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Abstract

Adolescents who develop depression have worse interpersonal and affective experiences and are more likely to develop substance problems and/or suicidal ideation compared to adolescents who do not develop depression. This study examined the combined effects of negative self-referent information processing and rumination (i.e., brooding and reflection) on adolescent depressive symptoms. It was hypothesized that the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and brooding would significantly predict depressive symptoms, while the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and reflection would not predict depressive symptoms. Adolescents (n = 92; 13-15 years; 34.7% female) participated in a six-month longitudinal study. Self-report instruments measured depressive symptoms and rumination; a cognitive task measured information processing. Path modelling in Amos 19.0 analyzed the data. The interaction of negative information processing and brooding significantly predicted an increase in depressive symptoms six months later. The interaction of negative information processing and reflection did not significantly predict depression, however, the model not meet a priori standards to accept the null hypothesis. Results suggest clinicians working with adolescents at-risk for depression should consider focusing on the reduction of brooding and negative information processing to reduce long-term depressive symptoms.
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Introduction: The Combined Effects of Self-referent Information Processing and Ruminative Responses on Adolescent Depression

A meta-analysis of epidemiological studies on adolescent depression found a 5.7% rate of depression for adolescents between 13 and 18 years of age (Costello, Erkanli, & Angold, 2006). Moreover, adolescents with depressive symptoms are more likely to have interpersonal problems and to develop major depression, suicidal ideation, anxiety, and/or substance abuse problems compared to adolescents without depressive symptoms (Marttunen, Haarsilta, Aalto-Setälä, & Pelkonen, 2003). Therefore, an examination of the risk factors associated with adolescent depression is critical to developing prevention and intervention methods for depression. Two important cognitive constructs related to depression and/or depressive symptoms are self-referent information processing and rumination.

Beck’s cognitive theory (1976) asserts that an individual’s information processing can be obscured by maladaptive schemata, which is associated with depression. Nolen-Hoeksema’s response styles theory asserts that individuals who ruminate on a particular negative event can worsen or instigate a depressed mood (Nolen-Hoeksema & Morrow, 1991). Both of these theories propose that cognitive styles and cognitive processes (i.e., rumination, information processing and schemata) are risk factors for depressive symptoms. Researchers have begun to explore these theoretical constructs together as they relate to depressive symptoms (Alloy et al., 2004; Ciesla & Roberts, 2007; Pössel, 2011; Robinson & Alloy, 2003). Studies have shown support for a moderation model wherein information processing and rumination interact to predict depressive symptoms (e.g., Ciesla & Roberts, 2007; Robinson & Alloy, 2003). Despite the evidence in support of this moderation model, it has not been tested in an adolescent sample. Thus, the current study examined information processing and rumination as related to
the cognitive theory and response styles theory with an adolescent sample.

Information Processing

Information processing occurs when an individual receives information from the environment and then encodes, processes, or retrieves the information as a memory. Many cognitive models of depression posit that biases in information processing (e.g., interpreting negative information as self-referent, or interpreting ambiguous stimuli as negative) are the principle cause of the onset and maintenance of depression (for a review, see Jacobs et al., 2008). An important, related construct that predicts to depression is a person’s self-schema (Beck, 1987). A person’s self-schema is a stable, cognitive structure of thought patterns that influence how a person codes and interprets external stimuli in relation to him-/herself (Beck, 1964). Beck (1987) posits additionally, negative schemas relate to functions of negatively biased information processing. Specifically, negative schemas cause people to recall negative aspects of a memory more readily than positive aspects of a memory. People are also more likely to ignore information from the environment that is contrary to their self-schema (Beck, 1987), which implies a bias in encoding or processing information from the person’s surroundings. Additionally, schemata are dormant until they are activated through emotional experiences. In other words, an individual’s negative schema would not be activated, or used, until they experienced a negative affective experience (Miranda & Persons, 1988), making emotion an important component in studying cognitive constructs.

