This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Leach, Dawn M., Terry, Philip and Nikcevic, Ana (2018) The Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ): an examination of the psychometric properties in perinatal samples. Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 25(1), pp. 152-162., which has been published in final form at http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2149. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

# The Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ): An examination of the psychometric properties in perinatal samples

## Regular Article

Word count: 5,085 (excluding Abstract, tables and references)
Date of submission: 25/06/2017

Dawn M. Leach, MSc Kingston University, Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK

Phillip Terry, PhD Kingston University, Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK

Ana V. Nikčević\*, PhD Kingston University, Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK

## **June 2017**

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Leach DM, Terry P, Nikčević AV. The Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ): An examination of the psychometric properties in perinatal samples. Clin Psychol Psychother. 2017;1–11., which has been published in final form at <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2149">https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2149</a>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving."

Correspondence should be addressed to: \*Ana Nikčević, PhD, Department of Psychology, Kingston University, Kingston-Upon-Thames, KT1 2EE, United Kingdom. Tel. +44 (0)20 8417 2287, e-mail <u>A.Nikcevic@kingston.ac.uk</u>. **Abstract** 

**Background:** Identifying vulnerability to perinatal depression is an important public health issue (NICE, 2007). Risk factors include general and maternal-specific dysfunctional attitudes. Scales of maternal attitudes have a number of shortcomings. Further, it is not known whether antenatal maternal attitudes predict postnatal depression, independently of general dysfunctional attitudes (GDA). The aim of the current study was to examine the psychometric properties of the Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ; Moorhead, Owens, & Scott, 2003), and to establish, prospectively, the utility of the revised PRBO in predicting the symptoms of postnatal depression. Method: In study one, a cross-sectional sample of 344 participants, who were either pregnant or in the postnatal period, completed a battery of questionnaires assessing background factors, GDA, attitudes specific to motherhood (PRBO), and depression. In study two, a sample of 210 women completed a battery of questionnaires, including a measure of GDA, the PRBQ-8, and depression, on two occasions: early in the second trimester of pregnancy and postnatally. **Results:** Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported a one-factor, eight-item measure of maladaptive attitudes specific to motherhood (PRBQ-8). The PRBQ-8 was found to have good convergent, concurrent, and predictive validity and high internal and test-retest reliability. A hierarchical regression analysis revealed that antenatal PRBQ-8 scores predict the severity of postnatal depression symptoms, after controlling for background factors, antenatal depression, and GDA. Conclusions: The PRBQ-8 is a psychometrically sound measure of maternal attitudes that can be used antenatally to identify women at risk of postnatal depression.

Key words: cognitive style; maladaptive maternal attitudes; motherhood; perinatal depression.

## 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Perinatal depression: prevalence and predictors

Depression during the perinatal period is estimated to occur in approximately 13% of women (Bennett, Einarson, Taddio, Koren, & Einarson, 2004; O'Hara & Swain, 1996) with similar prevalence rates being reported during pregnancy and postnatally (Heron, O'Connor, Evans, Golding, & Glover, 2004). Perinatal depression is associated with a range of adverse outcomes for both mother and child (Brouwers, van Baar, & Pop, 2001; Murray & Cooper, 1996); hence, identifying risk factors for perinatal depression is an important public health issue (NICE, 2007). Despite decades of research, it remains contentious whether the perinatal period is a time of greater risk for the development of depression or not, with some researchers suggesting that the risk is not greater than at other times in life (Cox, Murray, & Chapman, 1993; O'Hara, 1994), and others reporting that the postpartum period is associated with an increased risk of psychiatric illness generally, and depression specifically (Eberhard -Gran, Eskild, Tambs, Samuelsen, & Opjordsmoen, 2002; Munk-Olsen, Laursen, Pedersen, Mors, & Mortensen, 2006). Furthermore, the evidence seems to concur that having a child constitutes a specific risk factor for some women, but not for others, and hence, that women depressed postnatally are cognitively heterogeneous (Church, Brechman-Toussaint, & Hine, 2005; Cooper & Murray, 1995; Warner, Appleby, Whitton, & Faragher, 1997).

