



Letter to the Editor

Review of the COVID-19 Pandemic-related Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10-C)



Revisión de la Escala de Estrés Percibido (EEP-10-C) relacionado con la pandemia de COVID-19

To the Editor,

The COVID-19 Pandemic-Related Stress Scale (PSS-10-C) was presented amidst the worldwide coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak.¹ The PSS-10-C is an adaptation of the famous Scale of Perceived Stress (PSS-10).² The instrument's relevance is evidenced by several citations of using the PSS-C-10 in the world context.³⁻⁵ The PSS-10-C presented a one-dimensional structure, without a confirmatory analysis factorial, and high internal consistency; however, the need to make adjustments in PSS-10-C was noted.¹

Since perspective focused on the writing of the items, a review of the PSS-10-C suggested that the Spanish item 6 ('I have felt *unable* to face the things I have to do to control the possible infection') could partly explain that the factorial solution was not wholly satisfactory in explaining less than 50% of the variance.⁶ Furthermore, item 6 was scored directly and was preceded and followed by two items scored inversely.¹ Often, these details can have a significant impact on the performance of the measurement scales.⁷

A sample of 1136 students from all majors of a Colombian university participated. Participants include ages between 18 and 29 years (mean, 22 ± 3], currently called emerging adults.⁸ 66% of the sample was female, and 79% of residents in low-income areas were included. Students completed online an adjusted version of the PSS-10-C that only has a modification (in italics) in Spanish item 6 to which the wording was adjusted ('I have felt *able* to face the things that I have to do to control a possible infection'), and the meaning of the qualification was changed from direct to reverse. Items 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10 were scored directly from 0 to 4, and items 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 were reversed from 4 to 0.¹ Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory (EFA) were performed (CFA). Besides, Cronbach's alpha was calculated as an indicator of internal consistency.⁹ The analysis was performed using IBM-SPSS version 23.¹⁰ This study was approved by an institutional research ethics committee (Act 002 of an ordinary meeting, March 26th, 2020).

In the EFA, the coefficient was KMO = .86, and Bartlett's test showed $\chi^2 = 3.985.3$, $df = 54$ and $P < .001$. Two factors were

retained, factor 1 ('distress') (items 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10), which showed an Eigenvalue of 4.24 that explained 42.4% of the variance and factor 2 ('coping') (items 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) that presented Eigenvalue of 1.42 responsible for 14.2% of the variance. The correlation between the factors was .55. The CFA showed the goodness-of-fit indexes the two-dimensional model of the PSS-10-C ($\chi^2 = 295.6$; $df = 34$; $P < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 8.7$; RMSEA = .08; 90%CI, 0.07-0.09; CFI = .93; TLI = .91; SRMR = .05). The global PSS-10-C showed Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$, factor 1 = .83, and factor 2 = .77.

A slight modification in the writing and way of rating an item can produce a significant change in an instrument's psychometric performance, such as disqualifying adjectives, negative sentences, or other strategies that can change the rating sense of items.⁷ The two-dimensional solution for the PSS-10-C is not novel; it has been previously reported for the PSS-10.¹¹⁻¹³ The 2 factors retained more than 50% of the variance, as is usually recommended,⁶ and indicators of goodness-of-fit are good.^{14,15} Also, this version of the PSS-C-10, with the adjustment of item 6, showed high internal consistency (.85), as the previous version (.86).¹

In conclusion, the PSS-10-C is a valid and reliable tool among emerging adult students from a Colombian university. These indicators need to be corroborated in future research.

Funding

The Universidad del Magdalena supported Adalberto Campo-Arias and John Carlos Pedrozo-Pupo, and the Instituto de Investigación del Comportamiento Humano supported Edwin Herazo.

REFERENCES

1. Campo-Arias A, Pedrozo-Cortés MJ, Pedrozo-Pupo JC. Pandemic-Related Perceived Stress Scale of COVID-19: An exploration of online psychometric performance. *Rev Colomb Psiquiatr.* 2020;49:229-30.

2. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1983;24:385-96.
 3. Campo-Arias A, Perdomo-Rojas JA, Caballero-Domínguez CC. Social capital and perceived stress related to coronavirus disease in Colombia. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2020;74:872.
 4. Hernandez-Garcia F, Gongora-Gomez O, Gonzalez-Velazquez VE, Pedraza-Rodriguez EM, Zamora-Fung R, Lazo LA. Stress perceived by students of the medical sciences in Cuba toward the COVID-19 pandemic: results of an online survey. medRxiv. 2020, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248345>.
 5. Bermejo-Martins E, Luis EO, Sarrionandia A, et al. Different responses to stress, health practices and self-care during COVID-19 lockdown: A stratified analysis. Preprints. 2021, <http://dx.doi.org/10.20944/preprints202102.0092.v1>, 2021020092.
 6. Campo-Arias A, Herazo E, Oviedo HC. Factor analysis: Principles to evaluate measurement tools for mental health. *Rev Colomb Psiquiatr.* 2012;41:659-71.
 7. Liu M, Keusch F. Effects of scale direction on response style of ordinal rating scales. *J Offic Stat.* 2017;33:137-54.
 8. Arnett JJ. Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *Am Psychol.* 2000;55:469-89.
 9. Cronbach J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika.* 1951;16:297-334.
 10. IBM-SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 23.0. Armonk: SPSS. Inc.; 2015.
 11. Wang Z, Chen J, Boyd JE, et al. Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the Perceived Stress Scale in policewomen. *PloS One.* 2011;6:e28610.
 12. Ng SM. Validation of the 10-item Chinese perceived stress scale in elderly service workers: one-factor versus two-factor structure. *BMC Psychol.* 2013;1:9.
 13. Sandhu SS, Ismail NH, Rampal KG. The Malay version of the perceived stress scale (PSS)-10 is a reliable and valid measure for stress among nurses in Malaysia. *Malay J Med Sci.* 2015;22:26-31.
 14. Hu LT, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equat Model.* 1999;6:1-55.
 15. Wheaton B, Muthen B, Alwin DF, Summers GF. Assessing reliability and stability in panel models. In: Heise DE, editor. *Sociological methodology.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1977. p. 84-136.
- Adalberto Campo-Arias ^{a,*}, John Carlos Pedrozo-Pupo ^a, Edwin Herazo ^b
- ^a Programa de Medicina, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia
- ^b Instituto de Investigación del Comportamiento Humano, Bogotá, Colombia
- * Corresponding author.
E-mail address: acampo@unimagdalena.edu.co (A. Campo-Arias).
0034-7450/
© 2021 Asociación Colombiana de Psiquiatría. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcp.2021.02.002>