Negative Self-Referent Information Processing

Studies have found that negative self-referent information processing biases arise when the participants endorse a negative self-schema (Derry & Kuiper, 1981; Dykman, Abramson, Alloy, & Hartlage, 1989; Kuiper & Derry, 1982). Additionally, studies have shown that the processing
of a self-schema (i.e., how easily an individual can encode and recall a particular memory) may contribute to differences between depressed and non-depressed individuals.

Using an adjective-encoding task, Kuiper and Derry (1982) found that depressed individuals’ self-schema, compared to non-depressed individuals, operate less efficiently when recalling self-referent information. These results have been replicated in other adult samples (e.g., Dozois & Dobson, 2001).

Similar investigations have been conducted with adolescent samples. Using a self-referent encoding and recall task similar to Kuiper and Derry’s (1982), one study found a positive association between depressive symptoms and the endorsement of negative self-referent adjectives among psychiatric inpatient adolescents (Gençöz, Voelz, Gençöz, Petit, & Joiner, 2001). However, the researchers did not find a predictive relationship between the self-referent processing task and depressive symptoms. Prinstein, Cheah, and Guier (2005) found similar results with 10th grade adolescents when examining peer attributions and victimization. However, the positive association between negative self-referent adjectives and depressive symptoms was only predictive for adolescent males experiencing high levels of peer victimization.

Summarized, the established relationship between negative self-referent information processing and depression in adults has also been found to a limited extent in adolescents. Depressed individuals tend to have more negative self-schemas and are therefore more inclined to process negative, rather than neutral and/or positive, self-referent information compared to non-depressed individuals (Dozois & Dobson, 2001; Gençöz et al., 2001; Prinstein et al., 2005). More specifically, the operations in information processing differ between depressed and non-depressed individuals, where depressed individuals store, process, and retrieve information in a
negatively biased way (Dozois & Dobson, 2001; Dykman et al., 1989; Gençöz et al., 2001; Kerry & Duiper, 1982; Prinstein et al., 2005). These findings lend support to Beck’s theory (1964, 1987) that negative self-referent information processing contributes to depression.

**Rumination**

Rumination is a cognitive style which involves repetitive thinking in reaction to stressful events and focuses on the origins and symptoms of the stressful event and subsequent distress (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, & Lyubomirsky, 2008). Hilt, McLaughlin, and Nolen-Hoeksema (2010) found that adolescents (6th through 8th grade) who had a high tendency to ruminate were more depressed seven months later compared to adolescents with a low tendency to ruminate. In a two year longitudinal study with adolescents aged 11-15 years, Abela and Hankin (2011) found that high-ruminating adolescents were more likely than their low-ruminating peers to have future major depressive episodes, and that these future episodes were more likely to last longer. Abela and Hankin (2011) also controlled for participants’ current and past levels of depression, making their results even more compelling.

Although rumination is usually seen as a negative construct, further examinations of ruminative subtypes reveals that some ruminative thoughts are negative while others are considered neutral or even positive. Researchers have classified rumination into brooding and reflection (Treynor et al., 2003). Brooding, which involves moody and passive thinking about one’s actions or situation (e.g., thinking about how a situation could have gone differently), has been found to be maladaptive and be caused by perceived low mastery (i.e., controllability of a situation or environment; Treynor et al., 2003). Burwell and Shirk (2007) also found that brooding predicted adolescent self-reports of depressive symptoms over time.

In contrast, reflection (e.g., analyzing why events make one feel a certain way) involves...
more active problem solving and contemplation compared to brooding. While it has been shown to have a positive association with depression concurrently, it may have no longitudinal association to depressive symptoms or actually alleviate depressive symptoms over time (Burwell & Shirk, 2007; Treynor et al., 2003). This was supported in a study with early adolescents, where participants were better-adjusted if they engaged in more reflective thinking instead of brooding (Lopez, Driscoll, & Kistner, 2009). Thus, brooding is more likely increase depressive symptoms over time, while reflection will not. Thus, it is important to consider these ruminative subtypes’ influence on depression separately.¹

