

The Independent and Interactive Effects of the Big Five Personality Dimensions upon Dispositional Coping and Coping Effectiveness in Sport.

Kaiseler, M., Levy, A.R., Nicholls, A.R., & Madigan, D.

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	RIJS-2016-0124.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Personality, Big-Five, Dispositional Coping, Coping effectiveness, Sport

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 Table 1: Descriptive statistics and reliability for the Big Five personality dimensions, dispositional
 2 coping and coping effectiveness
 3

Subscale	Mean	SD	Alpha	Skewness	Kurtosis
Big-5					
Extraversion	3.55	0.73	0.78	-.07	-.64
Agreeableness	3.48	0.78	0.82	-.34	-.77
Conscientiousness	3.40	0.80	0.84	-.19	-.82
Neuroticism	2.87	0.75	0.75	-.07	-.37
Openness	3.16	0.62	0.66	-.24	.47
Task Coping					
Mental Imagery	12.13	4.50	0.83	-.24	-.99
Effort Expenditure	11.13	2.83	0.71	-.59	-.36
Thought Control	13.03	3.28	0.71	-.33	-.22
Seeking Support	12.25	3.66	0.72	-.14	-.28
Relaxation	11.35	3.52	0.70	.04	-.41
Logical Analysis	13.64	3.42	0.72	-.37	-.36
Distraction Coping					
Distancing	4.61	2.20	0.69	.50	-.74
Mental Distraction	10.56	4.16	0.78	.14	-1.00
Disengagement Coping					
Venting	12.87	4.00	0.79	-.11	-.56
Resignation	9.06	4.26	0.85	.67	-.61
Coping Effectiveness					
Coping effectiveness	18.51	3.35	0.60	-.05	-.03

1
2 Table 2. Bivariate correlations between Big-5, dispositional coping and coping effectiveness.

3 Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
4 1. Extraversion	-	.21**	.31**	-.32**	.25**	.31**	.32**	.28**	-.01	.06	.16	-.29**	-.21**	.11*	-.27**	.06
5 2. Agreeableness		-	.61**	-.49**	.33**	.57**	.58**	.35**	-.15**	-.09	.19**	-.46**	-.46	-.30**	-.56**	.07
6 3. Conscientiousness			-	-.44**	.32**	.54**	.58**	.36**	-.23**	-.08	.13**	-.32**	-.46**	-.25**	-.56**	.01
7 4. Neuroticism				-	-.27**	-.42**	-.35**	-.36**	.13**	.02	-.07	.31**	.38**	.23**	.54**	-.28**
8 5. Openness					-	.37**	.24**	.23**	.09	.14**	.25**	-.08	-.25	-.14	-.30**	.08
9 6. Mental Imagery						-	.62**	.55**	-.02	.17**	.42**	-.28**	-.41**	-.10*	-.54**	.04
10 7. Effort Expenditure							-	.46**	-.17**	-.01	.26**	-.36**	-.45**	-.09	-.56**	-.00
11 8. Thought Control								-	.14**	.31**	.38**	-.15**	-.21**	-.17**	-.42**	.12*
12 9. Seeking Support									-	.43**	.33**	.05	.27**	.08	.24**	.06
13 10. Relaxation										-	.38**	.12*	.14**	.03	.18**	-.01
14 11. Logical Analysis											-	-.14**	-.04	.15**	-.05	-.05
15 12. Distancing												-	.40**	.09	.46**	-.10*
16 13. Mental Distraction													-	.22**	.64**	-.14**
17 14. Venting														-	.37**	-.18**
18 15. Resignation															-	-.21**
19 16. Coping Effectiveness																-

1 * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
2 *Note.* Correlations were considered small (.10), medium (.30), or large (.50) based on the criteria suggested
3 by Cohen (1992).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1 Table 3. Unstandardised and Standardised regression coefficients with collinearity diagnostics.

	Task-Coping		Distraction-Coping		Disengagement-Coping		Coping Effectiveness		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Beta	B	Beta	B	Beta	B	Beta	VIF	Tolerance
	Step 1									
Gender	-.36	-.01	.63	.06	.23	.02	.06	.01	1.00	1.00
Age	.05	.03	-.08	-.11*	-.12	-.12*	-.02	-.04	1.00	1.00
Step 2										
Extraversion (E)	3.10	.17**	-.88	-.12*	1.19	.13**	-.09	-.02	1.21	.83
Neuroticism (N)	-.34	-.02	.88	.12*	2.47	.27***	-1.64	-.37***	1.53	.66
Conscientiousness (C)	1.84	.11	-1.34	-.20***	-2.04	-.24***	-.56	-.13	1.93	.52
Agreeableness (A)	3.65	.21***	-2.39	-.35***	-2.17	-.25***	-.16	-.04	1.83	.55
Openness (O)	4.44	.20***	.12	.01	-.78	-.07	.23	.04	1.20	.88
Step 3										
E x N	-4.99	-.19***	-.52	-.05	-1.26	-.10*	.05	.01	1.35	.74
E x O	.87	.03	.60	.06	-.35	-.03	.16	.03	1.27	.79
E x A	-2.49	-.10	.58	.06	-.06	-.00	-.36	-.06	1.72	.58
E x C	-1.48	-.06	-.84	-.08	-.26	-.02	.19	.03	1.49	.67
N x O	4.46	.15**	.21	.02	-.84	-.06	-.17	-.02	1.68	.60
N x A	-1.41	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.39	-.03	-.22	-.04	1.84	.55
N x C	2.09	.09	.88	.09	-.13	-.01	-.18	-.03	2.01	.50
O x A	3.12	.11	-.13	-.01	.65	.05	-.17	-.02	1.88	.53
O x C	-.48	-.02	-.64	-.06	-1.10	-.08	-.41	-.06	1.74	.58
A x C	.13	.01	1.62	.20***	.34	.03	.32	.06	1.89	.53

2 * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

3

4

Figure Captions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3 Figure 1: Result of the Big-5 interaction between neuroticism an openness upon task-oriented coping.

5 Figure 2: Result of the Big-5 interaction between extraversion and neuroticism upon task-oriented coping.

7 Figure 3: Result of the Big-5 interaction between agreeableness and conscientiousness upon distraction
8 coping.

For Peer Review Only




Figure 1.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2.




Figure 3.

1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Independent and Interactive Effects of the Big Five Personality Dimensions upon Dispositional Coping and Coping Effectiveness in Sport.

