

Psychometric Properties of the PASS-20: Normative Data with a Non-clinical Sample



Murray Abrams, R. Nicholas Carleton, M.A., Jennifer A. Stapleton, M.A., Gordon J. G. Asmundson, Ph. D.

Anxiety and Illness Behaviour Laboratory, University of Regina

Introduction

- The Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale-20 (PASS-20; McCracken & Dhingra, 2002) is a 20 item instrument. which measures four factorially distinct components of pain-related anxiety:
- •cognitive
- •Fear
- •escape/avoidance
- physiological

Scale a if item deleted

- For samples experiencing chronic pain the PASS-20 has demonstrated good factor stability, reliability, and internal consistency (Coons, Hadjistavropoulos, & Asmundson, 2004)
- · For non-clinical samples the PASS-20 has confirmed that fear of pain manifests in both those with and without chronic pain (e.g., Asmundson & Carleton, 2005), however normative psychometric data for healthy controls have yet to be established
- . The purpose of this study was to perform a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the PASS-20 with a sample of healthy pain-free individuals in order to establish normative psychometric data for subsequent comparative purposes

Method

• Participants were 176 undergraduates who completed the PASS-20 as part of a larger study. None of them reported current pain or a history of chronic pain

- 55 men. ages 18 31 (*M* = 21.0; *SD* = 3.0)
- 121 women, ages 17 45 (M = 20.7; SD = 4.7)

· Factorial validity was established with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) comparing the proposed fourfactor structure (McCracken & Dhingra, 2002) to a unitary model using a non-clinical sample

· Model fit was evaluated using indices as suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999):

- 1) Chi-square/df ratio (values should be < 2.0) 2) Comparative Fit Index (CFI; values should be close to .95)
- 3) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; values should be close to .06)
- 4) Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR; Values should be close to .08) 5) Expected Cross Validation Index (ECVI, lower values indicate better fit: Brown & Cudeck, 1993)

 Descriptive statistics were assessed for the total measure, each of the subscales, along with an item by item reliability analysis (Tables 1 & 2)

Results

• The CFA testing a unitary factor structure resulted in unacceptable fit indices

- $\gamma^2/df = 3.89$
- CFI = .89
- RMSEA = .15

90% confidence intervals of .14 and .16 • SRMR = .09

• ECVI = 5.11

90% confidence intervals of 4.62 and 5.64

 The CFA testing the proposed 4-factor structure resulted in acceptable fit indices

- $\chi^2/df = 2.03$
- CFI = .96
- RMSEA = .08

90% confidence intervals of .07 and .09 • SRMR = .06

• ECVI = 2.46

90% confidence intervals of 2 19 and 2 78

· As expected, t-test comparisons demonstrated the clinical sample from McCracken and Dhingra (2002) reported significantly more fear on each subscale than our sample of healthy controls (Table 2)

Inter-factor correlations are presented in Figure 2

Discussion

• CFA results confirm that pain-free individuals exhibit pain-related anxiety, but, as would be expected, to a lesser degree than clinical pain populations

 Comparisons of subscale means with a clinical sample revealed significant differences on all four domains •The escape/avoidance subscale accounted for the largest amount of variance

• In line with expectations, people with no history of pain are less likely to endorse escape and avoidance pain behaviours relative to those suffering from chronic pain

. The findings of this study are limited in that the current sample consists only of undergraduate students; further verification of normative data is warranted with other, more demographically and culturally diverse samples

 Additional research should explore test re-test reliability and predictive diagnostic utility

 Future longitudinal research should determine whether relative elevations in PASS-20 subscales is indicative of specific vulnerabilities for chronic pain

 Establishing normative psychometric data for the PASS-20 provides a basis for general assessment and comparison with various clinical populations

Table 1a. PASS-20 Items					Table 1b. PASS-20 Items					
Cognitive Factor		M SD CITC α*		α*	Fear Factor	М	SD	CITC	α*	
1. I can't think straight when in pain	1.89	1.26	0.67	0.91	11. I think that if my pain gets too severe, it will never decrease	1.02	1.23	0.61	0.91	
2. During painful episodes it is difficult for me to think of					12. When I feel pain I am afraid that something terrible will					
anything besides the pain	1.90	1.31	0.70	0.91	happen	0.95	1.04	0.61	0.91	
3. When I hurt I think about pain constantly	1.73	1.23	0.71	0.91	13. When I feel pain I think I might be seriously ill	0.95	1.05	0.69	0.91	
4. I find it hard to concentrate when I hurt	1.99	1.25	0.70	0.91	14. Pain sensations are terrifying	0.88	0.90	0.62	0.91	
5. I worry when I am in pain	1.71	1.39	0.72	0.91	15. When pain comes on strong I think that I might become					
					paralyzed or more disabled	0.37	0.74	0.46	0.91	
Escape/Avoidance Factor	М	SD	CITC	α*	Physiological Anxiety	М	SD	CITC	α*	
6. I go immediately to bed when I feel severe pain	1.32	1.32	0.43	0.91	16. I begin trembling when engaged in an activity that causes					
7. I will stop any activity as soon as I sense pain coming on	1.13	1.09	0.41	0.91	pain	0.61	1.01	0.42	0.91	
8. As soon as pain comes on I take medication to reduce it	1.44	1.34	0.40	0.91	17. Pain seems to cause my heart to pound or race	1.20	1.15	0.55	0.91	
9. I avoid important activities when I hurt	1.22	1.06	0.49	0.91	18. When I sense pain I feel dizzy or faint	0.90	1.13	0.55	0.91	
10. I try to avoid activities that cause pain	1.40	1.44	0.37	0.92	19. Pain makes me nauseous	0.98	1.13	0.59	0.91	
					20. I find it difficult to calm my body down after periods of pain	1.05	1.09	0.67	0.91	
CITC = Corrected Item Total Correlations										

	Healt	hy Cont	rols	Clinical [†]			Comparisons		
	Mean	SD	α	Mean	SD	α	t	р	r ²
Cognitive	9.22	5.59	.92	12.27	6.73	.86	4.62	< .01	.04
Escape/Avoidance	6.51	4.09	.66	12.84	6.11	.75	11.42	< .01	.22
Fear	4.17	3.89	.83	7.37	6.38	.82	5.68	< .01	.07
Physiological Anxiety	4.74	4.20	.82	6.15	5.69	.81	2.64	< .01	.02
Total	24.64	14.41	.92	38.62	20.38	.91	7.43	< .01	.11
[†] As reported in McCracken & Dhingra (2002), <i>p</i> values indicate one-tailed tests									

Figure 1: Normative Subscale Correlations



*For a copy of this poster please visit www.uregina.ca/anxietylab