**Negative Self-Referent Information Processing and Rumination**

It is well established that individuals who ruminate have negatively biased information processing when encoding and retrieving memories. For example, the Cognitive Vulnerability to Depression (CVD; Alloy & Abramson, 1999) Project has been investigating the relationship between self-referent information processing and ruminative response styles, based on Beck’s cognitive theory (1976), Abramson’s hopelessness theory (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989), and Nolen-Hoeksema’s response styles theory (Nolen-Hoeksema & Morrow, 1991) in college students. Robinson and Alloy (2003) analyzed CVD data and found that negative cognitive processes (e.g., negative inferential styles and dysfunctional attitudes) are associated with depressive episodes when combined with rumination, a negative cognitive style. Robinson and Alloy (2003) confirmed their hypothesis that the interaction of negative cognitive styles and

¹Currently, the depression-related subtype of rumination is interpreted as a depressive symptom, not as an independent construct such as brooding and reflection (Treynor et al., 2003). Thus, depression-related rumination will not be examined in the current study.
Ciesla and Roberts (2007) had similar findings when they investigated the effects of interactive cognitive vulnerabilities to depression. Ciesla and Roberts (2007) tested whether the interaction of rumination and dysfunctional attitudes or rumination and negative attributional style(s) predicted changes in dysphoric mood after inducing sadness in their participants. The researchers’ moderation model had mixed support. When rumination was combined with dysfunctional attitudes the model did predict significant changes in dysphoric mood, but not when rumination was combined with attributional style. Due to this unexpected result, Ciesla and Roberts (2007) recommend that further research needs to be conducted to better understand what variations in negative cognitive styles or processes might amplify the effects of rumination on dysphoric or depressed mood.

**Hypotheses**

The current study examined longitudinally the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative response styles as a predictor of depressive symptoms in adolescents. While there are studies demonstrating that negative self-referent information processing and ruminative brooding independently relate to adolescent depressive symptoms, no study has examined the combination of these constructs in an adolescent sample. This is critical, as constructs contributing to adolescent depressive symptoms can upset adolescents’ interpersonal relationships and is associated with substance abuse (Marttunen et al., 2003).

We expected that the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative brooding would significantly predict depressive symptoms in adolescents over a six-month period. It was expected that this interaction will more strongly predict depressive symptoms six months later compared to the main effects of either negative self-referent
information processing or ruminative brooding. That is, we expected that high levels of brooding combined with high levels of negative self-referent information processing would result in a higher level of depressive symptoms later. Accordingly, we expected that low levels of brooding combined with low levels of negative information processing would result in lower levels of depression symptoms six months later. Moreover, we expected that the interaction of negative self-reference information processing and ruminative reflection would not significantly predict depressive symptoms in adolescents over a six-month period. That is, we expected that because reflection is a neutral, rather than negative, ruminative style, it would not combine with negative information processing to cause greater depressive symptoms.

Method

Participants

Adolescents from a larger sample of 302 were randomly selected and invited to participate in laboratory-based measures. The original sample (n = 302) was initially recruited by sending letters to principals at six schools inviting them to participate in the study. Two principals declined, leaving four remaining schools. Parent-teacher conferences were held to explain the nature of the study to the teachers, parents, and students. All classes invited from the remaining four schools agreed to participate. All of the parents and students from these four schools agreed to participate. It is worth noting that this high participation rate is common in school systems in Germany, because the students take their classes with the same 30 classmates all four years. Therefore, students are more motivated to participate in the same programs their classmates do.

The interest of the current study is vulnerability to depression rather than testing the effects of the scar hypothesis, which asserts that individuals who have experienced
depression show a negative cognitive bias compared to never depressed individuals (Pössel & Knopf, 2008). As this suggests that already depressed participants could bias the data, participants were screened during the collection of the original sample \( n = 302 \) for depression using the 12-item Depression-Screening Questionnaire (DSQ; Wittchen & Perkonigg, 1997),\(^2\) which measures the presence of current or past Major Depression based on the DSM-IV-TR (APA, 2000). Participants who scored a 10 or higher met the clinical cut-off and were excluded from the analysis \( n = 21 \). For ethical reasons, these adolescents with elevated DSQ scores were offered treatment instead. Scores on the DSQ were the only inclusion/exclusion criteria for participation in the study.

