Running Head: PEER RELATIONSHIPS AND DEPRESSION RISK

Brief Report: Preliminary evidence that co-rumination fosters adolescents' depression risk by
increasing rumination

Lindsey B. Stone¹ and Brandon E. Gibb²

¹Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine
Pittsburgh, PA, United States of America

²Department of Psychology, Binghamton University (SUNY)
Binghamton, NY, United States of America

Correspondence

Lindsey B. Stone, Ph.D.
University of Pittsburgh Medical School
Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic
3811 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Stonelb@upmc.edu
Phone: (412) 648-9438
Fax: (412) 383-5426

Brandon E. Gibb
Bgibb@binghamton.edu

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by National Institute of Mental Health grant F31 MH093019 awarded to Lindsey B. Stone and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development grant R01 HD057066 awarded to Brandon E. Gibb. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to stonelb@upmc.edu.

Abstract

Mounting research shows that the tendency to co-ruminate with peers regarding ongoing problems increases adolescents' depression risk; however, the means by which this interpersonal process fosters risk has not been identified. This said, theorists have proposed that co-rumination increases depression risk, in part, by increasing one's tendency to ruminate when alone. We tested this hypothesis in a study of 201 high-school freshmen who completed two assessments, six months apart. Supporting the proposed model, co-rumination predicted prospective increases in rumination and rumination predicted increases in depressive symptoms. The direct effect of co-rumination on depressive symptom change was not significant. Results indicate that co-rumination with friends may serve to increase rumination, which in turn increases depression risk.

Highlights:

- Mounting evidence supports co-rumination is a risk factor for depression in youth.
- Yet little is known about precise mechanisms by which co-rumination fosters risk.
- Co-rumination was found to increase depressive symptoms by increasing rumination.
- Findings help to bridge interpersonal and intrapersonal models of depression risk.

Keywords: co-rumination; depression; rumination; peer relationships; adolescence

Co-rumination involves the tendency to engage with peers in extensive negatively focused discussion, by rehashing one's reactions to ongoing problems (Rose, 2002). Despite the social benefits of increasing friendship quality (e.g., Rose, 2002; Rose, Carlson & Waller, 2007), there is growing evidence that co-rumination increases adolescents' risk for future depressive symptoms and diagnoses (Hankin, Stone, & Wright, 2010; Stone, Hankin, Gibb, & Abela, 2011). Although the precise mechanisms by which co-rumination increases depression are not known, Rose (2002) hypothesized that co-rumination increases youth's risk for emotional distress by reinforcing their tendency to ruminate on their own. There is preliminary cross-sectional support for this hypothesis (Rose, 2002) but it has not yet been tested prospectively.

The primary goal of this study was to provide a prospective test of Rose's (2002) mediation hypothesis. Focusing on a sample of high school freshmen assessed twice, 6 months apart, we predicted that levels of co-rumination assessed at the initial assessment would predict prospective changes in rumination over the follow-up and that initial levels of rumination would predict prospective changes in adolescents' depressive symptoms. Given some evidence that rumination may predict prospective increases in co-rumination (Jose, Wilkins & Spindel, 2012), we also tested for potential bi-directional influences between co-rumination and rumination.

Finally, co-rumination has been emphasized in adolescent girls' depression risk since it is more common of female friendships (e.g., Rose, 2002; Hankin et al., 2007). However, the majority of results show that, despite being more common in girls, both girls and boys who co-ruminate with peers are at heightened depression risk (Hankin et al., 2010; Stone et al., 2010; 2011; but see also Rose et al., 2007). Therefore, although we tested for gender differences and

gender moderation in this study, we did not anticipate any significant gender differences in the magnitudes of the associations between the variables in our model.

Method

Participants and procedure

Participants were freshman recruited from a local high school. Of 336 incoming students, 245 parental consent forms were completed, with 218 granting permission. Several students declined to participate or were absent, resulting in 201 participants. Attrition was low, with 192 (95%) students completing the follow-up assessment. The final sample of 201 freshmen was 51% female and 84% Caucasian. The average age was 14.16 ($SD = .44$). Students participated with parental consent and gave assent at the baseline assessment. Assessments were administered six months apart in group setting. Afterwards participants were entered into a lottery for a chance to win \$50-100 gift cards.

Measures

The Children's Depression Inventory (CDI; Kovacs, 1981) was used to assess depressive symptom levels. Consistent with what is typical in school-based research, the suicide item was omitted (α s: T1 = .88 and T2=.89).

The Co-Rumination Questionnaire (CRQ; Rose, 2002) was used to assess the extent to which participants co-ruminate with their best or closest friend. Participants responded to 27 items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" (1) to "Really true" (5). Co-rumination was calculated by averaging participants' ratings across the 27 items, (α s: T1= .97 and T2= .98)

The five-item brooding subscale of the Ruminative Responses Scale (RRS; Nolen-Hoeksema & Morrow, 1991; Treynor et al., 2003) was used to assess levels of brooding rumination, (α s: T1 = .86 and T2 = .80).

