



Published in final edited form as:

*Addict Behav.* 2015 December ; 51: 127–130. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.07.010.

## A CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PROTECTIVE BEHAVIORAL STRATEGIES SCALE AMONG OEF/OIF VETERANS

Jennifer M. Cadigan<sup>1</sup>, Cameron C. Weaver<sup>2</sup>, Nicholas W. McAfee<sup>1</sup>, Tracy E. Herring<sup>1</sup>, and Matthew P. Martens<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology, University of Missouri

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Stout

### Abstract

**Introduction**—Military veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq (OEF/OIF/OND) are at-risk for increased alcohol consumption and alcohol-related consequences. The Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale (PBSS) has been shown to be a reliable and valid measure of assessing strategies to facilitate more responsible drinking and to reduce alcohol-related harm among college student populations. The purpose of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of the PBSS among the OEF/OIF veteran population.

**Method**—Participants were 251 veterans (94% male; 83% White; *M* age = 31.77 years) who were participating in a larger alcohol intervention trial and reported consuming alcohol within the past 30 days.

**Results**—Confirmatory Factor Analyses indicated the model fit of the PBSS was similar to college student samples. Although a confirmatory three-factor model best fit the data, model fit indices were slightly below commonly accepted guidelines. All PBSS subscales were negatively correlated with alcohol outcomes. Greater use of Manner of Drinking (MOD) and Stopping/Limiting Drinking (SLD) strategies were associated with less alcohol consumption and lower peak BAC. Greater use of MOD strategies were associated with less alcohol-related problems.

**Conclusions**—Findings provide initial support for use of the PBSS among OEF/OIF veterans. Strategies aimed at stopping/limiting drinking and the manner of drinking may be more effective with a veteran sample. Additional studies examining the external validity of this measure are encouraged.

### Keywords

Protective Behavioral Strategies; Confirmatory Factor Analysis; OEF/OIF; Veterans

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jennifer M. Cadigan; Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology, 16 Hill Hall; University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211; (573) 882-3382; Jennifer.Cadigan@mail.missouri.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

## 1. Introduction

Military veterans are at-risk for increased alcohol consumption and alcohol-related consequences. Returning soldiers from conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq (Operations Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom, and New Dawn OEF/OIF/OND) are at an increased risk for alcohol misuse compared to other veterans (Hoge et al., 2004), and at greater risk than non-veterans (Hawkins et al., 2010; Wagner et al., 2007). Increased levels of alcohol misuse among OEF/OIF veterans have been associated with harmful physical and psychological outcomes (Kehle et al., 2011; McDevitt-Murphy et al., 2010). Considering the negative and serious consequences of alcohol misuse, it is important to understand factors that may protect veterans from alcohol-related harms.

### 1.1 Protective Behavioral Strategies

Protective behavioral strategies (PBS) are defined as active behaviors used while consuming alcohol to facilitate more responsible drinking and to reduce harm associated with alcohol (Martens et al., 2005). Strategies include avoiding drinking games, using a designated driver, and alternating alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks. The use of PBS has been associated with fewer alcohol-related harms (see Pearson, 2013).

A commonly used measure to assess PBS is the Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale (PBSS; Martens et al., 2005; Martens et al., 2007). The PBSS is a 15-item measure that asks participants to indicate how often they engage in each protective strategy when using alcohol. Participants indicate a response using a 6-point, Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*always*). To date, studies examining the factor structure of the PBSS have primarily utilized college samples, including volunteers (Martens et al., 2005) and judicially mandated participants (Martens et al., 2007). Factor analytic studies have supported a three-factor structure, with the following subscales: Stopping/Limiting Drinking (SLD; seven items; e.g., “Determine not to exceed a set number of drinks”), Manner of Drinking (MOD; five items; e.g., “Avoid trying to “keep up” or “out drink” others”), and Serious Harm Reduction (SHR; three items; e.g., “Know where your drinks has been at all times”) (Martens et al., 2005; Martens et al., 2007). Among college student samples, internal consistency estimates have ranged from .81-.85 (SLD), .74-.79 (MOD), and .59-.66 (SHR) (Martens, et al. 2007; Treloar et al., 2014; Walters et al., 2007).