For Peer Review Only

Abstract

We examined the independent and interactive effects of the Big-Five personality traits on dispositional coping and coping effectiveness among athletes. Participants were 400 athletes (mean age 22.97, $s = 7.00$) from the United Kingdom. The athletes completed measures of personality, dispositional coping, and coping effectiveness. The Big-Five personality traits independently predicted the use of higher-order coping dimensions. Extraversion, agreeableness, and openness positively predicted task-oriented coping. Neuroticism positively predicted distraction-oriented coping, whereas agreeableness, extraversion and conscientiousness were negative predictors. Both extraversion and neuroticism positively predicted disengagement-oriented coping, whereas agreeableness and conscientiousness were negative predictors. Only neuroticism predicted coping effectiveness, which emerged as a negative predictor. Findings also showed a two-way interaction effect for predicting task-oriented coping between neuroticism and openness, and between extraversion and neuroticism. A further two-way interaction effect for predicting distraction-oriented coping was found between agreeableness and conscientiousness. These findings reinforce the need to investigate not only independent, but also interactive effects of personality dimensions upon sport-related dispositional coping.

Keywords: Personality, Big-Five, Dispositional Coping, Coping Effectiveness, Sport.

1
2 1 The Independent and Interactive Effects of the Big Five Personality Dimensions upon Dispositional
3
4 2 Coping and Coping Effectiveness in Sport

5
6 3 Coping is of interest to sport psychologists and sport psychology research, because it is
7
8 4 associated with both athletic performance (Nicholls, Taylor, Carroll, & Perry, 2016b) and
9
10 5 psychological well-being (Nicholls, Levy, Carson, Thompson, & Perry, 2016a). Indeed, many
11
12 6 interventions in sport psychology are designed to maximize performance (see Brown & Fletcher,
13
14 7 2016 for a review of psychological and psychosocial interventions designed to enhance
15
16 8 performance). As such, increasing our understanding of coping and factors that may influence
17
18 9 coping (e.g., personality, gender, or age) has the potential to enhance both athletic performance and
19
20 10 psychological well-being through the development of more sophisticated coping interventions.

21
22 11 Lazarus and Folkman (1984) defined coping as conscious cognitive and behavioural efforts to
23
24 12 manage internal or external demands. Coping can be assessed as a changing process in which the
25
26 13 scholar examines how coping changes from one situation to another, or even within the same
27
28 14 situation. It can also be assessed dispositionally, by examining how individuals normally cope with
29
30 15 stressful situations (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Assessing coping as process allows scholars to
31
32 16 accurately assess how an individual copes within a specific situation, but it does not allow
33
34 17 researchers to accurately predict how an athlete would normally cope over an extended period of
35
36 18 time (Fleeson, 2004). In order to do this, scholars could assess coping at the dispositional level
37
38 19 (Fleeson, 2004; Nicholls, Perry, Jones, Morley, & Carson, 2013). Regardless of whether coping is
39
40 20 assessed as a process or a trait, Gaudreau and Blondin (2004) proposed a three-factor classification
41
42 21 of coping, which is widely used in the sport psychology literature (Nicholls et al., 2016b). These are
43
44 22 *task-oriented coping* (i.e., strategies utilized to master stressful situations and include strategies
45
46 23 such as as thought control and imagery), *distraction-oriented coping* (i.e., strategies that redirect the
47
48 24 attention of an athlete to non-sport-related aspects, including distancing from the situation and
49
50 25 mental distraction), and *disengagement-oriented coping* (i.e., strategies that involve athletes ceasing
51
52 26 in their attempts to achieve personal goals).

PERSONALITY AND COPING

4

1 A factor that is associated with process coping among athletes is personality (Allen, Frings, &
2 Hunter, 2012; Allen, Greenlees, & Jones, 2011; Kaiseler, Polman, & Nicholls, 2012). Allport
3 (1961) defined personality as “a dynamic organisation, inside the person, of psychophysical systems
4 that create the person’s characteristic patterns of behaviour, thoughts and feelings” (p. 28). Allport’s
5 conceptualization of personality has received the greatest research attention and support over the
6 years (Larsen & Buss, 2008). Indeed, this theory implies that personality consists of a pattern of
7 relatively stable traits. The pattern and distribution of these traits differs from one individual to the
8 next (Carver & Scheier, 2008). Trait theorists tend to agree that there are five basic traits, or in other
9 words a five-factor model (McCrae & Costa, 2003). The Big-Five factor model (McCrae & Costa)
10 is a widely accepted broad-based taxonomy of personality traits, which arguably represents the
11 minimum number of traits needed to describe personality (Costa & McCrae, 1985; David & Suls,
12 1999). The Big-Five factor model of personality is useful for understanding coping in non-sport
13 contexts (Lee-Baggley, Preece, & DeLongis, 2005). This model suggests that the five personality
14 dimensions (e.g., neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and
15 conscientiousness) all include a number of specific traits. As an example, *neuroticism* is associated
16 with the experience of negative emotions such as depression, anxiety, or anger. It is associated with
17 impulsive and less emotionally stable feelings, thoughts, and behaviors (McCrae, 1992; McCrae &
18 Costa, 1987). *Extraversion* is linked to positive emotions, sociability, warm, cheerful, energetic, and
19 assertive behaviors (McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1987). *Agreeableness* comprises a more
20 trusting, helpful and unselfish way of thinking, feeling and behaving (McCrae, 1992; McCrae &
21 Costa, 1987). *Openness* implies being creative, imaginative, psychologically minded, curious, and
22 flexible in their way of thinking, feeling and behaving (Costa & McCrae, 1992). *Conscientiousness*
23 implies a more organised, reliable, punctual, hardworking, determined, and self-disciplined
24 approach (McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1987).

25 Although a rapid growth in personality research has been seen over the past 30 years in non-
26 sport psychology (John & Srivastava, 1999), sport psychology scholars are yet to give this

1 relationship sufficient attention (Allen, Greenless, & Jones, 2013). Particularly, when investigating
2 the influence of the Big-Five factor in coping in sport. To our knowledge, scholars are yet to
3 explore the relationship between dispositional coping and the Big-Five among competitive athletes.
4 Even though coping with specific stressors is highly influenced by situational factors, such as nature
5 and intensity of stressors, personality factors should better predict dispositional coping, or in other
6 words typical responses to a broad variety of stressors (Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007).
7 Furthermore, an athlete's personality is likely to influence the type of events an individual chooses
8 to engage with, which may consequently influence their dispositional coping (Bouchard,
9 Guillemette, & Landry-Leger, 2004; Penley & Tomaka, 2002). In a meta-analysis investigating the
10 relationship between personality and coping, Connor-Smith and Flachsbart (2007) concluded that
11 coping focus analyses (comparing personality to coping correlations for dispositional versus
12 situational coping), resulted in personality being a stronger predictor of dispositional than
13 situational coping. Additionally, the authors found that coping focus was a significant moderator for
14 13 regressions between the Big-Five and coping strategies.

