) omega formula as shown in Equation 1 where λ_i is the standardized
 5 item loading and δ_{ii} is the item residual variance:

$$6 \quad \omega = \frac{(\sum |\lambda_i|)^2}{([\sum |\lambda_i|]^2 + \sum \delta_{ii})} \quad (1)$$

7 The second phase of analysis was associated with the second aim of the study and
 8 involved the examination of the convergent validity of LOT-R, SCI, and CSCI responses. A
 9 general measurement model was specified with links between the SCI and CSCI factors and
 10 from these factors to optimism (and pessimism) as measured by the LOT-R. Finally, to satisfy
 11 the third aim of the study, the retained LOT-R, SCI, and CSCI solutions were subjected to
 12 tests of full measurement and structural invariance over competition level (international
 13 athletes vs. domestic athletes). The multigroup tests were performed as per Millsap and Yun-
 14 Tein's (2004) taxonomy of invariance tests for models based on polytomous data.

15 All analyses in the present investigation were conducted using Mplus 7.3 (Muthén &
 16 Muthén, 1998-2014). Model solutions were estimated using diagonal weighted least squares
 17 with a mean-and-variance adjusted test statistic, operationalized as the WLSMV estimator in
 18 Mplus. The ESEM analyses were conducted using target rotation, which is appropriate when
 19 there is at least some knowledge of the factor structure, as in the present study (Browne, 2001;
 20 Myers, Jin, Ahn, Celimli, & Zopluoglu, 2015). For the assessment of model fit, we did not
 21 rely on the χ^2 test given its sample size dependency and restrictive hypothesis test (i.e., exact
 22 fit). Instead, three approximate fit indices were used to assess model fit as follows:
 23 comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), $> .90$ and $.95$ for acceptable and
 24 excellent fit, respectively; and RMSEA, $< .05$, $.08$ and $< .10$ for close, reasonable fit and poor

1 fit, respectively (Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004). For nested model comparisons, although we
2 report the corrected χ^2 difference test (MD χ^2) appropriate for the WLSMV estimator,
3 implemented via the DIFFTEST option in Mplus, because the MD χ^2 tends to be sensitive to
4 even trivial differences in large samples, we relied on changes in the CFI (Δ CFI) and RMSEA
5 (Δ RMSEA). A decrease in the CFI and increase in RMSEA of less than .010 and .015,
6 respectively, are indicative of support for a more parsimonious model (Chen, 2007; Cheung &
7 Rensvold, 2002).

8 **Results**

9 Data Screening

10 Inspection of observed bivariate contingency tables revealed a large number of cells
11 with zero frequencies concerning the lowest three categories of the SCI and lowest category
12 of the CSCI. As zero-frequency cells can result in model convergence problems under
13 WLSMV estimation due to difficulties computing polychoric correlations, the lowest four
14 categories of the SCI items and the lowest two categories of the CSCI items were collapsed,
15 yielding four-point and three-point response scales, respectively. Across the SCI, CSCI and
16 LOT-R, only four observed variables contained missing data (range = 0-1.5%), which were
17 found to be non-systematically missing, $\chi^2(128) = 111.44, p = .85$ (Little, 1988). Pairwise
18 present methods were used to account for this missingness. Sample estimates of the thresholds
19 and polychoric correlations for the 33 observed indicators can be obtained by request from the
20 first author.

21 Latent Structure

22 Results of the fit of the LOT-R, SCI and CSCI measurement structures are shown in
23 Table 1. For the LOT-R, fit statistics for the unidimensional model were mixed. Whereas the
24 CFI and TLI were suggestive of excellent and acceptable fit, respectively, the RMSEA
25 indicated poor model fit. The test of the correlated trait (CT) bidimensional LOT-R model
26 resulted in an excellent fit to the data in terms of the CFA and TLI and marginally acceptable

1 fit in terms of the RMSEA. Notably, the bidimensional model provided an appreciably better
2 fit to the data than the unidimensional solution and was thus retained as the preferred solution
3 for the convergent validity tests.

4 For the SCI, the unidimensional model provided a poor fit to the data and was
5 rejected. The test of the CT three-factor model resulted in an acceptable fit to the data
6 according to the CFI and TLI; however, the RMSEA exceeded the common cut-off criteria
7 used for acceptable (.08) and poor fit (.10). A further problem with the three-factor SCI
8 solution was the high correlation between the Cognitive Efficiency and Resilience factors ($r =$
9 .88), suggesting a lack of discriminant validity. However, large factor correlations can arise
10 because of the ICM-CFA restriction that ensures that all items load on one, and only one,
11 factor. The ICM restriction means that any commonality, substantive or artifactual, between
12 items and non-target factors must be expressed through over-estimated factor correlations.
13 Misspecifications of this kind can also result in distorted structural relations (Asparouhov &
14 Muthen, 2009). ESEM was developed to address this problem. As can be seen from Table 1,
15 the CT ESEM solution fit the data appreciably better than the CT ICM-CFA and was retained
16 for further scrutiny.