Higher scores on the PBSS subscales have been shown to be associated with less alcohol consumption and fewer alcohol-related problems among college students (D’Lima et al., 2012; LaBrie et al., 2011; Martens et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2012). Although studies have shown the MOD and SHR subscales to be predictive of alcohol use and related problems, the SLD subscale has not been shown to uniquely predict alcohol outcomes (Martens, et al., 2005; Martens et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2012). Clinically, PBS have been shown to mediate brief alcohol interventions (Barnett et al., 2007; Larimer et al., 2007), and there is support for a PBS-specific group alcohol intervention (Kenney et al., 2014).

In sum, research with college student populations has supported the psychometric properties of the PBSS, but less is known regarding its reliability and validity among other at-risk

populations. The current study aimed to address this limitation by examining the psychometric properties of the measure among a sample of OEF/OIF veterans.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants and Procedures

Participants were enrolled in a larger study examining the efficacy of a brief alcohol intervention among OEF/OIF veterans (Martens et al., 2015). Participants were recruited from a primary care clinic at the Harry S. Truman VA Hospital from January 2011 to February 2013. All OEF/OIF veterans who presented at the clinic were eligible for the study and were randomized to a personalized drinking feedback intervention or an alcohol education control condition. They were compensated \$30 for completing the baseline assessment.

The current project analyzed baseline data from 251 veterans (94.4% male; 82.5% White;  $M$  age = 31.77 years) who reported consuming alcohol within the past 30 days. The majority (72.1%) were in the Army. Participants reported an average of 1.62 ( $SD$  = .91; range = 1 – 7) deployments to Iraq and/or Afghanistan. Over half (56.6%) were married and 62.9% had children. Participants reported consuming an average of 13.76 drinks per week ( $SD$  = 14.27) with an average estimated peak blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .067 ( $SD$  = .091) within the past 30 days.

### 2.2. Measures

*Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale* (PBSS; Martens et al., 2005; Martens et al., 2007). The PBSS is a 15-item measure assessing strategies used to reduce high risk drinking and associated negative consequences. Participants indicated how often they engage in each protective strategy on a 6-point, Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*always*). One item is reverse coded. Higher scores indicate greater use of PBS.

*Daily Drinking Questionnaire* (DDQ; Collins et al., 1985). Participants indicated the number of drinks typically consumed each day of the week over the past 30 days. Responses were summed to provide an estimate of typical drinks consumed per week. Participants indicated the maximum number of drinks consumed on a single occasion in the past 30 days, and the number of hours they consumed alcohol on that occasion. A standard formula accounting for gender and body weight was then used to estimate peak BAC (Matthews & Miller, 1979).

*Short Inventory of Problems* (SIP; Miller et al., 1995). The SIP is a 15-item self-report measure assessing alcohol-related consequences over the past 6-months. It is a brief version of the Drinker Inventory of Consequences (DrInC; Miller et al., 1995). Responses were dichotomously scored, as participants indicated whether or not they had experienced the alcohol-related consequence. Internal consistency in the present sample was .87.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Mean scores on PBSS subscales were as follows: SLD = 2.81 ( $SD = 1.22$ ), MOD = 3.82 ( $SD = 1.33$ ), SHR = 4.48 ( $SD = 1.25$ ). Internal consistency for the SLD, MOD, and SHR subscales was .84, .83, and .52, respectively.

#### 3.2 Confirmatory Factor Analyses

One-factor and three-factor models were examined. Due to high covariance between error terms, the error terms for PBSS item 10 (“Stop drinking at a predetermined time”) and item 6 (“Leave the bar/party at a predetermined time”) were correlated. Martens and colleagues (2007) also correlated these error terms.

To assess model fit, we followed commonly accepted guidelines (Kline, 2011), where adequate model fit is indicated by  $CFI > .90$ ,  $TLI > .90$ ,  $RMSEA < .08$ , and  $SRMR < .10$ . Model fit was significantly better for the three-factor model compared to the one-factor model, as the  $\chi^2$  difference test was significant ( $p < .001$ ). Model fit for the three-factor model was slightly below commonly accepted guidelines,  $\chi^2(86) = 249.639$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $CFI = .886$ ,  $TLI = .861$ ,  $RMSEA = .087$ ,  $SRMR = .069$ . Factor loadings for each subscale were mostly moderate to large in magnitude (see Table 1) and were similar to those found in previous samples (Martens et al., 2007). The item “Use a designated driver” had the lowest factor loading of .33, but similar results have been found in college samples.