15 Following evidence from [non-sport contexts](#) that the Big-Five factor model influenced the
16 stress and coping process (DeLongis & Holtzman, 2005), Kaiseler et al. (2012) explored whether
17 the Big-Five factors influenced appraisal, coping, and perceived coping effectiveness among a
18 sample of 482 [athletes](#). These authors found that high levels of neuroticism were associated with a
19 greater deployment of emotion-focused (*i.e., strategies that reduce negative emotional responses*)
20 and avoidant coping strategies (*i.e., strategies that avoid dealing with the stressor*), but less
21 problem-focused (*i.e., strategies that remove the stressor*) coping and lower coping effectiveness.
22 Whereas the other four personality dimensions were associated with coping strategies perceived to
23 be effective by athletes. Particularly, high extroversion, [conscientiousness](#) and openness were
24 associated with more use of problem-focused coping strategies and these strategies were perceived
25 as more effective, whereas high levels of agreeableness preferred using a combination of problem
26 and emotion-focused strategies and rated these strategies as effective. [Although this study shows](#)

PERSONALITY AND COPING

6

1 evidence of the influence of the Big-Five factor model on stress and coping process in sport, the
2 Big-Five factors were analysed independently. As suggested by Carver and Conner-Smith (2010),
3 research in this area should consider how personality traits interact in determining outcomes.
4 Furthermore, the authors used the Modified Coping Inventory (MCOPE; Crocker & Graham, 1995)
5 that provides an episode specific measure of coping in sport instead of a more general measure of
6 coping, which may affect generalizations of the findings to other situations. In agreement with this,
7 Nicholls et al. (2013) suggested that the assessment of coping during a specific episode of sport
8 might not be reflective of how athletes would normally cope, and may result in an untruth view of
9 coping. This is consistent with Lazarus and Folkman (1984) who acknowledged the importance of
10 not only assessing coping from a situational perspective but also dispositional. Accordingly, recent
11 developments have sought to establish a dispositional measure of coping that is context specific to
12 sport (Hurst, Thompson, Vissek, Fisher, & Gaudreau, 2011). One such advance has been the
13 development of the Dispositional Coping Inventory for Competitive Sports (DCICS; Hurst et al.,
14 2011). The DCICS uses the three-factor sport coping classification (i.e., task-oriented, distraction-
15 oriented and disengagement-oriented coping) (Gaudreau & Blondin, 2004) to represent the general
16 use of coping among athletes.

17 In addition to Kaiseler et al's findings, Allen et al. (2011) explored interactive effects, of the
18 Big-Five factors on reported coping styles among 253 athletes. The authors found that extraverted
19 athletes, who were more emotionally stable and open to new relationships used more problem-
20 focused coping. Conscientious athletes, and athletes displaying higher levels of extraversion,
21 openness, and agreeableness used more emotion-focused coping. Additionally, in this study the
22 authors found that different personality traits were associated with higher or lower level athletes,
23 between male and female and between team and individual sports. Furthermore, a study by Allen et
24 al. (2012) investigated challenge and threat cardiovascular responses, personality, and coping. The
25 authors reported that conscientious athletes used more problem-focused coping and athletes high on
26 neuroticism and/or low on agreeableness and/or openness used more avoidance coping.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Although coping strategies are not universally effective or ineffective, task-oriented coping
2 typically seems to predict better physical and mental outcomes and distraction-oriented and
3 disengagement-oriented coping typically predicts poorer outcomes (Compas, Connor-Smith,
4 Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001) and sporting performance (Nicholls et al., 2016b).
5 Coping effectiveness indicates the successfulness of a coping strategy in managing the demands of
6 a situation (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As suggested by Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) and
7 DeLongis and Holtzman (2005), personality traits may influence coping effectiveness, by certain
8 strategies being more useful for some individuals and less useful or even harmful for those with
9 different personality traits. Coping effectiveness in sport has shown to be associated with the Big-
10 Five factor model (Kaiseler et al., 2012). Particularly, when rating the effectiveness of a particular
11 coping strategy in a specific stress situation, athletes showing higher levels of neuroticism perceived
12 their strategies as being less effective, whereas the other four dimensions of the Big-Five rated their
13 coping strategies as more effective. However to date, more research is required to verify the
14 relationship between perceptions of coping effectiveness and the Big-Five personality taxonomy.

15 The aim of this study, therefore, was to explore **not only the independent but also the**
16 **interaction effects** of the Big-Five factor model on a sport specific dispositional coping taxonomy
17 and coping effectiveness. Specifically we hypothesised that athletes high in neuroticism will be less
18 likely to cope effectively and use distraction and disengagement coping more frequently compared
19 to task-oriented coping. In addition, we expected athletes high in extraversion, conscientiousness,
20 **openness** and agreeableness to cope effectively and use task-oriented coping more frequently
21 compared to distraction and disengagement coping. In view of the general lack of literature
22 exploring Big-Five interaction effects it is not possible to offer any firm hypotheses.

Method

Participants

25 Participants were 400 UK student-athletes from two different UK institutions (male $n = 237$;
26 female $n = 163$) aged between 18 to 48 years (mean age 22.97 years, $s = 7.01$), who were

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 completing a sport and exercise related undergraduate degree. Experience in their sport ranged from
2 1 to 33 years (mean 8.06, $s = .41$). The sample consisted of sports performers from team ($n = 315$)
3 and individual ($n = 85$) sports, competing at beginners ($n = 24$), national ($n = 30$), county ($n = 119$),
4 and club/university ($n = 215$) levels. All participants were actively involved in competitive sport
5 and had participated competitively within the last 14 days.

6 Instruments

7 *The Big Five.* The 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991)
8 measures The Big Five dimensions Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness, and
9 Extraversion. Example items include “I see myself as someone that has an assertive personality” for
10 extraversion, whereas “I see myself has someone that worries a lot” is an example of a neuroticism
11 item. A five-point rating scale was used ranging from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly.
12 Participants were advised that the questionnaire included a number of characteristics that may or
13 may not apply to them and where asked to select the extent to which they agree or disagree with
14 each statement. The BFI has been shown to have good psychometric properties with good
15 reliability, retest reliability, factor structure and convergent and discriminant validity (John &
16 Srivastava, 1999). The reliability for the five factors in the present study was satisfactory; .67
17 (Openness), .82 (Agreeableness), .75 (Neuroticism), .84 (Conscientiousness), and .78 (Extraversion).