17 For the CSCI, the unidimensional solution provided an acceptable fit to the data in line
18 with the CFI and TLI, but the RMSEA was suggestive of poor fit. On the contrary, the CT
19 ICM-CFA (two factors) provided an acceptable-to-good fit to the data in terms of all three fit
20 indices. Moreover, in relative terms, the CT ICM-CFA provided an appreciably better fit to
21 the data than the unidimensional solution and was retained.

22 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

23 In summary, these CFA and ESEM findings supported a two-dimensional solution for
24 the LOT-R, the a priori three-factor solution for the SCI but with factorial complexity

1 permitted at the item level, and the a priori two-factor solution for the CSCI. The next three
2 tables present the parameter estimates for each of the three instruments.

3 As shown in Table 2, the six LOT-R items loaded moderately-to-substantially onto
4 their respective factors, and these loadings were uniformly statistically significant at $p < .001$.
5 The factor correlation between Optimism and Pessimism was substantial ($r = -.74$). Factor
6 reliability, computed according to McDonald's (1970) omega, was low for Optimism ($\omega =$
7 $.67$) but acceptable for Pessimism ($\omega = .86$).

8 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

9 Parameter estimates from the retained CT ESEM solution for the SCI are shown in
10 Table 3. Target factor loadings (range = .18 to .91, $M = .62$) were generally weaker than ICM-
11 CFA analogues (range = .73 to .897, $M = .81$) but substantially stronger than non-target
12 loadings (range = $-.37$ to $.547$, $|M| = .25$). There were, however, six cases where secondary
13 loadings were sizeable (e.g., λ_{61} , λ_{141} , λ_{101} , λ_{52} , λ_{82} , λ_{12}). All three freely-estimated factor
14 correlations in the ESEM solution were positive and statistically significant. Importantly, as
15 shown in Table 3, the sizes of these correlations, especially between SCI-EFF and SCI-RES,
16 were appreciably below estimates obtained from the ICM-CFA, supporting the discriminant
17 validity of the SCI factors and, by implication, the multidimensionality of the SCI.

18 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

19 Parameter estimates from the retained CT ICM-CFA solution for the CSCI are shown
20 in Table 4. All thirteen CSCI items loaded substantially onto their respective factors, and
21 these loadings were uniformly statistically significant at $p < .001$. The factor correlation
22 between CSCI-OPT and CSCI-COMP was likewise substantial ($r = .74$). Finally, factor
23 reliability was acceptable for both CSCI-OPT ($\omega = .90$) and CSCI-COMP ($\omega = .85$).

24 INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

25 Convergent Validity

1 invariance across competition level. These tests were conducted separately for each of the
2 instruments. The LOT-R invariance tests failed to yield admissible solutions, so those
3 associations will be tested in other ways in the next section of the analyses. As shown in
4 Table 6, the CT ESEM for the SCI provided support for configural invariance, equality of
5 item loadings, thresholds, uniquenesses, and the factor variance-covariance matrices.
6 However, the invariance of factor means was not supported. Inspection of a model in which
7 the latent means were free to vary in the domestic athletes group, revealed small to moderate
8 and statistically significant mean differences between international and domestic athletes on
9 all three SCI factors. International athletes were found to be higher than domestic athletes on
10 SCI-EFF ($d = .42$), SCI-RES ($d = .26$) and SCI-PST ($d = .51$).

11 INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

12 Table 7 reports the results of tests of invariance for the CSCI. It can be seen from this table
13 that configural invariance was found. There was also support for the invariance of item factor
14 loadings, thresholds, uniquenesses, and variance-covariance matrices. A final model in which
15 the two factor means were constrained to equality was supported, indicating the invariance of
16 latent means. International athletes were trivially and non-significantly higher than domestic
17 athletes on CSCI-OPT ($d = .17$), and no substantive differences were found on CSCI-COMP
18 ($d = .03$).

19 INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

20 Descriptive statistics for scales

21 Up until this point, the analyses have employed CFA and ESEM techniques because the focus
22 has been on the constructs and the relations among those constructs. In practice, however,
23 psychologists will construct scale scores from these instruments. They will do this by
24 following instructions in which each of the items is assigned to a particular scale, as they were
25 in the CFA (but not the ESEM) modeling described above. To complete the psychometric

1 analysis of these three instruments, we present the familiar summary descriptive statistics,
2 Cronbach alpha reliability estimates, and correlations for each of the measures. To facilitate
3 comparisons with data already reported in the literature and to enable comparisons among
4 subscales with different numbers of items, total scores are reported for LOT-R whereas item-
5 level statistics are reported for the SCI and the CSCI subscales. Note that the full range of
6 scores was used for these analyses. That is, the lowest scoring categories were not collapsed.
7 Note also that to calculate Pessimism subscale scores for the LOT-R, the three negatively-
8 worded items (3, 7, 9) were not treated as reverse-scored. Descriptive statistics, scale
9 reliabilities, and correlations among all measures for the full sample are shown in Table 8.