The finale sample \( n = 100 \) for this study comprised of adolescents aged 13 to 15 years old \( M = 13.58; SD = 0.56 \), who attended public \( n = 3 \) or private \( n = 1 \) schools in a rural area of southwest Germany. All adolescents who were invited for this laboratory study accepted the offer. All participants were German nationals and spoke German as their primary language. Although data on social-economic status of the students are not available, a wide range of social classes is likely to be represented because students from schools in economically diverse regions of the area. However, eight sets of data were lost due to technical difficulties, resulting in a final

\(^2\) Participants answered the DSQ items based on all past experiences on a 3-po2int Likert scale (no, sometimes, most days). If an adolescent rated at least five items as experienced “most days” in the same two weeks or more, it indicated that the participant was experiencing a pattern of symptoms similar to a diagnosis of major depression (consistent with the DSM-IV-TR). Although the DSQ was developed for adults, it has been used with adolescents (see Essau, Karpinski, Petermann, & Conradt, 1998; Pössel, Seeman, Ahrens, & Hautzinger, 2006).
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1 sample of 92 participants (54 males, 32 females). The Institutional Review Board at Eberhard-Karls University approved this study (Pössel, Seeman, & Hautzinger, 2008).

Materials

Rumination. Rumination was measured with the Ruminative Responses Scale (RRS) from the Response Styles Questionnaire (RSQ; Nolen-Hoeksema, Parker, & Larson, 1994) at both time points. The RRS measures both Brooding (e.g., “think, ‘Why do I always react this way?’”) and Reflection (e.g., “analyze recent events to try to understand why you are depressed”). Each of these two subscales is comprised of five items asking participants how often they engage in certain behaviours or thoughts when depressed, measured on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = almost never, 4 = almost always; Treynor et al., 2003). Although the RRS was developed for adults (Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 1994) it has been used in adolescent samples (e.g., Wilkinson & Goodyer, 2006). For the current sample, internal consistency for the overall measure was strong at both time points (Cronbach’s alpha = .95 and .87, respectively). While internal consistency for the Brooding subscale was slightly lower than preferred at both Time 1 and Time 2 (Cronbach’s alpha = .66, .68, respectively), other studies found comparable internal consistencies ranging from .60 (Pössel, 2011) to .77 (Treynor et al., 2003). Internal consistency for the Reflection subscale was acceptable at both Time 1 and Time 2 (Cronbach’s alpha = .80, .73, respectively), which were also comparable to internal consistencies in other studies (Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .68 to .73, Pössel, 2011, Treynor et al., 2003).

Depressive Symptoms. The Self-Report Questionnaire – Depression (SBB-DES) measured participants’ level of depressive symptoms during the last two weeks at Time 1 and Time 2. The SBB-DES is a self-report instrument developed for children and adolescents to
measure the presence and severity of depressive symptoms (Döpfner & Lehmkuhl, 2000). The SBB-DES has 26 items, each on a 4-point Likert scale. The summary score represents the mean of the items and has a possible range from 0 to 3, with higher scores indicating a greater severity or presence of depressive symptoms. Internal consistency of the current measure was strong (Cronbach’s alpha = .91).

Participants with SBB-DES scores greater than or equal to 1.23 (10% of the sample) at Time 1 were considered “clinically relevant” (total range = 0.0 – 2.12; Döpfner, Götz-Dorten, & Lehmkuhl, 2008). Participants who scored in the “clinically relevant” category were not excluded from analyses because their elevated scores represented depressive symptoms rather than Major Depression symptoms (as seen on the DSQ). The proportion of participants experiencing depressive symptoms at Time 1 demonstrates that the sample represented a wide range of symptoms as seen in the general population.