18 *Coping Dispositional Scale.* Coping was assessed using the Dispositional Coping Inventory
19 for Competitive Sport (DCICS; Hurst et al., 2011). This instrument assesses three higher-order
20 dispositional dimensions (e.g., distraction-oriented coping, disengagement-oriented coping, and
21 task-oriented coping) based on 10 different dispositional coping strategies. These represent what
22 athletes normally use to cope with stress in sport. An example of task-oriented question was “I
23 mentally rehearse the execution of my movements” whereas “I entertain myself in order not to think
24 about the competition” is an example of a distraction-oriented question. “I let myself feel hopeless
25 and discouraged” is an example of a disengagement-oriented coping strategy. Athletes were asked
26 to rate how they normally cope to competition on a 5-point Likert type scale, with 1 representing

1
2 1 Does not correspond to what I do or think to 5 representing Corresponds very strongly to what I do
3
4 2 or think. Participants were instructed to circle the answers that best characterized what they
5
6 3 generally do during competition in their sport. Hurst et al. did not report Cronbach alpha
7
8 4 coefficients for three higher-order dimensions of the DCICS. Alternatively, the authors reported
9
10 5 Cronbach alpha coefficients for the 10 dispositional strategies ranging from .60 to .80 from a
11
12 6 sample of 596 athletes aged between 18 and 23 years of age. The reliability for the three factors in
13
14 7 the current study was .85 for task-oriented coping, .78 distraction-oriented coping and .82
15
16 8 disengagement-oriented coping.

17
18 9 *Coping Effectiveness.* Coping effectiveness was assessed using the coping effectiveness scale
19
20 10 (Gottlieb & Rooney, 2004). This instrument assessed how effectively the athletes were coping with
21
22 11 the stressor that was causing them the most worry in sport. Items in this questionnaire include “The
23
24 12 ways I try to cope with this problem are not working too well these days,” “I am dealing with this
25
26 13 stressor better than I used to” and “I can find more or different ways to cope with this stressor.” The
27
28 14 coping effectiveness scale is a 7-item scale, in which participants were asked to report the
29
30 15 effectiveness of their coping with stress on a 4-point Likert-type scale, anchored at 1 representing
31
32 16 *Strongly disagree* to 4 representing *Strongly agree*. Participants responded to questions in relation
33
34 17 to a stressor/ demand (e.g., performance concerns, worries of injury, team selection, home-life
35
36 18 worries, etc) that caused them the most worry in their sport recently. The coping effectiveness scale
37
38 19 has been shown to have an acceptable internal reliability of .69 from a sample of 141 family
39
40 20 caregivers (Gottlieb & Rooney, 2004) and was .60 in the current study.

41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **Procedure**

48
49 22 The study was approved by a University’s Research Ethics Committee and participants
50
51 23 provided informed consent prior to participating and were informed that all answers provided would
52
53 24 remain anonymous. The study was advertised at the end of seminar sessions and interested students
54
55 25 volunteering to participate, completed the questionnaires in class, ensuring a quiet environment.
56
57
58 26 Trained researchers administered the questionnaires in the order described above to all participants.
59
60

PERSONALITY AND COPING

10

1 Instructions about how to complete the questionnaire were provided orally and in written format
2 and participants were encouraged to ask questions to the trained researchers.

3 Questionnaires were completed in the presence of the researchers and approximately time for
4 completion was 15 minutes.

Data Analysis

6 After screening for outliers and normality, Cronbach's alphas and descriptive statistics for all
7 study variables were obtained. Multicollinearity was checked by calculating tolerance (1/VIF).

8 Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted for each coping subscale. At step one
9 demographic variables (gender and age) were entered, at step two the independent Big-Five
10 personality traits were added and at step three, two-way interaction Big-Five effects were included.

11 All of the Big-Five predictor variables were mean centered (see Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken,
12 2003). Finally, to statistically adjust for the ten two-way interaction terms, we used the False
13 Discovery Rate (FDR; Benjamini & Hotchberg, 1995).

Results

15 Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics of variables. There were no missing data, outliers,
16 or issues with skewness <2, kurtosis <2, or multivariate normality <10. The FDR for the interaction
17 terms was $p = .01$.

18 Table 2 shows the correlations between all variables. All Big-5 traits showed small-to-
19 moderate positive correlations with one another, except neuroticism which showed moderate
20 negative correlations with all other Big-5 traits. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and
21 openness showed moderate -to-large positive correlations with the majority of task coping
22 subscales. Extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness showed moderate negative
23 correlations with distraction coping subscales, whereas neuroticism showed moderate positive
24 correlations. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness showed moderate -to-
25 large negative correlations with the majority of disengagement coping subscales, whereas

1
2 1 neuroticism showed moderate positive correlations. Finally, neuroticism showed a small negative
3
4 2 correlation with coping effectiveness.
5

6
7 3 Hierarchical regression revealed that both age and gender did not significantly predict task-
8
9 4 oriented coping when entered in Step 1 ($R^2 = .001$, $F_{2,397} = .17$, $p = .84$). In Step 2, the addition of
10
11 5 the Big-Five independent personality traits produced a significant overall model accounting for
12
13 6 24.3% of the variance for predicting task-coping ($R^2 = .24$, $F_{7,392} = 17.95$, $p < .001$). The additional
14
15 7 Big-Five traits added in step 2 explained a significant increase of 24.2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .24$,
16
17 8 $\Delta F_{5,392} = 25.04$, $p < .001$). However, as evident from table 3, only extraversion ($\beta = .17$, $p < .01$),
18
19 9 agreeableness ($\beta = .21$, $p < .001$) and openness ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$) were statistically significant
20
21 10 predictors of task-oriented coping. In Step 3, the addition of the Big-Five personality trait
22
23 11 interactions produced a significant overall model accounting for 28.7% of the variance for
24
25 12 predicting task-oriented coping ($R^2 = .29$, $F_{7,392} = 17.95$, $p < .001$). After controlling for the Big-
26
27 13 Five independent personality traits, the Big-Five interactions, added in Step 3, significantly
28
29 14 explained an additional 4.4% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{10,382} = 2.35$, $p < .05$). In Step 3, the
30
31 15 independent Big-Five effects of extraversion ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$), agreeableness ($\beta = .21$, $p < .001$)
32
33 16 and openness ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$) remained significant. In addition, as evident from Table 3, the
34
35 17 interactive effect of extraversion and neuroticism ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .001$) alongside neuroticism and
36
37 18 openness ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$) became significant predictors of task-oriented coping. To examine the
38
39 19 interaction effects, we conducted a simple slopes analysis following Aiken and West (1991) and
40
41 20 plotted the interaction and examined the significance of the slopes. First, we examined the slopes of
42
43 21 neuroticism (see Figure 1). Results showed that the slope of neuroticism was only significant at low
44
45 22 levels of openness ($t = -2.59$, $p = .01$), but not at high levels of openness ($t = 1.94$, $p = .05$). Next,
46
47 23 we examined the slopes of openness. Results showed that the slope of openness was significant at
48
49 24 high levels of neuroticism ($t = 4.78$, $p < .001$), but not low levels of neuroticism ($t = 0.189$, $p = .85$).
50
51

52
53
54
55 25 Then, we examined the slopes of extraversion (see Figure 2). Results showed that the slope of
56
57 26 extraversion was only significant at low levels of neuroticism ($t = 5.22$, $p < .001$), but not at high
58
59
60

1 levels of neuroticism ($t = -1.09, p = .28$). Next, we examined the slopes of neuroticism. Results
2 showed that the slope of neuroticism was significant at high levels of extraversion ($t = -.33, p <$
3 $.001$) and at low levels of extraversion ($t = 2.72, p < .01$).