10 The first question to ask regarding these descriptive data is whether they are similar to
11 data reported on the same scales by other researchers. Gould et al. (2002) reported a LOT-R
12 mean score of 18.70 and a standard deviation of 2.54 for their sample of Olympic medal
13 winners. Scheier et al. (1994) reported a mean of 14.33 and a standard deviation of 4.28 for
14 college students. The mean for this sample of athletes (16.72) fell between these two
15 benchmarks which is where one might expect this mixed sample of athletes to score. The
16 larger standard deviation in the current study (3.73) reflects the diversity of this sample in
17 comparison with the Olympic champions sampled by Gould et al.

18 In relation to the SCI, the means for the three subscales were slightly lower than those
19 reported by Vealey and Knight (2002) for their sample of 211 varsity athletes. However, the
20 ranking of the subscale means was the same with Physical Skills receiving the highest mean
21 score followed by Cognitive Efficiency and then Resilience. Regarding relations among the
22 subscales, Vealey and Knight reported that the subscale correlations ranged from .35 to .57.
23 The subscale correlations in the current study ranged from .45 to .79. As shown in Table 5,
24 however, when cross-loadings were allowed, the correlations among the constructs ranged
25 from .30 to .44. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were similar for the two studies.

1 Manzo et al. (2001) did not report any means, standard deviations, or correlations for the
2 CSCI, so it is not possible to make comparisons between our descriptive data and theirs.

3 INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

4 In the test for the invariance of latent mean structures reported in Tables 6 and 7, the
5 three factors of the SCI were the only ones that discriminated between athletes performing at
6 different levels of competition (international versus domestic levels). The LOT-R was not
7 included in those analyses because of convergence problems but it was included in the
8 analysis of group differences on scale scores. A multivariate analysis of variance of these
9 scores (Wilks' Lambda) indicated that there was a significant main effect for competition
10 level in favour of international athletes, $F(6, 241) = 3.76, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$. Univariate F-
11 tests revealed that the difference between competition levels occurred on all three SCI
12 subscales.

13 Discussion

14 Findings relating to the LOT-R, the SCI, and the CSCI will be discussed separately
15 before reviewing the aims of the study and reaching some conclusions about the suitability of
16 these measures of sport confidence and dispositional optimism.

17 LOT-R

18 The LOT-R is a measure of dispositional optimism that can be used in a wide range of
19 settings. As noted in the introduction to the paper, questions have been raised about its
20 dimensionality, whether used in sporting contexts (Appaneal, 2012) or in more general
21 settings (Herzberg et al., 2006). Carver and Scheier (2014) acknowledged this ambiguity,
22 which applies to other instruments with a similar mix of positive and negative items, and
23 encouraged researchers to examine the item subsets as well as the overall score. The CFA
24 results in the current study showed that, compared with a unidimensional solution, the two-
25 factor model provided a better fit to the data. The three positively-worded items defined an

1 optimism factor and the three negatively-worded items defined a pessimism factor. This is the
2 same result obtained by both Appaneal and Herzberg et al. and may be an artefact of
3 measurement method rather than a reflection of substantive underlying individual differences
4 (Marsh, 1996; Segerstrom, Evans, & Eisenlohr-Moul, 2011; Spector, 1997).

5 One solution to this problem involves continuing to use a unidimensional solution but
6 weighting one set of items more than the other on the basis of factor coefficients (Marsh,
7 1996). In the present study, this approach would involve giving more weight to the
8 negatively-worded items because the loadings for those items were considerably higher.
9 However, an argument against this approach is that the weightings and factor inter-
10 correlations could vary from sample to sample. More validation research on samples of
11 athletes is required before adopting this approach. A further option is to use two subscales
12 instead of a single scale. However, that option is not available if the reliability of one of the
13 subscales drops to unacceptable levels, as was the case in the present study and also in
14 Appaneal's (2012) study. In the longer term, we support the suggestion that the LOT-R
15 requires further revisions (Appaneal). In particular, the reliance on three negatively-valenced
16 and three positively-valenced items is likely to continue to create confusion about the
17 dimensionality of the scale.

18 Sport Confidence Inventory

19 The SCI was developed to measure sport confidence in three areas: physical skills and
20 training, cognitive efficiency, and resilience. Convergent validity indicators for the three
21 factors were sound and reliability estimates for all subscales were very good but factor and
22 scale inter-correlations showed that there was a lot of overlap between Resilience and
23 Cognitive Efficiency, indicating problems with discriminant validity. We explored the
24 possibility that the high degree of overlap was due to the ICM requirement for items to have
25 zero loadings on non-target factors. Relaxing the ICM requirement through the use of ESEM

1 (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009) resulted in factor correlations that were more in line with
2 expectations (see Table 5) and removed concerns about discriminant validity at the construct
3 level. As Table 8 shows, however, the correlation between Cognitive Efficiency and
4 Resilience was still high at the scale level because in the process of scale formation even
5 factorially complex items were assigned to a single scale. It would be impractical to suggest
6 scoring methods that weighted the contribution of complex items to multiple scales. A better
7 option is to refine those items that demonstrated factorial complexity.