Mood induction check. Participants reported their levels of sadness, anger, anxiety and happiness on a visual analogue scale before and after undergoing a mood induction (VAS; Kelvin, Goodyer, Teasdale, & Brechin, 1999) at both Time 1 and Time 2.

Self-Referent Information Processing. The computerized version of the self-referent encoding task paradigm (SRET; Kelvin et al., 1999; Kuiper & Derry, 1982) was used at both time points in conjunction with word lists developed by Maes et al. (1998), which comprised 50 negative German adjectives that were comparable on emotional valence, meaning and fluency. Fluency was determined in a pilot study to ensure that German adolescents often used the SRET task words in normal conversations.

Word lists with 50 negative adjectives (e.g., dismal, bleak, egoistic, dishonest) were distributed to the participants. Participants were instructed to indicate whether each negative
adjective applied to them (i.e., whether the adjective was self-referent) by marking either a “yes” or a “no” next to the word on their word sheet over a 30-second period. Next, participants were asked to recall (i.e., incidental free recall) as many of the “yes-rated” (self-referent) negative adjectives as possible during a three-minute period.

As the study was longitudinal, participants were informed at the beginning of the SRET task that their word recall ability would be tested, to keep recall testing consistent between the first and second sessions. The number of recalled yes-rated (self-referent) negative adjectives was divided by the total number of yes-rated (self-referent) negative adjectives to create a proportion for each participant. The resulting proportions range from 0 to 1 and denote the percentage of accurately recalled adjectives for negative adjective groups. A higher proportion of negative adjectives represent a more negative self-schema, or more negative self-referent information processing (Kuiper & Derry, 1982).

**Procedure**

The questionnaires measuring rumination and depressive symptoms were distributed and completed in classrooms during the school day, and the SRET was conducted in individual computer sessions in a university laboratory. Individual sessions began with an explanation of the study procedure and informed consent. As schema need to be activated by affective experiences (Miranda & Persons, 1988), participants underwent a dysphoric mood induction (Kelvin et al., 1999) by listening to a 3-minute clip of Prokofiev’s “Alexander Nevsky-Russia under The Mongolian Yoke,” a piece meant to evoke images of destruction and loss. Participants were also prompted to think of an experience in their lives when they were sad. After this mood induction, participants completed a VAS to determine whether the mood induction was successful, and then completed the SRET. To ensure participants did not leave in
a depressed mood, participants listened to a 3-minute clip of “Taschenrechner” by the German band, Kraftwerk and were asked to think about positive experiences they have had. They were then given the VAS again to ensure that they left the laboratory in a less negative and more neutral mood. Participants completed the individual sessions and RRS and SBB-DES questionnaires at Time 1 and then six months later at Time 2.

**Data Analysis**

The hypothesized model was tested with the maximum likelihood method by calculating a path model in AMOS 19.0. The effects of depressive symptoms at time 1 were controlled for and the main effects of ruminative brooding and negative self-referent information processing were explored in the model. Additionally, given that there is much support regarding gender differences in depressive symptoms (e.g., Nolen-Hoeksema, 2001; Rutter, 2007), gender was placed into the model as a covariate at Time 1 and Time 2. The goodness of fit of the models to the data was tested with $\chi^2$. However, as this measure is sensitive to the number of participants in the study, other measures, such as $\chi^2/df$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), root mean squared of the residuals (RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1980), and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1974) were also used. To further examine any statistically significant interaction effects, the path model’s regression equation was used to construct a model-implied graph which would chart the interacting constructs’ (i.e., ruminative brooding and negative self-referent information processing) effects on depressive symptoms at Time 2 separately (main effects) and together (interaction effect).

Each of the above measures for goodness of fit has specific parameters that must be considered. Statistically nonsignificant values of $\chi^2$ and values of $\chi^2/df$ that are smaller than 2 (Kline, 2005; Ullman, 1996) indicate a good fit of the model to the data. A CFI value of 1.00
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A perfect model fit to the data, a value of ≥ .95 demonstrates good model fit, and values of ≥ .90 are considered acceptable (Hu & Bentler, 1999). An RMSEA value of .00 demonstrates a perfect model fit to the data, and values of < .05 are considered a good model fit, though values of < .08 are regarded as acceptable (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Significance level for the alternative hypotheses was set at 5%, and for the null hypothesis that the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative reflection did not predict depression it was set at 20%. This level for the null hypothesis is considered conservative (Bortz & Döring, 2002).