4 For distraction-oriented coping, hierarchical regression indicated that both age and gender
5 were not significant predictors in Step 1 ($R^2 = .02, F_{2,397} = 3.03, p = .05$). In Step 2, the addition of
6 the independent Big-Five personality traits produced a significant model, accounting for 36.3% of
7 the variance for predicting distraction-oriented coping ($R^2 = .36, F_{7,392} = 31.97, p < .001$). The
8 additional independent Big-Five traits explained a significant increase of 34.8% variance in Step 2
9 ($\Delta R^2 = .35, \Delta F_{5,392} = 42.91, p < .001$). Extraversion ($\beta = -.12, p < .01$), agreeableness ($\beta = -.33, p <$
10 $.001$), conscientiousness ($\beta = -.20, p < .001$) and neuroticism ($\beta = .12, p < .05$) were significant
11 predictors of distraction-oriented coping (see Table 3). The Big-Five personality trait interactions
12 added in Step 3 did display a significant overall model accounting for 40.6% of the variance for
13 predicting distraction-oriented coping ($R^2 = .41, F_{17,382} = 15.38, p < .001$). The remaining
14 significant Big-Five independent personality traits, in step 3, were agreeableness ($\beta = -.33, p <$
15 $.001$), conscientiousness ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$) and neuroticism ($\beta = .11, p < .05$). After controlling for
16 these significant independent effects, a Big-Five trait interaction significantly explained an
17 additional, 4.3% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .04, \Delta F_{10,382} = 2.76, p = < .01$). As evident from Table 3,
18 agreeableness and conscientiousness ($\beta = .20, p < .001$) was the only interactive effect found.
19 Again, we examined the interaction effect using simple slopes. First, we examined the slopes of
20 agreeableness (see Figure 3). Results showed that the slope of agreeableness was only significant at
21 low levels of conscientiousness ($t = -6.86, p < .001$), but not at high levels of conscientiousness ($t =$
22 $-1.09, p = .28$). Next, we examined the slopes of conscientiousness. Results showed that the slope of
23 conscientiousness was significant at low levels of agreeableness ($t = -6.361, p < .001$), but not high
24 levels of agreeableness ($t = -1.16, p = .25$).

25 Hierarchical regression revealed that variables entered in Step 1, were not significant
26 predictors of disengagement-oriented coping ($R^2 = .02, F_{2,397} = 2.93, p = .06$). However, age did

1 demonstrate a significant independent predictor ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$). The addition of the Big-Five
2 independent personality traits, in Step 2, revealed a significant overall model ($R^2 = .38, F_{7,392} =$
3 $34.70, p < .001$), which accounted for 38.3% of the variance for predicting disengagement-oriented
4 coping. The additional variables in Step 2 explained a significant increase of 36.8% in explained
5 variance ($\Delta R^2 = .37, \Delta F_{5,392} = 46.74, p < .001$). The Big-Five traits, extraversion ($\beta = .13, p < .01$),
6 neuroticism ($\beta = .27, p < .001$), agreeableness ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = -.24, p$
7 $< .001$) were independent predictors (see Table 3). Furthermore, age ($\beta = -.003, p = .94$) was no
8 longer significant in Step 2, suggesting the aforementioned Big-Five traits were significant
9 predictors of disengagement-oriented coping after controlling for the influence of age. In Step 3, the
10 addition of the Big-Five personality trait interactions revealed a significant overall model
11 accounting for 40.3% of the variance for predicting disengagement-oriented coping ($R^2 = .40,$
12 $F_{17,382} = 15.16, p < .001$). The additional trait interactions added in Step 3, explained a non-
13 significant increase of 2.0% explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02, F_{10,382} = 1.29, p = .23$). Moreover, the
14 interaction of extraversion and neuroticism ($\beta = .13, p > .01$) was just short of the FDR adjusted
15 significance level. In addition to the interaction effect, in Step 3, the independent effects of
16 extraversion ($\beta = .13, p < .01$), neuroticism ($\beta = .29, p < .001$), agreeableness ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$)
17 and conscientiousness ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$) remained significant.

18 For coping effectiveness, hierarchical regression indicated both age and gender were not
19 significant predictors in Step 1 ($R^2 = .002, F_{2,397} = .34, p = .71$). In Step 2, the addition of the Big-
20 Five independent traits produced a significant model, accounting for 10.2% of the variance for
21 predicting coping effectiveness ($R^2 = .10, F_{7,392} = 6.37, p < .001$). The additional independent Big-
22 Five traits included in Step 2 explained a significant increase of 8.6% of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .09,$
23 $\Delta F_{5,392} = 8.76, p < .001$). Specifically, neuroticism ($\beta = -.37, p < .001$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = -$
24 $.13, p < .05$) predicted coping effectiveness. In Step 3, the Big-Five personality traits interactions
25 indicated a significant overall model accounting for 11.3% of variance for predicting coping
26 effectiveness ($R^2 = .11, F_{17,382} = 2.87, p < .001$). However, the Big-Five interactions only explained

1 a non-significant additional increase of 1.1% variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F_{10,382} = .49$, $p = .90$). Although
2 no significant interaction effects were found in Step 3, the independent effects of neuroticism ($\beta = -$
3 $.35$, $p < .001$) remained significant, however, conscientiousness became non-significant ($\beta = -.14$, p
4 $= .05$).

5 Discussion

6 The purpose of this study was to examine the independent and interactive effects of the Big-
7 Five personality traits on higher order dispositional coping dimensions and coping effectiveness.

8 Extraversion, agreeableness and openness predicted task-oriented coping, while neuroticism,
9 extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness predicted distraction-oriented coping. Predictors
10 of disengagement-oriented coping were agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and
11 neuroticism. The only predictor of coping effectiveness was neuroticism. In terms of interactive
12 effects, the only three that emerged were in predicting task-oriented coping. Specifically, both
13 neuroticism and openness, and extraversion and neuroticism predicted task-oriented coping.
14 Agreeableness and conscientiousness predicted distraction-oriented coping.