8 Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory

9 The CSCI was developed to measure individuals' sport confidence levels with
10 subscales of dispositional optimism and sport competence. The CFA supported the proposed
11 two-factor structure. Scales formed from these two factors were moderately correlated and
12 demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency reliability. An interesting outcome of the
13 analysis of all 33 items from the three instruments was the support found for a six-factor
14 model in which the LOT-R-OPT and CSCI-OPT items defined a single factor. On these
15 grounds, the CSCI is a viable alternative measure of dispositional optimism when working
16 with athletes.

17 Overall evaluation of measures

18 Tests of configural invariance showed that the factor structure of all three instruments
19 remains robust across different levels of athletic achievement. However, there are other
20 aspects of these instruments to be considered when evaluating their suitability for use in sport
21 and exercise settings. The mean scores for each instrument are reported in Table 8 alongside
22 the possible range for each score. It is a simple matter to convert these means to percentages.
23 When that is done, the mean scores were 55.74% for LOT-R, 75.79% for the SCI, and
24 82.35% for the CSCI. The high mean score for the CSCI suggests that the instrument may be
25 subject to ceiling effects. Neither the LOT-R nor the CSCI discriminated between

1 international level and domestic level athletes. The mean for the SCI was also somewhat high
2 at nearly 76% but the mean did vary according to level of sporting achievement.

3 The face validity of the three instruments should also be taken into consideration. The
4 LOT-R uses a familiar item format and assesses the athlete's overall outlook on life. Using
5 the LOT-R in a sporting context therefore requires the athlete to make the transition from the
6 general to the specific. For example, a question such as "I'm always optimistic about my
7 future" (LOT-R) can be applied to sport and even to a situation in a contest but the application
8 is easier for a question such as "How certain are you that you can regain your mental focus
9 after an error?" (SCI). In the same vein, although the word "sport" is included in item stems,
10 the CSCI is also general in nature. That is, some transition to particular game contexts is still
11 required. For example, the item "I believe that I have a bright future in sporting events"
12 (CSCI) is designed to tap dispositional optimism but it may not be useful for tracking
13 confidence levels from game to game. We can summarise these observations by noting that in
14 terms of their general orientation, LOT-R applies to life in general, the CSCI to sport in
15 general, and the SCI to actual game scenarios.

16 An important point that follows from this summary is that an instrument may be better
17 suited to some situations than to others, even when sport is the focus of attention. For
18 example, if the aim is to assess an athlete's general sense of optimism, the LOT-R may be a
19 good choice. If the aim is to assess, say, attitudes within a student population towards sport as
20 well as confidence in actual sporting activities, the CSCI comes into consideration. If the
21 focus is much narrower and confidence during specific sports competitions is the centre of
22 attention, of the three instruments we have evaluated, the SCI is the best choice.

23 Limitations and Further Research

24 The absence of actual performance measures was a limitation in this study, as was the
25 adoption of a data collection technique that did not control for variance in competitive

1 pressure. The best way to test the sensitivity of psychological measures is to collect both
2 psychological and performance data over time, as Vealey and Knight (2002) did in Phase 4 of
3 their SCI validation study. It is also what we did in the final stage of this research program.
4 All three measures were administered repeatedly over the course of an individually-
5 administered psychological skills program. The contents of that intervention and the changes
6 in optimism and confidence as measured by the three instruments validated in this paper are
7 described elsewhere (Furst, Thomas, & Fogarty, in preparation).

8 In terms of further research, we have already indicated that despite the generally sound
9 psychometric properties exhibited by the LOT-R, the SCI, and the CSCI, more research is
10 needed at the item level to determine whether greater discrimination can be achieved among
11 the subscales of these instruments. However, we also emphasise that such research efforts
12 should not focus on item content alone. The validation samples themselves may prove to be of
13 interest. Inspection of SCI item content, for example, suggests that it should be possible to
14 distinguish among the three constructs it purportedly measures. A possible explanation is that
15 it may take a lot of practice in psychological skills before athletes distinguish readily between
16 these different types of sport confidence. Until they reach that level of knowledge,
17 confidence, broadly defined, is just one of the many psychological skills they are trying to
18 acquire. This phenomenon is well-known in the differential and developmental psychology
19 fields where, during the course of mental development, global, undifferentiated constructs
20 become increasingly differentiated, articulated, and hierarchically integrated (e.g., Burt,
21 1954). Such a developmental sequence in the athlete would mirror the conceptual
22 developments in the discipline itself, where sport confidence was once seen as a
23 unidimensional construct (Vealey, 1986).