Results

Given the presence of some missing data at each assessment (6-7%), we examined if data were missing at random to justify data imputation methods for estimating missing values (Shafer & Graham, 2002). Little's missing completely at random (MCAR) test was non-significant, $\chi^2(892) = 906.57, p = .36$, supporting the imputation of missing values (Little & Rubin, 1987). Thus, maximum likelihood estimates of missing data were created and used in all analyses (Shafer & Graham, 2002). Descriptive statistics and correlations are presented in **Table 1**. Associations between co-rumination, rumination, and depressive symptoms were significant concurrently and across assessments. Girls exhibited higher levels of co-rumination than boys, but contrary to prediction there was no gender difference in rumination or depressive symptoms at either assessment.

We then used path analysis to test our model, following the steps outlined by MacKinnon and colleagues (2002) using AMOS (Arbuckle, 2010). For an indirect pathway between co-rumination and depressive symptoms via rumination to be supported, (i) the overall model has to provide a good fit to the data, and (ii) the indirect pathway (product of the $\alpha\beta$ coefficients) must be significant (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West & Sheets, 2002). The model is presented in **Figure 1**. In this two wave study the indirect path was as follows: co-rumination must predict a significant increase in rumination ($\alpha = T1CoRum \rightarrow T2Rum$) covarying for baseline rumination ($T1Rum \rightarrow T2Rum$), and rumination must predict a significant increase in depressive symptoms: ($\beta = T2Rum \rightarrow T2CDI$) covarying for baseline depression ($T1CDI \rightarrow T2CDI$; cf. Cole & Maxwell,

2003). In this model, all baseline predictors were allowed to correlate, as were the error terms of the endogenous, time two variables.

Our predicted indirect pathway model provided an excellent fit to the data: $\chi^2(4) = 4.79$, $p = .31$, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .04 (Hu & Bentler, 1999), with every specified path significant except for one error-covariance (**Figure 2**). Having established model fit, we next tested the significance of the indirect ($\alpha\beta$) path following the procedures outlined by MacKinnon et al, (2002). This indirect path was significant, $Z' = 1.63$, $p < .05$. Adding a direct pathway from Time 1 co-rumination to Time 2 depressive symptoms did not improve model fit, $\Delta\chi^2(1) = .52$, $p = .47$, and the path was not significant, standardized beta = .03, $p = .47$.¹

Next we considered whether there was a reciprocal effect, such that Time 1 rumination would also predict prospective increases in co-rumination from Time 1 to Time 2. The addition of this path also did not improve model fit, $\Delta\chi^2(1) = 1.89$, $p = .17$, and the path was not significant, unstandardized beta = .07, $p = .17$.

Finally, we conducted a multi-group comparison to determine if any of the paths in the model were moderated by adolescents' gender. Specifically, we compared a model in which the magnitudes of the paths were allowed to differ for boys and girls to one in which they were constrained to be equal between genders. The constrained model provided a satisfactory fit to the data, $\chi^2(20) = 22.76$, $p = .36$, CFI=.99, SRMR=.04, and did not fit significantly worse than the model in which the paths were allowed to vary, $\Delta\chi^2(10) = 5.45$, $p = .86$, indicating that the effects between co-rumination, rumination, and depressive symptoms did not significantly differ between girls and boys.

Discussion

The current study provides the first prospective test of whether co-rumination fosters youths' depression risk by increasing rumination (Rose, 2002). Co-rumination did not directly predict depressive symptom changes, but indirectly increased depressive symptoms by increasing adolescents' tendency to ruminate. Perhaps importantly, the reverse was not true; rumination did not predict prospective increases in the tendency to co-ruminate with one's friends. The results add to a growing body of research suggesting co-rumination is not merely a symptom of internal rumination, but actually serves to increase ruminative tendency. With rumination an established predictor of youths' depression (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco & Lyumbomirski, 2008), this strengthens the need to target co-rumination in adolescent depression interventions.

We should note that the indirect pathway model fit equally well for girls and boys in our sample. This is consistent with prior work showing that when present, co-rumination is equally maladaptive for both girls and boys (Hankin, Stone & Wright, 2010; Rose et al., 2002; Stone et al., 2010, 2011). Results also replicated the gender difference in co-rumination; however, in contrast to previous research, we did not observe a gender difference in rumination or depressive symptoms.