15 Findings suggest that extraversion positively predicted the use of task-oriented coping.
16 These findings support those by Allen et al. (2011) and Kaiseler et al. (2012) reinforcing the
17 conclusion that athletes high in extraversion have a tendency towards using task-oriented coping. In
18 addition to previous findings, our results suggest that agreeableness and openness were also positive
19 predictors of task-oriented coping. Previous non-sport research reported that individuals who tend
20 to be creative, imaginative, and curious (High O) are more likely to use more intellectual (Connor-
21 Smith & Flachsbart, 2007) coping styles, such as task-oriented coping. In addition, trustful,
22 compliant, and determined athletes (High A) are also likely to use task-oriented coping strategies,
23 particularly in the form of perceived and received social support (Bowling, Beehr, & Swader, 2005;
24 Tong, Bishop, Diong, Enkelman, Why, Ang et al., 2004).

25 Neuroticism has been associated with a Big-Five predictor of avoidance coping (Allen et al.,
26 2011). Extending Allen and colleagues finding, we found that distraction-oriented coping was

1 positively predicted by neuroticism and negatively predicted by extraversion, agreeableness and
2 conscientiousness. Accordingly, athletes who displayed tendencies to be independently neurotic
3 were more likely to use distraction-oriented coping, while athletes who were independently
4 extraverted, agreeable and conscientious were less likely to use distraction-oriented coping.
5 Distraction has been found to be least desirable in the context of athletic performance (Hill & Shaw,
6 2013). As such, based on our current findings, athletes who have tendencies to be neurotic may be
7 vulnerable to dysfunctional performance as a result of using distraction-oriented coping.

8 Disengagement-oriented coping negatively predicted agreeableness and conscientiousness.
9 Athletes high on agreeableness may be less likely to engage in disengagement-oriented coping as
10 these may be perceived of little use for improving their relationships with others. Accordingly,
11 Connor-Smith and Flachsbart (2007) suggested that individuals high on agreeableness tend to use
12 less withdrawal ways of coping. Additionally, athletes who are organised, reliable and hardworking
13 (High in C) are more likely to be involved in more task-oriented ways of coping (i.e., cognitive
14 restructuring, problem solving) requiring the ability to plan and problem solve as opposed to
15 disengagement ways of coping (Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007). Additionally, disengagement-
16 oriented coping was also predicted by high levels of extraversion and neuroticism. These findings
17 suggest that athletes who are less emotionable stable (High N) tend to engage more in
18 disengagement-oriented coping, supporting previous studies in sport (e.g., Allen et al., 2011;
19 Kaiseler et al., 2012). In addition, athletes who tend to be more emotional positive, and sociable
20 (High E) tend to use more disengagement-oriented coping. This particular finding contradicts
21 previous research in *non-athletic populations*, which suggested that extroversion predicts more
22 engagement ways of coping (Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007). Considering that disengagement-
23 oriented coping encompasses the venting of unpleasant emotions, it is possible, according to current
24 findings, that athletes high on extraversion when performing under highly competitive sport
25 environments may be prone, socially, to vent their emotions. Further research is warranted to
26 confirm this assumption.

PERSONALITY AND COPING

16

1 Scant research to date has explored the relationship between the Big-Five and coping
2 effectiveness. The current study found neuroticism was the only Big-Five personality trait that
3 predicted coping effectiveness. Specifically, those athletes prone to experiencing negative emotions,
4 impulsivity, and self-**conscientiousness** (High N) were less likely to cope effectively. This finding
5 supports Kaiseler et al. (2012) who found neuroticism was associated with lower levels of state
6 reported coping effectiveness. **Hence, there seems to be a clear need to design coping effectiveness**
7 **interventions for athletes who are less emotionally stable (High N). Acknowledging that**
8 **mindfulness was positively associated with coping effectiveness among athletes (see Kaiseler,**
9 **Poolton, Backhouse, & Stanger, 2017), it is recommended that future research investigates the**
10 **usefulness of mindfulness to improve coping effectiveness particularly among neurotic athletes.**

11 To date, research investigating the Big-Five personality trait interactions and their effects
12 upon dispositional coping is scarce. The current study found three significant two-way interactions
13 unique to the sport psychology literature. First, we found a two-way interaction effect for
14 neuroticism and openness predicted task-oriented coping. Specifically, neurotic athletes (High N)
15 were less likely to adopt task-oriented coping if they were also not open to new experiences (Low
16 O). As suggested by McCrae and Costa (1987) individuals higher on N have a tendency to
17 experience negative emotions, therefore are more likely to align their coping resources towards
18 managing negative emotions instead of engaging in task-oriented coping. Our findings support
19 McCrae and Costa's assertion, but also suggest this may only be the case in sport when openness is
20 relatively low. Conversely, our findings uniquely indicated that athletes who were open to new
21 experiences (High O) in conjunction with being emotionally unstable (High N) were more likely to
22 use task-oriented coping. **It is possible that high levels of openness may protect athletes who have**
23 **tendencies to be emotionally unstable. For example, high openness individuals can experience a**
24 **diversity of emotions (McCrae, 1992) and are more likely to engage in positive re-appraisal**
25 **(O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996) that may negate neurotic tendencies. Current findings suggest neurotic**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 athletes (High N) who are more creative, flexible and imaginative (High O), compared to their
2 neurotic low openness counterparts, are able to adopt task-oriented coping.

3 Second, a two-way interaction for extraversion and neuroticism predicted task-oriented
4 coping. That is, extraverted athletes (High N) were more likely to use task-oriented coping if they
5 were emotionally stable (Low N). Previous literature in *non-sport contexts* (Carver & Connor-
6 Smith, 2010; Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007) have asserted the independent effects of being
7 sociable and emotionally stable upon the use of engagement and problem-focused coping. Upon
8 extending these findings to *the sport context*, the current study suggests athletes who are both
9 sociable and prone to experience less negative emotions are likely to adopt task-oriented coping.
10 Furthermore, our findings uniquely suggest emotionally stable athletes (Low N) were less likely to
11 use task-oriented coping when socially inhibited (Low E). Despite previous *non-sport research*
12 (Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007) associating emotional stability (Low N) with engagement (or
13 task-oriented) coping, our findings suggest this may not be the case for athletes when extraversion
14 is relatively low. This is consistent with Vollrath and Torgersen (2000) who found the effects of
15 extraversion on coping was dependent on alternative combinations of neuroticism.