24 An additional line of research involves extending the methodology we used to
25 embrace other psychological tests. We examined just three instruments and their associated

1 constructs from what is now a large pool of instruments designed to measure aspects of sport
2 confidence, optimism, resilience, tough-mindedness, and the like. The study therefore
3 samples from that pool and makes no judgements about instruments we did not examine.
4 Such a line of research would provide valuable psychometric data on established tests as well
5 as continuing to address the jingle-jangle fallacy posed by Marsh (1994). Ultimately, more
6 evaluative research of this kind would help psychologists to select suitable measures from a
7 confusing array of assessment tools in a popular domain of sport and exercise psychology.

8 **Conclusion**

9 Our first aim in this study was to test the factor structure of the LOT-R, the SCI, and
10 the CSCI. Regarding the LOT-R, our conclusion is that it can be treated as a unidimensional
11 instrument but a more accurate description is that it contains two correlated dimensions, one
12 reflecting dispositional optimism, the other dispositional pessimism. Regarding the SCI, we
13 found evidence to support its hypothesized three-dimensional structure. We also found that
14 some of the SCI items have loadings on two or more factors, a problem that needs to be
15 addressed, especially in relation to the SCI-Efficiency and SCI-Resilience subscales.
16 Regarding the CSCI, the hypothesized two-factor structure was supported in this study.

17 The second aim of this study was to explore relations among the constructs of
18 dispositional optimism and sport confidence. This aim was prompted by Marsh's (1994)
19 caution that in an era of rapid test development, the same construct can appear under different
20 labels and different constructs can appear under the same label. Our CFA of all 33 items
21 indicated that this type of confusion is not happening across these three instruments.
22 Dispositional optimism and sport confidence emerged as distinct but related constructs. The
23 seven-factor solution provided a good fit to the data, suggesting that although they are highly
24 correlated there is sufficient discriminant validity among the seven constructs measured by

1 the LOT-R, the SCI, and the CSCI. A six-factor solution also fitted the data but the two
2 constructs that merged were both labelled dispositional optimism, so there was no confusion.

3 The third aim of the study was to explore relations between scores on the three
4 instruments and a measure of sporting achievement. Interpreted differently, the aim was to
5 develop an understanding of which of the three instruments might be most useful in sport
6 psychology research and practice. Vealey and Chase (2008) commented that the different
7 approaches to the measurement of sport confidence now offer plenty of choice and they
8 advised researchers to select the instrument that suits their research purposes. On the basis of
9 the data collected in this study, of the three instruments we evaluated, the SCI is likely to be
10 the most useful for sport and exercise psychologists interested in the effects of interventions
11 on confidence. Most importantly, item content is based on actual competition situations.

References

- 1
2
- 3 Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in
4 humans: Critique and reformulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88*, 242-248.
5 doi:10.1037/0021-843X.87.1.49
- 6 Albinson, C. B., & Petrie, T. A. (2003). Cognitive appraisals, stress, and coping: Preinjury
7 and postinjury factors influencing psychological adjustment to sport injury. *Journal of*
8 *Sport Rehabilitation, 12*(4), 306-322.
- 9 Appaneal, R. N. (2012). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Life Orientation Test-Revised
10 with competitive athletes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 83*, 592-596.
11 doi: 10.1080/02701367.2012.10599885
- 12 Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B.O. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling. *Structural*
13 *Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 16*, 397-438. doi:
14 10.1080/10705510903008204
- 15 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- 16 Brewer, B. W., Cornelius, A. E., Sklar, J. H., Van Raalte, J. L., Tennen, H., Armeli, S., ...
17 Brickner, J. C. (2007). Pain and negative mood during rehabilitation after anterior
18 cruciate ligament reconstruction: A daily process analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of*
19 *Medicine & Science in Sports, 17*, 520–529. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2006.00601.x
- 20 Browne, M. W. (2001). An overview of analytic rotation in exploratory factor analysis.
21 *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 36*, 111-150. doi:
22 10.1207/S15327906MBR3601_05
- 23 Burt, C. (1954). The differentiation of intellectual abilities. *British Journal of Educational*
24 *Psychology, 24*, 76-90.

- 1 Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2014). Dispositional optimism. *Trends in Cognitive Science*,
2 18, 293-299. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2014.02.003
- 3 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance.
4 *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14, 464-504. doi:
5 10.1080/10705510701301834
- 6 Chen, L. H., Kee, Y. H., Tsai, Y-M. (2008). Relation of dispositional optimism with burnout
7 among athletes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 106, 693-698. doi:
8 10.2466/pms.106.3.693-698
- 9 Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing
10 measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*,
11 9, 233-255. doi: 10.1207/s15328007sem0902_5
- 12 De la Vega, R., Ruiz, R., Batista, F., Ortín, F., & Giesenow, C. (2012). Effects of feedback on
13 self-efficacy expectations based on the athlete's optimistic profile. *Psychology*, 3,
14 1208-1214. doi: 10.4236/psych.2012.312A179.
- 15 Gaudreau, P., & Blondin, J. P. (2004). Differential associations of dispositional optimism and
16 pessimism with coping, goal attainment, and emotional adjustment during sport
17 competition. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11, 245-269. doi:
18 10.1037/1072-5245.11.3.245
- 19 Gordon, R. A. (2008). Attributional style and athletic performance: Strategic optimism and
20 defensive pessimism. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, 336-350.
21 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.04.007
- 22 Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K., & Moffett, A. (2002). Psychological characteristics and their
23 development in Olympic champions. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14, 172-
24 204. doi:10.1080/10413200290103482