A key strength of this study was the prospective design and the focus on evaluating potential reciprocal relations between co-rumination and rumination. However, several limitations should also be noted. First, despite the strengths of the prospective design, it is ideal to test mediation models with three or more assessments. Second, the study focused exclusively on high school freshmen and a large age range would enable analysis of potential developmental differences in the links among these variables, which may be informative given that co-rumination emerges across late-childhood into adolescence coinciding with the emergence of

gender differences in depression (Hankin et al., 2010; Rose, 2002). Finally, we assessed co-rumination with participants' 'closest or best friend', but did not constrain analyses to stable, reciprocated dyads. The link between friendship stability and co-rumination has not been assessed and it is possible that the maladaptive effects of co-rumination may differ between reciprocated vs. non-reciprocated friendships. Future studies should explore these possibilities.

In summary, therefore, the current results provide important information about the temporal relation between co-rumination and rumination and suggest that co-rumination with one's friends may increase depression risk, in part, by increasing the tendency to ruminate by oneself outside of these discussions. At a broader level, these findings demonstrate how interpersonal vulnerabilities may impact intrapersonal risk factors for depression, providing additional potential targets for intervention.

Footnote

¹. A linear regression testing the direct effect of co-rumination on depressive symptom change (covarying only for baseline symptom levels) was also not significant, $t(198) = 1.03$, $p = .31$, $sr = .05$, and was not moderated by gender, $t(196) = .45$, $p = .65$).

References

- Arbuckle, J. L. (2010). IBM SPSS[®] AMOS[™] 19 User's Guide. Amos Development Corporation.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator– mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Calmes, C. A., & Roberts, J. E. (2008). Rumination in interpersonal relationships: Does co-rumination explain gender differences in emotional distress and relationship satisfaction among college students? *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 32, 577-590.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.
- Cole, D. A., & Maxwell, S. E. (2003). Testing mediational models with longitudinal data: Questions and tips in the use of structural equation modeling. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 112, 558-577.
- Furman, W., Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and Sex Differences in Perceptions of Networks of Personal Relationships. *Child Development*, 63, 103-115.
- Hankin, B. L., Abramson, L. Y., Moffitt, T. E., Silva, P. A., McGee, R., & Angell, K. E. (1998). Development of depression from preadolescence to young adulthood: emerging gender differences in a 10-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107, 128.
- Hankin, B. L., Stone, L. B., & Wright, P. A. (2010). Co-rumination, interpersonal stress generation, and internalizing symptoms: Accumulating effects and transactional influences in a multi-wave study of adolescents. *Development and Psychopathology*, 22, 217-235.

- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Jose, P. E., Wilkins, H., & Spendelow, J. S. (2012). Does social anxiety predict rumination and co-rumination among adolescents? *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 41(1), 86-91.
- Kovacs, M. (1981). Rating scales to assess depression in school-aged children. *Acta Paedopsychiatrica*, 46, 305–315.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Hoffman, J. (1998, June). A new method to test for mediation. In *annual meeting of the Society for Prevention Research, Park City, UT* (pp. 268-274).
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., & Sheets, V. (2002). A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 83–104.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyumbomirski, S. (2008). Rethinking Rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 400-424.
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 611–621.
- Rose, A. (2002). Co-rumination in the friendships of boys and girls. *Child Development*, 73, 1830-1843.

- Rose, A. J., Carlson, W., Waller, E. M. (2007). Prospective associations of Co-rumination with friendship and emotional adjustment: Considering the socioemotional trade-offs of co-rumination. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(4), 1019-1031.
- Schafer, J. L., & Graham, J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 147-177.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 290–312). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Stone, L. B., Hankin, B. L., Gibb, B. E., & Abela, J. R. Z. (2011). Co-rumination predicts the onset of depressive disorders during adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 120, 752-757.
- Stone, L. B., Uhrlas, D. J., & Gibb, B. E. (2010). Co-rumination and lifetime history of depressive disorders in children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 39, 597-602.
- Treynor, W., Gonzalez, R., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2003). Rumination reconsidered: A psychometric analysis. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 27, 247-259.

Table 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1 T1 CDI	—						7.60	7.98
2 T1 CoRum	.26***	—					2.38	0.90
3 T1 Rum	.48***	.28***	—				10.70	4.10
4 T2 CDI	.78***	.25***	.46***	—			7.60	7.00
5 T2 CoRum	.25***	.70***	.26***	.23***	—		2.45	0.97
6 T2 Rum	.37***	.29***	.59***	.48***	.37***	—	10.75	3.76
7 Gender	-.01	.35***	.06	-.05	.25***	.11	—	—

Note: T1, T2= Time 1 and Time 2 respectively. CDI= Children's Depression Inventory. RRS= Ruminative Response Style Scale. Gender: Boys = 0, Girls = 1. *** $p \leq .001$

Figure 1: Co-rumination indirect pathway model

Note: CoRum = Co-Rumination Questionnaire; Rum= Ruminative Responses, Brooding Subscale; CDI = Children's Depression Inventory.

Figure 2: Rumination acts as an intervening variable between baseline co-rumination and depressive symptom changes.

Values represent standardized betas.

* $p < .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$