A number of demographic (low income), social (past history of mental illness, absence of partner support, adverse life events and high perceived stress), and psychological risk factors (neuroticism, perfectionism, low self-esteem, cognitive style) for the development of antenatal and postnatal depression have been identified (Biaggi, Conroy, Pawlby, & Pariante, 2016; Eberhard ; Gracesettall,,20002); Leigh & Milgrom, 2008).

Most of these are also associated with depression, generally. It remains uncertain, however, whether there are additional vulnerabilities, specific to the perinatal period, that put at least some women at risk of developing depression.

## 1.2 Cognitive style and perinatal depression

The role of cognitive style and dysfunctional attitudes in depression is most comprehensively conceptualised within Beck's Cognitive Model of Depression (Beck, 1967). According to this model, individuals vulnerable to depression have maladaptive cognitive schemas, which are relatively stable and lay dormant, until triggered by stressful life events. Dysfunctional attitudes reflect the content of these relatively stable schemas and were initially conceptualised by Beck as a general cognitive vulnerability factor. The Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (DAS) was developed in order to assess the presence and intensity of general dysfunctional beliefs in depression (Weissman & Beck, 1978) and is focussed on themes of personal inadequacy, failure, and negative perceptions of the self, world, and future, with a more recent refinement of the DAS (i.e. DAS-A-17; de Graaf, Roelofs, & Huibers, 2009) providing evidence for the salience of two particular dimensions of general dysfunctional attitudes (GDA): 'perfectionism /performance evaluation' and 'need for approval by others.' However, subsequent empirical research has demonstrated that individuals at risk of depression may have dysfunctional attitudes in some, but not all, areas of their lives (de Graaf et al., 2009; Dyck, 1992; Hilsman & Garber, 1995). The particular stressors in these individuals' lives interact with these specific dysfunctional beliefs, increasing the risk for depression. While there is a debate as to whether dysfunctional attitudes are indicative of an enduring cognitive style predictive of depression (or are covariates of depression and, thus, state-dependent), a significant body of work has demonstrated an association between elevated GDA and depression (Dent & Teasdale, 1988; Reilly-Harrington, Alloy, Fresco, & Whitehouse, 1999).

The role of GDA in relation to perinatal depression has been examined across several studies. It has been reported that GDA are associated with antenatal depression (Leigh & Milgrom, 2008), and that they differentiate between depressed postnatal samples and healthy controls (Jones et al., 2010). They were also found to be significantly higher in postnatal women with a previous history of depression, compared to those with no previous depression history (Church, Brechman-Toussaint, & Hine, 2005). However, GDA do not differentiate between women with a history of major depression and those with a history of postnatal depression (PND; Jones et al., 2010). In line with evidence suggesting that postnatally depressed women are cognitively heterogeneous, it could be that GDA contribute to vulnerability to PND in some women, but that there is also a further subset of women in whom having a child acts as a specific stressor, which triggers maladaptive cognitions related to being, or becoming, a mother, increasing their risk for PND. As such, dysfunctional attitudes related to motherhood can both, independently or additively (together with GDA), and in interaction with other background factors, increase the chances of PND. 1.3 Dysfunctional attitudes related to motherhood and perinatal depression A number of researchers have reported that attitudes towards motherhood and parentingspecific beliefs are associated with perinatal depression. However, a range of shortcomings relating to these studies should be noted (see Table 1 for a summary of the existing measures and their limitations). Most of the existing measures provide only preliminary evidence of their construct validity, as no factor analytic methods were utilised to confirm the proposed themes/dimensions. Another significant shortcoming concerns the conceptual lack of clarity regarding what these maternal cognitions actually assess. Sockol and colleagues (2014) highlighted that some of the existing maternal attitudes scales measure women's expectations, representing beliefs concerning predictions of the future (e.g. I will be happy to have a baby) and/or experiences, representing situations individuals have experienced during

motherhood/pregnancy (e.g. I feel guilty when my baby cries), as well as attitudes, which, by definition, include an evaluative component (e.g. If my baby is unsettled, it is because I am a bad mother). Although optimistic expectations about motherhood have been associated with better adjustment postnatally (Coleman, Nelson, & Sundre, 1999; Green & Kafetsios, 1997), when real-life experiences are not as positive as one's expectations, optimistic expectations are no longer associated with well-being and the discrepancy may lead to increased symptoms of depression (Harwood, McLean, & Durkin, 2007).