**Results**

Descriptive data and intercorrelations of the measures are reported in Table A.1. It is worth noting that depressive symptom and rumination scores at Time 1 were significantly correlated with each other. However, the predictor variables used to make the interaction variables (e.g., ruminative brooding x SRET) were not correlated with each other.

**Effects of Mood Induction Tests**

To determine whether the mood induction was successful, participants’ baseline scores (anger, sadness, happiness, and anxiety) were compared to their post-induction scores using t-tests. Thus, if there was a significant difference between two VAS scores (e.g., happy at baseline and happy at post-mood induction), it was concluded that the mood induction was successful.

Negative mood inductions should result in an increase of anger, sadness, and anxiety, and a decrease of happiness, as seen in the SRET procedure used by Kuiper and Derry (1982). The analyses were significant for all four VAS measures at Time 1 (angry: $t = -5.12, p < .001$; happy: $t = 7.57, p < .001$; sad: $t = -13.20, p < .001$; anxious: $t = 3.21, p < .01$). It should be
noted that the VAS scores for anxiety decreased significantly after the mood induction, which
was not expected. However, adolescents may have trouble differentiating between emotions,
particularly negative emotions such as anger and sadness (Williams, Connolly, & Segal, 2001),
which may account for the unexpected result. The analyses were significant for three of the
VAS measures at Time 2 (angry: $t = -9.58, p < .001$; happy: $t = 7.77, p < .001$; sad: $t = -38.72, p$
< .001). The VAS anxious scores were not significantly different before and after the mood
induction, although the relationship was approaching significance, suggesting that the mood
induction was still effective ($t = -1.78, p = .078$). The VAS score descriptive statistics for both
time points are listed in Table A.2.

**Test of the Hypothetical Model**

The hypothesized model yielded acceptable goodness-of-fit indices, $\chi^2 (23, N=92) = 29.462,
p = .165, \chi^2/df = 1.281, \text{CFI} (.967), \text{RMSEA} (.056)$. Thus, it was acceptable to further
analyze the model to test the hypotheses.

As predicted, the model showed a positive, significant pathway for the interaction of
the ruminative brooding subscale and the SRET variable at Time 1 on self-reported depressive
symptoms at Time 2 ($p < .05$). The standardized coefficient for this relationship was .462,
which is considered a large effect (Kline, 2005). This coefficient indicates that the interaction
of brooding and SRET at Time 1 accounted for 21.34% of the variance in depressive
symptoms at Time 2. The interaction of ruminative reflection and negative self-referent
information processing was marginally significant in predicting a decrease in depressive
symptoms at Time 2 ($p = .089$). This result goes beyond our hypothesis that negative self-
referent information processing and ruminative reflection would not predict increases in
depression by suggesting that there may be an inverse relationship. Interestingly, the main
effects of brooding and the SRET variable at Time 1 did not have a significantly relationship
with depressive symptoms at Time 2. The model with its standardized cross-wave regression
weights is shown in Figure B.1.

A model-implied graph was constructed to examine the effect of the interaction
ruminative brooding and negative self-referent information processing on depressive
symptoms (Figure B.2). The graph demonstrates that the interaction effects of brooding and
negative self-referent information processing determine the level of depressive symptoms at
Time 2 much more than either construct alone. Additionally, the graph shows that an
adolescent’s level of negative self-referent information processing increases, the effects of
ruminative brooding on depressive symptoms (six months later) is not as strong.