- 1 Grove, J. R., & Heard, P. (1997). Optimism and sport confidence as correlates of slump-
2 related coping amongst athletes. *The Sport Psychologist, 11*, 400-410.
- 3 Hanrahan, S.J., Grove, R., & Hattie, J.A. (1989). Development of a questionnaire measure of
4 sport-related attributional style. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 20*, 114–
5 134.
- 6 Herzberg, Y. H., Glaesmer, H., & Hoyer, J. (2006). Separating optimism and pessimism: A
7 robust psychometric analysis of the Revised Life Orientation Test (LOT-R).
8 *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 433-438. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.18.4.433
- 9 Little, R. J. A. (1988). A test of Missing Completely at Random for multivariate data with
10 missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83*, 1198-1202. doi:
11 10.1080/01621459.1988.10478722
- 12 Manzo, L. G., Silva, J. M., & Mink, R. (2001). The Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory.
13 *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13*, 260-274.10.1080/104132001753144400
- 14 Marsh, H. W. (1994). Sport motivation orientations: Beware of jingle-jangle fallacies.
15 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 16*, 365-380.
- 16 Marsh, H. W. (1996). Positive and negative global self-esteem: A substantively meaningful
17 distinction or artifactors? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 810-819.
- 18 Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on
19 hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in
20 overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*
21 *Multidisciplinary Journal, 11*(3), 320-341. doi: 10.1207/s15328007sem1103_2
- 22 McDonald, R. P. (1970). The theoretical foundations of principal factor analysis, canonical
23 factor analysis, and alpha factor analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and*
24 *Statistical Psychology, 23*, 1-21. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8317.1970.tb00432.x

- 1 Millsap, R. E., & Yun-Tein, J. (2004). Assessing factorial invariance in ordered-categorical
2 measures. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*, 479-515. doi:
3 10.1207/s15327906mbr3903_4
- 4 Morin, A. J. S., & Maïano, C. (2011). Cross-validation of the short form of the Physical Self-
5 Inventory (PSI-S) using exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM).
6 *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, *12*, 540-554. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.04.003
- 7 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2014). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén
8 & Muthén.
- 9 Myers, N. D. (2013). Coaching competency and (exploratory) structural equation modeling:
10 A substantive-methodological synergy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *14*, 709-
11 718. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.04.008
- 12 Myers, N. D., Jin, Y., Ahn, S., Celimli, S., & Zopluoglu, C. (2015). Rotation to a partially
13 specified target matrix in exploratory factor analysis in practice. *Behavior Research*
14 *Methods*, *47*, 494-505. doi: 10.3758/s13428-014-0486-7
- 15 Nes, L.S. & Segerstrom, S.C. (2006). Dispositional optimism and coping: A meta-analytic
16 review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 235–251. doi:
17 10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_3
- 18 Nicholls, A. R., Polman, R.C.J., Levy, A. R., & Backhouse, S. H. (2007). Mental toughness,
19 optimism, pessimism, and coping among athletes. *Personality and Individual*
20 *Differences*, *44*, 1182-1192. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.11.011
- 21 Parkes, J. F., & Mallett, C. J. (2011). Developing mental toughness: Attributional style
22 retraining in rugby. *The Sport Psychologist*, *25*, 269-287.
- 23 Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y, Metalsky, G. I., & Seligman, M.
24 E. P. (1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*,
25 *6*, 287-299.

- 1 Rees, T., Ingledew, D. K., & Hardy, L. (2005). Attribution in sport psychology: Seeking
2 congruence between theory, research and practice. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*,
3 6, 189-204. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2003.10.008
- 4 Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping and health: Assessment and
5 implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4, 219-247.
6 doi:10.1037/0278-6133.4.3.219
- 7 Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological well-being:
8 Theoretical overview and empirical support. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16,
9 201–228.
- 10 Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from
11 neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the
12 Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 1063-1078.
13 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1063
- 14 Segerstrom, S. C., Evans, D. R., & Eisenlohr-Moul, T. A. (2011). Optimism and pessimism
15 dimensions in the Life Orientation Test-Revised: Method and meaning. *Journal of*
16 *Research in Personality*, 45(1), 126-129. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.11.007
- 17 Spector, P.E. (1997). When two factors don't reflect two constructs: How item characteristics
18 can produce artifactual factors. *Journal of Management*, 23(5), 659-677.
- 19 Thomas, O., Lane, A., & Kingston, K. (2011). Defining and contextualizing robust sport-
20 confidence. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23, 189-208. doi:
21 10.1080/10413200.2011.559519
- 22 Vealey, R. S. (1986). Conceptualization of sport-confidence and competitive orientation:
23 Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Sport Psychology*,
24 8, 221-246.