#### 3.3 Convergent Validity

All PBSS subscales were positively correlated with one another ( $r = .388 - .562$ ) and were negatively correlated with all alcohol outcomes ( $r = -.162 - -.413$ ). Thus, greater use of PBS was associated with fewer drinks per week, lower BAC, and fewer alcohol-related problems.

#### 3.4 Concurrent Validity

**3.4.1 Drinks per Week**—Hierarchical regression controlling for gender found baseline scores on PBSS subscales were associated with drinks per week,  $F(3, 246) = 16.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .17$ . Higher scores on SLD and MOD were associated with less alcohol consumption ( $\beta = -.227$ ,  $\beta = -.247$ ,  $p$ 's  $< .01$ , respectively).

**3.4.2 BAC**—Hierarchical regression controlling for gender found scores on PBSS subscales were associated with peak BAC,  $F(3, 242) = 22.30$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .22$ . Higher scores on SLD and MOD were associated with lower BAC ( $\beta = -.266$ ,  $\beta = -.304$ ,  $p$ 's  $< .001$ , respectively).

**3.4.3 Alcohol-related Problems**—Hierarchical regression controlling for both gender and drinks per week found scores on PBSS subscales were associated with alcohol-related problems,  $F(3, 245) = 9.90$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .08$ . Higher scores on MOD were associated with fewer alcohol-related problems ( $\beta = -.285$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

## 4. Discussion

The current study provides preliminary support for use of the PBSS for assessing the use of PBS among OEF/OIF veterans. Although fit indices were slightly below commonly accepted guidelines, significant factor loadings and negative correlations between PBSS subscales and alcohol outcomes suggests initial support for the PBSS. Higher scores on the MOD and SLD subscales were associated with less alcohol use, and higher scores on MOD were associated with less alcohol-related consequences. Specific strategies aimed at reducing the amount and speed at which alcohol is consumed may be most useful for reducing alcohol use and consequences among OEF/OIF veterans.

The psychometric properties of the PBSS in the current study are somewhat similar to those among college students (Martens et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2012; Walters et al., 2007). Although the overall model fit is slightly below commonly accepted guidelines, similar fit indices have been found among college student populations (Martens et al., 2007). The factor structure of the SLD and MOD subscales are good ( $\alpha = .84, .83$ , respectively), and similar internal consistency estimates have been found among college student samples (Martens et al., 2007; Treloar et al., 2014; Walters et al., 2007). Although the internal consistency estimate of the SHR subscale was somewhat low by conventional standards, similar results have been found in college samples and may be attributable to the small number of items (3) on the subscale (Martens et al., 2007; Treloar et al., 2014; Walters et al., 2007).

Perhaps the most important finding was that after controlling for the effects of gender and the other PBSS subscales, individual PBSS subscales were uniquely associated with alcohol use and/or problems. The MOD and SLD subscales predicted alcohol outcomes, such that greater use of MOD and SLD strategies were associated with less alcohol consumption and lower peak BAC. Greater use of MOD strategies were associated with less alcohol-related problems. Investigations with college students have also demonstrated a similar relationship between MOD and alcohol outcomes (Martens et al., 2005). These findings highlight the importance of utilizing the PBSS to identify individuals who may be at-risk for negative alcohol outcomes.

A unique finding to the current study is the significant association between the SLD subscale and alcohol outcomes. This association has not been found among college student populations (Martens et al., 2005; Martens et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2012). Additionally, while research with college student samples has found the SHR subscale to have the strongest unique relationship with alcohol-related problems (Martens et al., 2007), in this study the SHR subscale did not predict any alcohol outcome.

The veteran sample represents an important at-risk group who are qualitatively different from traditional college student samples. The average age of participants was older than traditional college students and participants were seeking services at a VA Hospital. Given that the PBSS was developed specifically for college students, it is plausible some items may not apply for individuals who are not in a college environment. It is possible the

psychometric properties could be improved by modifying a handful of the items to make them more relevant to the veteran population.