16 Finally, a two-way interaction for agreeableness and conscientiousness predicted distraction-
17 oriented coping. Notably, hostile and disagreeable athletes (Low A) were more likely to use
18 distraction-oriented coping if they were less goal driven and undisciplined (Low C). To date, we are
19 not aware of any research that has identified agreeableness as a combinable trait to significantly
20 predict coping. Previous conscientiousness-related findings, however, have revealed high
21 neuroticism and low conscientiousness predict dysfunctional coping *in non-sport contexts* (Conner-
22 Smith & Flachsbart, 2007; Vollrath & Torgersen, 2000). The current study extends previous
23 findings suggesting athletes with Low A and Low C demonstrate greatest use of distraction-oriented
24 coping. Furthermore, our findings uniquely indicate that athletes who were hard working, organised
25 and self-disciplined (High C) in combination with being confrontational, hostile and non-empathetic
26 (Low A) were less likely to use distraction-oriented coping. Conscientious individuals have been

PERSONALITY AND COPING

18

1 found to use positive re-appraisal, actively plan and problem solve (Lee-Baggly et al., 2005), which
2 may not interfere with disagreeable tendencies. For example, it would seem reasonable that athletes
3 can be conscientious (High C) about playing their sport and be ruthless and tough-minded (Low A)
4 at the same time. Current findings, therefore, suggest conscientious athletes (High C) who are
5 ruthless and tough-minded (Low A), compared to their less conscientious counterparts, are less
6 likely to adopt distraction-oriented coping.

7 This study is the first to explore the relationship between the Big-Five, dispositional coping,
8 and coping effectiveness in sport. The findings of this study, however, should be considered in light
9 of some limitations associated with cross-sectional and self-report design, restricting causal
10 inferences. Given the exploratory nature of our study, however, it is hoped that the findings will be
11 able to inform future experimental research. A further limitation concerns the moderate alpha
12 coefficient associated with the measurement of coping effectiveness. In view that the current study
13 adopted a measure of coping effectiveness items developed from a non-sport context, future
14 research may wish to consider the development of a coping effectiveness measure that contains
15 items specific to sport. Furthermore, alphas for openness and distancing were marginal. However,
16 in personality research it is not uncommon for trait measures to be below the .70 cut-off (McCrae,
17 2015). Furthermore, Cronbach and Shavelson (2004) urged caution against the arbitrary
18 oversimplification of the .70 alpha cut-off value. Finally, questionnaires were completed in a fixed
19 order due to concerns related with participants switching back and forth between personality and
20 sport-specific measures what could potentially confuse them, impairing the validity of assessment.
21 However, we do recognize that not counterbalancing questionnaires may cause possible order
22 effects.

23 In conclusion, the current study offers two unique findings to our understanding of the
24 relationship between the Big-Five and coping. First, the effects of neuroticism upon task-oriented
25 coping was dependant on its combination with openness and extraversion. Unlike previous research
26 to date, our study suggests neurotic athletes (High N) open to new experiences (High O) were more

1 likely to use task-coping, whereas less neurotic athletes (Low N) who were social inhibited (Low E)
2 were less likely to use task-coping. Second, we found the interaction between agreeableness and
3 conscientiousness predicted varying distraction-oriented coping. That is, disagreeable (Low A) and
4 undisciplined (Low C) athletes were more likely to use distraction-oriented coping, whereas athletes
5 that remained disagreeable (Low A) and self-disciplined (High C) were less likely to use
6 distraction-oriented coping. As such, the effect of agreeableness upon distraction-oriented coping
7 was dependent upon its combination with conscientiousness. These findings indicate the importance
8 for conducting research investigating the interactive effects of the Big-Five upon coping in order to
9 better understand the complex relationship between personality and coping in sport. Although the
10 relationship between personality and athletic success in sport is often thought to be unidirectional, it
11 is also possible that athletic success or failure experienced throughout an athletes career, and
12 respective life changes may contribute to personality changes (Allen & Laborde, 2014). In support
13 of this argument evidence (e.g., Allen, Vella, & Laborde, 2015a; Allen, Vella, & Laborde, 2015b)
14 suggests that sport and exercise participation facilitate changes in personality. Hence, future
15 longitudinal designs are required to explore the bidirectional associations of personality and coping
16 in sport. Additionally, acknowledging that previous personality experimental research (e.g.,
17 Jackson, Hill, Payne, Roberts, & Stine-Morrow, 2012; Sander, Schmiedek, Brose, Wagner, &
18 Specht, 2016) found support for changes on the Big-Five personality traits following cognitive
19 training interventions, it is recommended that sport psychology practitioners and researchers
20 dedicate further attention to the relevance of these methods within this field of study.

References

141 Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*.
142 Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

PERSONALITY AND COPING

20

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 Allen, M.S., Greenlees, I., & Jones, M. (2011). An investigation of the five-factor model of
2 personality and coping behaviour in sport, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29, 841-850.
3 Doi.10.1080/02640414.2011.565064
- 4 Allen, M.S., Frings, D., & Hunter, S. (2012). Personality, coping, and challenge and threat states in
5 athletes. *International Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 10, 264-275.
6 Doi.10.1080/1612197x.2012.682375
- 7 Allen, M.S., Greenlees, I., & Jones, M. (2013). Personality in Sport: a comprehensive review.
8 *International Review of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 6, 184-208.
9 Doi.10.1080/1750984x.2013.769614
- 10 Allen, M.S., Laborde, S. (2014). The role of personality in sport and physical activity. *Current*
11 *Directions in Psychological Science*, 23, 460-465. Doi.10.1177/0963721414550705.
- 12 Allen, M. S., Vella, S. A., & Laborde, S. (2015a). Health-related behaviour and personality trait
13 development in adulthood. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 59, 104-110. Doi.
14 10.1016/j.jrp.2015.10.005
- 15 Allen, M. S., Vella, S. A., & Laborde, S. (2015b). Sport participation, screen time, and personality
16 trait development during childhood. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 33(3),
17 375-390. Doi.10.1111/bjdp.12102
- 18 Allport, G. (1961). *Patterns and growth in personality*. New York. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- 19 Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and
20 powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 57, 289–300.
- 21 Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process.
22 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 890-902. Doi.10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.890
- 23 Bowling, N., Beehr, T., & Swader, W. (2005). Giving and receiving social support at work: The
24 roles of personality and reciprocity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 476–489.
25 Doi.10.1016/j.vb.2004.08.004

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 Bouchard, G., Guillemette, A., & Landry-Leger, N. (2004). Situational and dispositional coping: An
2 examination of their relation to personality, cognitive appraisals, and psychological distress.
3 *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 221–238. Doi.10.1002/per.512
- 4 Brown, D. J. & Fletcher, D. (2016) Effects of Psychological and Psychosocial Interventions on
5 Sport Performance: A Meta-Analysis, *Sports Medicine*, 1-23, ISSN: 0112-1642. Doi.
6 10.1007/s40279-016-0552-7.
- 7 Carver, C.S., & Connor-Smith, J. (2010). Personality and coping. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61,
8 679-704. Doi.10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100352
- 9 Carver, C.S., & Scheier, M.F. (2008). *Perspectives on personality* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- 10 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- 11 Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation*
12 *analysis for the behavioural sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 13 Compas, B. E., Connor-Smith, J. K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, H.A, & Wadsworth, M. E. (2001).
14 Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: Progress, problems, and potential in
15 theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 87-127. Doi.10.1037//0033-2909.127.1.87
- 16 Connor-Smith, J. K., & Flachsbart, C. (2007). Relations between Personality and Coping: A Meta-
17 Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 6, 1080-1107. Doi.10.1037/0022-
18 3514.93.6.1080
- 19 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual*. Odessa, FL:
20 Psychological Assessment Resources.
- 21 Crocker, P. R. E., & Graham, T. R. (1995). Coping with competitive athletes with performance
22 stress: Gender differences and relationships with affect. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 325-338.
23 Doi.10.1123/tsp.9.3.325
- 24 Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor
25 procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64, 391–418.
26 Doi.10.1177/0013164404266386.