Discussion

This study tested the effects of the interaction of negative self-referent information
processing (i.e., a cognitive process) and ruminative response styles (i.e., cognitive styles) on
depressive symptoms in adolescents without a diagnosis of Major Depression at the beginning of
the study (Time 1). As noted by Ciesla and Roberts (2007), further understanding of the
combined effects of various negative cognitive styles and processes is necessary to understand
how these constructs interact to predict depressed mood. It has been established that negative
self-referent information processing is related to the onset and maintenance of depression (Derry
& Kuiper, 1981; Dozois & Dobson, 2001). It has also been established that rumination,
particularly the brooding subtype, is related to the onset and maintenance of depressive
symptoms (Burwell & Shirk, 2007; Treynor et al., 2003). Additionally, research has shown that
ruminative reflection may lessen depressive symptoms over time (Burwell & Shirk, 2007;
Saffrey & Ehrenberg, 2007; Treynor et al., 2003).
The hypothesized moderation model fit the data well. As expected, the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative brooding predicted an increase of depressive symptoms six months later. This finding is especially notable, as this particular hypothesis had not been tested before. This result supports the idea that negative cognitive styles (i.e., rumination) and negative cognitive processes (i.e., negative self-referent information processing) can interact to predict depressive symptoms. Further, additional examination of the combination of these constructs demonstrates that ruminative brooding may be less impactful on depressive symptoms when an adolescent has high levels of negative self-referent information processing. In other words, when an adolescent is experiencing high levels of negative information processing and high levels of brooding, clinicians may find it more effective to target their client’s negative information processing first to reduce depressive symptoms.

As expected, the interaction of ruminative reflection and negative self-referent information processing did not interact to significantly predict an increase in depressive symptoms. Despite this nonsignificant result, hypothesis 2 could not be confirmed, as the level of nonsignificance obtained in the analysis did not meet the null hypothesis standards which were established a priori. Thus, based on the data, it could not be concluded that the combined effects of a negative cognitive process (i.e., negative self-referent information processing) and a neutral or positive cognitive style (i.e., ruminative reflection) do not predict depressive symptoms.

Nevertheless, the positive, significant relationship between the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative brooding to depressive symptoms, as well as the lack of relationship between the interaction of negative self-referent information processing
and ruminative reflection to depressive symptoms, supports the idea that there is a difference in how brooding and reflection contribute to the onset of depressive symptoms. This inference is supported by the literature, which has shown that the correlation between reflection and depression is often weaker than the correlation between brooding and depression (Burwell & Shirk, 2007; Ciesla & Roberts, 2007; Treynor et al., 2003). Thus, it contributes to the growing literature which seeks to combine Beck’s cognitive theory and Nolen-Hoeksema’s response styles theory, and supports this combination in adolescent community-based populations (e.g., Alloy & Abramson, 1999; Ciesla & Roberts, 2002; Robinson & Alloy, 2003).

This study should be considered within the context of its limitations. First, adolescent depressive symptoms were measured solely with self-reports. Future studies may benefit from using clinical interviews to measure depressive symptoms or clinical depression. Second, depressed participants were excluded from analyses, which weakened the external validity of the study. However, it is important to note that depressed participants were excluded to maintain internal validity – the goal was to study the risk factors to depression. Thus, an inclusion of participants who were currently depressed would have confounded depression risk factors with symptoms of current depressive episodes. Third, participants were informed about the SRET recall task at both time points. This was done to ensure that participants approached the task with the same anticipations and expectations during both trials. If participants had not been informed of the recall task when receiving instructions about the SRET at Time 1, they would surely have anticipated the recall task at Time 2, and therefore would have a distinct advantage during their second trial. While this did ensure consistency on the task, it is possible that the participants performed better than they would have if they had not been informed about the recall task, because they may have had more motivation to memorize the words in order to
perform well on the task. Fourth, the sample in this study had disproportionately more male than female participants. However, using gender as a covariate in the path model likely addressed any influences this gender imbalance might have had on the results. Fifth, participants were recruited from only one region of the country. It is possible that adolescents in this region may differ from adolescents in the rest of Germany. Thus, generalizing these results to other regions (or countries) should be done cautiously. Finally, because of the small sample size the statistical power of the analyses performed is limited. Future studies would benefit from larger samples to ensure more statistical power, which would lead to a more accurate understanding of the constructs at hand.