- 1 Vealey, R. S., & Chase, M. A. (2008). Self-confidence in sport: Conceptual and research
2 advances. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 65–97).
3 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 4 Vealey, R.S., & Knight, B.J. (2002). *Development of the multidimensional sport-confidence*
5 *inventory*. Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology, Tucson,
6 AZ.
- 7 Venne, S. A., Laguna, P., Walk, S., & Ravizza, K. (2006). Optimism levels among collegiate
8 athletes and non-athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 4,
9 182–195. doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2006.9671792
- 10 Weiner, B., Frieze, I. H., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S. & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1971).
11 *Perceiving the causes of success and failure*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Table 1.

Fit Statistics for the LOT-R, Sport Confidence Inventory, and Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory Measurement Models

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	Δ CFI	Δ RMSEA
LOT-R								
Independence Model	1498.25***	15						
Unidimensional	65.24***	9	.96	.94	.16	[.12, .19]		
CT ICM-CFA	22.26**	8	.99	.98	.08	[.04, .13]	+.03	-.07
Sport Confidence Inventory								
Independence Model	5659.54***	91						
Unidimensional	910.41***	77	.85	.82	.20	[.19, .22]		
CT ICM-CFA	362.92***	74	.95	.94	.12	[.11, .14]	+.10	-.08
CT ESEM	178.96***	52	.98	.96	.10	[.08, .11]	+.03	+.03
Carolina Sport Confidence Inventory								
Independence Model	2725.64***	78						
Unidimensional	250.79***	65	.93	.92	.11	[.09, .12]		
CT ICM-CFA	143.47***	64	.97	.96	.07	[.05, .08]	+.04	-.04

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ *df* = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI = Confidence interval; CT = correlated traits

Table 2

Factor Loadings for the LOT-R Indicators with Bidimensional and Unidimensional Solutions

Latent variable and indicators	Bidimensional Solution			Unidimensional Solution		
	λ	λ_{cs}	SE^a	λ	λ_{cs}	SE^a
Optimism						
LOT-R 1	1.00 ^b	.49	.04	1.00	.42	.05
LOT-R 4	1.26	.57	.04	1.26	.50	.05
LOT-R 10	2.57	.82	.03	1.89	.65	.03
Pessimism						
LOT-R 3	1.00 ^b	.69	.05	1.99	-.67	.04
LOT-R 7	1.93	.88	.05	3.75	-.86	.02
LOT-R 9	2.15	.90	.05	4.17	-.89	.02

Note. λ = unstandardized factor loading; λ_{cs} = completely standardized factor loading. ^a These values are based on standardized estimates. ^b These loadings were fixed to 1.00 to establish the metric of the latent variable. All factor loadings are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 3

Factor Loadings from the retained ESEM Correlated Factors Model for the SCI

Item	SCI-EFF	SCI-RES	SCI-PST
SCI-2	.68	.34	.08
SCI-5	.20	.55	.18
SCI-8	.18	.52	.27
SCI-11	.60	.35	.20
SCI-3	.11	.73	.10
SCI-6	.37	.59	.09
SCI-9	.24	.69	.02
SCI-12	.25	.60	.13
SCI-14	.45	.46	.03
SCI-1	-.31	.49	.60
SCI-4	.20	-.24	.85
SCI-7	.14	-.35	.89
SCI-10	-.37	.28	.79
SCI-13	.18	-.27	.91
SCI-EFF	–	.88	.62
SCI-RES	.31	–	.53
SCI-PST	.44	.42	–

Note. All factor loading estimates are standardized, and target loadings are shown in bold.

Correlations above the diagonal are from the ICM-CFA solution whereas those below the diagonal are ESEM estimates. All factor correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 4

Factor Loadings for the CSCI Indicators

Latent variable and indicators	λ	λ_{cs}	SE^a
CSCI-OPT			
item 2	1.00 ^b	.68	.04
item 5	1.27	.77	.04
item 6	1.93	.88	.03
item 8	0.92	.65	.05
item 10	1.85	.87	.02
item 11	1.19	.75	.04
item 13	0.93	.66	.06
CSCI-COMP			
item 1	1.00 ^b	.67	.05
item 3	1.20	.74	.05
item 4	0.98	.66	.05
item 7	2.05	.88	.03
item 9	0.83	.60	.05
item 12	0.87	.62	.05

Note. λ = unstandardized factor loading; λ_{cs} = completely standardized factor loading. ^a These values are based on standardized estimates. ^b These loadings were fixed to 1.00 to establish the metric of the latent variable. All factor loadings are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 5.