PERSONALITY AND COPING

22

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 David, J. P., & Suls, J. (1999). Coping efforts in daily life: role of big five traits and problem
2 appraisals. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 265-294. Doi.10.1111/1467-6494.00056
- 3 DeLongis, A., & Holtzman, S. (2005). Coping in context: The role of stress, social support, and
4 personality in coping. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1633-1656. Doi.10.1111/j.1467-
5 6494.2005.00361
- 6 Fleeson, W. (2004). Moving personality beyond the person-situation debate: The challenge and the
7 opportunity of within person variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 83-
8 87. Doi.10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00280.
- 9 Gaudreau, P., & Blondin, J-P. (2004). Different athletes cope differently during sport competition:
10 A cluster analysis of coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 1865-1877. Doi.
11 10.1016/j.paid.2003.08.017
- 12 Gottlieb, B.H. & Rooney, J.A. (2004). Coping effectiveness: determinants and relevance to the
13 mental health and affect of family caregivers of persons with dementia. *Aging & Mental*
14 *Health*, 8, (4), 364-373. Doi.10.1080/13607860410001709719
- 15 Hill, D.M., & Shaw, G. (2013). A qualitative examination of choking under pressure in team sport.
16 *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 14, 103-110. Doi. 10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.07.008.
- 17 Hurst, J.F., Thompson, A., Visek, A.J., Fisher, B. & Gaudreau, P. (2011). Towards a dispositional
18 version of the coping inventory for competitive sport. *International Journal of Sport*
19 *Psychology*, 42, 167-185. Doi.10.1037/e508412008-001
- 20 Jackson, J. J., Hill, P. L., Payne, B. R., Roberts, B. W., & StineMorrow, E. A. (2012). Can an old
21 dog learn (and want to experience) new tricks? Cognitive training increases openness to
22 experience in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 27, 286–292. Doi.10.1037/a0025918
- 23 John, O.P., Donahue, E.M., & Kentle, R.L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory – Versions 4a and 54*.
24 Berkley: University of California, Berkley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and
2 theoretical perspective. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory*
3 *and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-139). New York: Guilford Press.
- 4 Kaiseler, M., Polman, R.C.J. & Nicholls, A.R. (2012) Effects of the Big Five personality
5 dimensions on appraisal coping, and coping effectiveness in sport. *European Journal of Sport*
6 *Science*, 12 (1), 62-72. Doi.10.1080/17461391.2010.551410
- 7 Kaiseler, M., Poolton, J.M., Backhouse, S. H., & Stanger, N. (2017). The Relationship Between
8 Mindfulness and Life Stress in Student-Athletes: The Mediating Role of Coping Effectiveness
9 and Decision Rumination. *The Sport Psychologist*, 1-30. Doi.10.1123/tsp.2016-0083
- 10 Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2008). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human*
11 *nature* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- 12 Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- 13 Lee-Baggley, D., Preece, M., DeLongis, A. (2005). Coping with interpersonal stress: role of the big
14 five traits. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1141-1180. Doi.10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00345
- 15 McCrae, R. R. (1992). Situational determinants of coping. In B.N. Carpenter (Ed.), *Personal*
16 *coping: Theory research, and application*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- 17 McCrae, R. R. (2015). A more nuanced view of reliability specificity in the trait hierarchy.
18 *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19, 97–112. Doi.10.1177/ 1088868314541857.
- 19 McCrae R. R., & Costa P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across
20 instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
21 Doi.10.1037//0022-3514.52.1.81
- 22 McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (2003) *Personality in adulthood: A five factor theory perspective*
23 (2nd edn). New York: Guilford Press.
- 24 Nicholls, A. R., Levy, A. R., Carson, F., Thompson, M. A., & Perry, J. L. (2016a). The applicability
25 of self-regulation theories in sport: Goal adjustment capacities, stress appraisals, coping, and

PERSONALITY AND COPING

24

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 well-being among athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 27, 47-55.
- 2 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.07.011>
- 3 Nicholls, A.R., Perry, J.L., Jones, L., Morley, D., & Carson, F. (2013). Dispositional coping, coping
4 effectiveness, and cognitive social maturity among adolescent athletes. *Journal of Sport &*
5 *Exercise Psychology*, 35 (3), 229-238. Doi.10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.11.004
- 6 Nicholls, A. R., Taylor, N. J., Carroll, S., & Perry, J. L. (2016b). The development of a new sport-
7 specific classification of coping and a meta-analysis of the relationship between different
8 coping strategies and moderators on sporting outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:1674.
9 Doi.10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01674
- 10 O'Brien, T. B., & DeLongis, A. (1996). The interactional context of problem-, emotion-, and
11 relationship-focused coping: The role of the Big Five personality factors. *Journal of*
12 *Personality*, 64, 775–813.
- 13 Penley, J. A., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Associations among the Big Five, emotional responses, and
14 coping with acute stress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1215–1228.
15 Doi.10.1016/s0191-8869(01)00087-3
- 16 Sander, J., Schmiedef, F., Brose, A., Wagner, G.G., Specht, J. (2016). Long-term effects of an
17 extensive cognitive training on personality development. *Journal of Personality*. Doi.
18 10.1111/jopy.12252
- 19 Tong, E. M., Bishop, G. D., Diong, S. M., Enkelmann, H. C., Why, Y. P., Ang, J., et al. (2004).
20 Social support and personality among male police officers in Singapore. *Personality and*
21 *Individual Differences*, 36, 109–123. Doi.10.1016/s0191-8869(03)00072-2
- 22 Vollrath, M., & Torgersen, S. (2000). Personality types and coping. *Personality and Individual*
23 *Differences*, 29, 367–378. Doi.10.1016/s0191-8869(99)00199-3.

PERSONALITY AND COPING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only