Despite these limitations, this study has several strengths. The longitudinal design allowed for the examination of predictive relationships. The longitudinal design is especially helpful when analysing the relationship among these variables as research indicates both schemata and response styles tend to be stable constructs over time. For example, Treynor et al. (2003) found moderate test-retest reliability for brooding and reflection in an adult sample, and the current study showed moderate correlations between brooding at time one and two ($r = .47$) and reflection at time one and time two ($r = .48$). Whether adolescent cognitive patterns are stable remains unclear, however. Marcotte, Lvesque, and Fortin (2006) found that cognitive distortions were state-dependent for girls and had mixed findings regarding distortions in male adolescents. Future studies might consider testing different lengths of time when replicating this longitudinal model to determine whether the stability of these traits is upheld for adolescent samples. Furthermore, the investigation of the interaction of self-referent information processing and ruminative response styles on adolescent depression has been largely untested until now.

This study has significant clinical implications for both indicated prevention and
intervention settings. Based on current analyses, the interaction of negative self-referent information processing and ruminative brooding may instigate or worsen depressive states. Cognitive approaches to therapy may be especially beneficial for adolescents engaging in these constructs. It is well established that cognitively oriented therapies can alleviate depressive symptoms in adolescents (Compton et al., 2004). A clinical focus on the reduction of either or both constructs could reduce long-term depressive symptoms. Additionally, these findings could be applied to Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy, which encourages clients to become aware of their current thoughts so that they can detect negative thoughts earlier and stop depression from occurring (Segal, Williams, & Teasdale, 2002). An MCBT approach would give adolescents at-risk for depression the opportunity to pay attention to their internal mechanisms and monitor their negative information processing and ruminative tendencies.

Summarized, the current study confirmed a positive, statistically significant relationship between the interaction of brooding and negative self-referent information processing on depression six months later. Moreover, the interaction of reflection and negative self-referent information processing does not have a positive relationship to depression six months later – it may actually lessen these depressive symptoms. While studies with adult samples have demonstrated this type of relationship between cognitive processes and styles (e.g., Ceisla & Roberts, 2007; Robinson & Alloy, 2003), no study had previously confirmed its existence in adolescent samples. Especially in light of this second interaction effect, it is necessary to further investigate these constructs, especially in relation to the efficacy of cognitively-based prevention and intervention programs for adolescents who are either at-risk for or are currently experiencing depressive symptoms.
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Table A.1

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBB-DES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRS - R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRS - B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01; *p < .05. SBB-DES = Self-Report questionnaire - Depression; RRS – R = Ruminative Response Scale – Reflection subscale; RRS – B = Ruminative Response Scale – Brooding subscale; SRET = Self-referent information processing task - Negative Self-Referent Information Processing.
### Table A.2

**VAS Induction Scores – Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M_{\text{baseline}}$</th>
<th>$SD_{\text{baseline}}$</th>
<th>$M_{\text{post-induction}}$</th>
<th>$SD_{\text{post-induction}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>35.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>83.38</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>37.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>70.78</td>
<td>44.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>26.96</td>
<td>37.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>35.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>58.95</td>
<td>43.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>28.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.1. Pathway Model of the Data. For the sake of comprehension and simplicity, only pathways related to the study’s hypotheses are shown here. Depressive Sx = Self-Report Questionnaire – Depression; Reflection = Ruminative Responses Scale – Reflection subscale; Brooding = Ruminative Responses Scale – Brooding subscale; Negative Self-Referent Information Processing = Self-referent information processing task (SRET). *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$. The variables in the path model were correlated through their residuals (i.e., error terms; all variables had an error term), based upon whether the variables were shown to correlate significantly in Table A.1.
Figure B.2. Model Implied Graph of the Standardized Interaction Effect. For the sake of comprehension and simplicity, the model-implied plot points were calculated with standard deviations of -1 and 1 on both standardized negative self-referent information processing and standardized brooding scores.