There are several limitations to the current study. The sample consisted of a relatively homogenous population of White male veterans, limiting generalizability. All data collected were self-report. Finally, we were unable to examine measurement invariance across gender as the sample was 95% male.

Despite these limitations, the current study is the first to examine the psychometric properties of the PBSS among an at-risk OEF/OIF population. Current findings indicate the model fit and factor structure among the veteran population is similar to college students. Although the current study provides preliminary support for the use of the PBSS for assessing PBS among OEF/OIF veterans, we encourage future research to continue to examine the external validity of the measure with larger, non-college samples.

## Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NIAAA grants R21AA020180 and F31AA022830. This research is the result of work supported with resources and the use of facilities at the Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

## References

- Barnett NP, Murphy JG, Colby SM, Monti PM. Efficacy of counselor vs. computer-delivered intervention with mandated college students. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2007; 32:2529–2548.10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.06.017 [PubMed: 17707594]
- Collins RL, Parks GA, Marlatt GA. Social determinants of alcohol consumption: The effects of social interaction and model status on the self-administration of alcohol. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1985; 53:189–200.10.1037/0022-006X.53.2.189 [PubMed: 3998247]
- D'Lima GM, Pearson MR, Kelley ML. Protective behavioral strategies as a mediator and moderator of the relationship between self-regulation and alcohol-related consequences in first-year college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2012; 26:330–337.10.1037/a0026942 [PubMed: 22288975]
- Hawkins EJ, Lapham GT, Kivlahan DR, Bradley KA. Recognition and management of alcohol misuse in OEF/OIF and other veterans in the VA: A cross-sectional study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2010; 109:147–153.10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.12.025 [PubMed: 20167440]
- Hoge CW, Castro CA, Messer SC, McGurk D, Cotting DI, Koffman RL. Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2004; 351:13–22.10.1056/NEJMoa040603 [PubMed: 15229303]
- Kehle SM, Ferrier-Auerbach AG, Meis LA, Arbisi PA, Erbes CR, Polusny MA. Predictors of post deployment alcohol use disorders in National Guard soldiers deployed to Operation Iraqi Freedom. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2011; 26:42–50.10.1037/a0024663 [PubMed: 21823766]
- Kenney SR, Napper LE, LaBrie JW, Martens MP. Examining the efficacy of a brief group protective behavioral strategies skills training alcohol intervention with college women. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2014; 28:1041–1051.10.1037/a0038173 [PubMed: 25347024]
- Kline, RB. *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. 3. New York, NY: The Guilford Press; 2011.
- LaBrie JW, Lac A, Kenney SR, Mirza T. Protective behavioral strategies mediate the effect of drinking motives on alcohol use among heavy drinking college students: Gender and race differences. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2011; 36:354–361.10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.12.013 [PubMed: 21215529]
- Larimer ME, Lee CM, Kilmer JR, Fabiano PM, Stark CB, Geisner IM, Neighbors C. Personalized mailed feedback for college drinking prevention: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of*

- Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 2007; 75:285–293.10.1037/0022-006X.75.2.285 [PubMed: 17469886]
- Martens MP, Cadigan JM, Rogers RE, Osborn ZH. A randomized controlled trial of a personalized drinking feedback intervention for veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2015; 76:355–359.10.15288/jsad.2015.76.355 [PubMed: 25978820]
- Martens MP, Ferrier AG, Sheehy MJ, Corbett K, Anderson DA, Simmons A. Development of the Protective Behavioral Strategies survey. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2005; 66:698–705.10.15288/jsa.2005.66.698
- Martens MP, Pedersen ER, LaBrie JW, Ferrier AG, Cimini MD. Measuring alcohol-related protective behavioral strategies among college students: Further examination of the Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2007; 21:307–315.10.1037/0893-164x.21.3.307 [PubMed: 17874881]
- Matthews DB, Miller WR. Estimating blood alcohol concentration: Two computer programs and their applications in therapy and research. *Addictive Behaviors*. 1979; 4:55–60.10.1016/0306-4603(79)90021-2 [PubMed: 420046]
- McDevitt-Murphy ME, Williams JL, Bracken KL, Fields JA, Monahan CJ, Murphy JG. PTSD symptoms, hazardous drinking, and health functioning among U.S. OEF and OIF veterans presenting to primary care. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2010; 23:108–111.10.1002/jts.20482 [PubMed: 20104586]
- Miller, WR.; Tonigan, JS.; Longabaugh, R. *The Drinker Inventory of Consequences (DrInC): An Instrument for Assessing Averse Consequence of Alcohol Abuse (Test Manual)*. Rockville, MD: Department of Health and Human Services; 1995. NIAAA Project MATCH Monograph Series, Vol. 4, NIH Publication No. 95-3911
- Pearson MR. Use of alcohol protective behavioral strategies among college students: A critical review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2013; 33:1025–1040.10.1016/j.cpr.2013 [PubMed: 24036089]
- Pearson MR, Kite BA, Henson JM. The assessment of protective behavioral strategies: Comparing prediction and factor structures across measures. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2012; 26:573–584.10.1037/a0028187 [PubMed: 22612255]
- Treloar HR, Martens MP, McCarthy DM. Testing measurement invariance of the Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale in college men and women. *Psychological Assessment*. 2014; 26:307–313.10.1037/a0034471 [PubMed: 24059477]
- Wagner TH, Harris KM, Federman B, Dai L, Luna Y, Humphreys K. Prevalence of substance use disorders among veterans and comparable nonveterans from the National Health Survey on Drug Use and Health. *Psychological Services*. 2007; 4:149–157.10.1037/1541-1559.4.3.149
- Walters ST, Roudsari BS, Vader AM, Harris TR. Correlates of protective behavior utilization among heavy-drinking college students. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2007; 32:2633–2. [PubMed: 17669596]



**Highlights**

- We examined the psychometric properties of the Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale among veteran population
- Model fit was similar to college student samples
- Veteran strategies for reducing negative alcohol outcomes slightly differ from college students
- Strategies such as stopping/limiting drinking and the manner of drinking may be more effective for veterans



**Table 1**

Factor Loadings by Subscale (Item Standardized Regression Coefficients)

Item	Coefficient
Stopping/Limiting Drinking	
10 Stop drinking at a predetermined time	.813
2 Determine not to exceed a set number of drinks	.774
6 Leave the bar/party at a predetermined time	.758
3 Alternate alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks	.619
4 Have a friend let you know when you have had enough to drink	.551
11 Drink water while drinking alcohol	.501
12 Put extra ice in your drink	.436
Manner of Drinking	
14 Drink slowly, rather than gulp or chug	.815
5 Avoid drinking games	.742
13 Avoid mixing different types of alcohol	.700
15 Avoid trying to “keep up” or “out-drink” others	.657
9 Drink shots of liquor <sup>1</sup>	.572
Serious Harm Reduction	
8 Know where your drink has been at all times	.594
7 Make sure that you go home with a friend	.579
1 Use a designated driver	.330

Note.

<sup>1</sup> Item is reverse coded.

**Table 2**

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Summary of PBSS Subscales Predicting Alcohol Outcome

Variable	<i>B</i> (SE)	$\beta$	<i>t</i>
Drinks per week			
Gender	3.949 (3.641)	.064	1.085
SLD	-2.670 (.880)	-.227	-3.033*
MOD	-2.656 (.760)	-.247	-3.495*
SHR	.163 (.765)	.014	.213
Peak BAC			
Gender	-.031 (.023)	-.078	-1.349
SLD	-.020 (.006)	-.266	-3.597**
MOD	-.021 (.005)	-.304	-4.370**
SHR	.005 (.005)	.071	1.073
Alcohol-related Problems			
Gender	-1.406 (.627)	-.119	-2.244*
Drinks per Week	.073 (.011)	.387	6.712**
SLD	-.153 (.154)	-.069	-.993
MOD	-.583 (.134)	-.285	-4.358**
SHR	.097 (.131)	.045	.740

Note. SLD = Stopping/Limiting Drinking; MOD = Manner of Drinking; SHR = Serious Harm Reduction;

\*  $p < .05$ ,

\*\*  $p < .01$ .