Correlations among the SCI, CSCI and LOT-R Factors in a General Measurement Model

	SCI-EFF	SCI-RES	SCI-PST	CSCI-OPT	CSCI-COMP	LOT-R-OPT	LOT-R-PES
SCI-EFF	–						
SCI-RES	.30	–					
SCI-PST	.44	.42	–				
CSCI-OPT	.44	.53	.57	–			
CSCI-COMP	.27	.39	.54	.74	–		
LOT-R-OPT	.49	.50	.56	.79	.50	–	
LOT-R-PES	–.28	–.34	–.26	–.60	–.34	–.77	–

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 6

Fit Statistics for Competition Level Invariance (IN) SCI Models

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	MD χ^2	Δdf	ΔCFI	$\Delta RMSEA$
MGM1 (Configural IN)	223.482***	104	.977	.960	.096	[.079, .114]				
MGM2 (IN FL)	242.564***	137	.980	.973	.079	[.062, .095]	51.967*	33	+0.003	-.017
MGM3 (IN FL + Th)	277.783***	162	.978	.975	.076	[.061, .091]	43.194*	25	-.002	-.003
MGM4 (IN FL + Th + Uniq)	305.862***	176	.975	.974	.077	[.062, .043]	37.870**	14	-.003	+0.001
MGM5 (IN FL + Th + Uniq + FVCV)	268.144***	182	.984	.984	.062	[.045, .077]	12.536	6	+0.009	-.015
MGM6 (IN FL + Th + Uniq + FVCV + FM)	329.087***	185	.973	.973	.079	[.065, .093]	24.760***	3	-.011	+0.017

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ *df* = degrees of freedom; Δdf = change in *df*; MD χ^2 = change in χ^2 relative to the preceding model

computed using the Mplus DIFFTEST function; ΔCFI = change in comparative fit index; $\Delta RMSEA$ = change in root mean square of

approximation; MGM = multiple-group model; IN = invariance; FL = factor loadings; Th = Thresholds; Uniq = uniquenesses; FVCV = factor

variance-covariance matrix; FM = factor means.

Table 7

Fit Statistics for Competition Level Invariance (IN) CSCI Models

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	MD χ^2	Δdf	ΔCFI	$\Delta RMSEA$
MGM1 (Configural IN)	200.763***	128	.973	.967	.068	[.049, .085]				
MGM2 (IN FL)	210.129***	139	.973	.970	.064	[.046, .081]	14.064	11	.000	-.004
MGM3 (IN FL + Th)	226.721***	150	.971	.970	.064	[.046, .081]	19.143	11	-.002	-.003
MGM4 (IN FL + Th + Uniq)	255.832***	163	.965	.967	.068	[.051, .083]	31.782**	13	-.006	+.004
MGM5 (IN FL + Th + Uniq + FVCV)	284.600***	166	.956	.958	.076	[.061, .091]	14.500**	3	-.009	+.008
MGM6 (IN FL + Th + Uniq + FVCV + FM)	279.681***	168	.958	.961	.073	[.058, .088]	1.593	2	+.002	-.003

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ *df* = degrees of freedom; Δdf = change in *df*; MD χ^2 = change in χ^2 relative to the preceding model

computed using the Mplus DIFFTEST function; ΔCFI = change in comparative fit index; $\Delta RMSEA$ = change in root mean square of

approximation; MGM = multiple-group model; IN = invariance; FL = factor loadings; Th = Thresholds; Uniq = uniquenesses; FVCV = factor variance-covariance matrix; FM = factor means.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for LOT-R, SCI, and CSCI Scales (N = 260)

Measure	Range	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. LOT-R	0-24	16.72	3.73	<u>.77</u>									
2. LOT-R Optimism	0-12	8.21	2.01	.84	<u>.58</u>								
3. LOT-R Pessimism	0-12	4.13	2.94	-.86	-.47	<u>.79</u>							
4. SCI	1-7	5.31	.72	.47	.51	-.31	<u>.91</u>						
5. SCI Cognitive Efficiency	1-7	5.31	.83	.40	.42	-.27	.89	<u>.86</u>					
6. SCI Resilience	1-7	5.21	.85	.48	.49	-.35	.87	.79	<u>.86</u>				
7. SCI Physical Skills	1-7	5.40	.86	.32	.39	-.18	.79	.53	.45	<u>.85</u>			
8. CSCI	1-4	3.29	.43	.52	.50	-.39	.59	.50	.52	.48	<u>.85</u>		
9. CSCI Optimism	1-4	3.31	.42	.59	.58	-.43	.62	.54	.58	.46	.88	<u>.82</u>	
10. CSCI Competence	1-4	3.28	.50	.33	.31	-.26	.42	.34	.34	.39	.89	.57	<u>.76</u>

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

Scale reliabilities (α) are underlined in the main diagonal