To address these conceptual shortcomings, Sockol and colleagues (2014) developed the 12-item measure of dysfunctional maternal attitudes (AToM), consisting of three factors: beliefs about others' judgements, beliefs about maternal responsibility, and maternal role idealization. In cross-sectional samples of both primiparous and multiparous women, the AToM predicted both perinatal depression and anxiety (Sockol et al., 2014; Sockol & Battle, 2015). Preliminary evidence demonstrated that the AToM is a valid and reliable measure of maternal attitudes associated with perinatal depression, although not all three of their factors may have concurrent validity. A recently developed Rigidity of Maternal Beliefs Scale (RMBS; Thomason et al., 2015) also seems to highlight the role that maternal attitudes, relating to women's perceptions of their ability to 'mother' effectively, play in predicting postnatal depression. After controlling for antenatal depression levels, the 'maternal dichotomy' factor (a four-item factor focussing on attitudes related to what represents a good/bad parent/mother) was the only dimension that predicted postnatal depression levels; perceptions of societal expectations, role identify, and maternal confidence/efficacy were not predictive of PND.

1.4 GDA and maternal specific attitudes in predicting perinatal depressionOnly two studies, to date, have examined contemporaneously the contribution ofdysfunctional general and maternal-specific cognitions in predicting depression during the

perinatal period. Sockol and colleagues (2014) found that maternal beliefs were significantly associated with symptoms of perinatal depression, whilst taking into account GDA and interpersonal risk factors. Church and colleagues (2005) provided evidence using a postnatal sample that dysfunctional general and maternal cognitions may act as independent cognitive mediators of various risk factors for the development of PND, and, hence, that identifying different vulnerable risk profiles is important, so that they can be the target of psychological intervention. The limitation of both of these studies was that they used cross-sectional designs; therefore, determining whether dysfunctional general and maternal attitudes contributed causally to the development of depressive symptoms, or whether they simply reflected the symptoms of depression, could not be concluded with confidence.

## 1.5 Aims of our Study

The aims of our study were twofold: first, we wanted to examine and refine the psychometric properties of the Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ; Moorhead et al., 2003) to produce a revised and psychometrically sound scale of maternal attitudes, for use both antenatally and postnatally, to identify women with a vulnerable cognitive style that could put them at risk for depression. The PRBQ is 54-item questionnaire, which was developed to reflect the themes identified in antenatally and postnatally depressed women, such as concern about the maternal role, perceptions of coping ability, expectations about the behaviours of the new born, issues related to self-esteem, and relationship insecurity. These were suggested to represent vulnerability beliefs /attitudes, similar to those identified by the DAS, but more specific to motherhood. The authors reported preliminary evidence of its construct validity (the PRBQ scores correlated meaningfully with DAS and the Beck Depression Inventory scores) and high internal reliability. However, its length and the fact that it was developed on a very small sample limits its wider use with perinatal populations. Hence, our first goal was to refine this scale psychometrically and examine its factor structure, construct validity, and

reliability. Secondly, we wanted to establish the predictive utility of this revised PRBQ, using a longitudinal sample, whilst controlling for background factors and GDA. As such, our study would offer further empirical examination, to date only provided using cross-sectional samples, of whether both dysfunctional general and specific maternal attitudes play a role in predicting the severity of symptoms of depression during the postnatal period.

## Study 1: Item Analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis, and Reliability and Validity Analyses of the PRBO

## 2. Method

## 2.1 Participants

A total of 344 participants, ages 19-47 years, completed questionnaires at one-time point. A convenience sample was recruited online (n = 199, 57.8%) and a consecutive sample was recruited through St. Michael's Hospital, NHS North Bristol Trust's antenatal clinic waiting room (n = 145, 42.2%). Participants were included if they were 18 years of age or older, residing in the UK, could complete the questionnaires in English, and were either pregnant or had given birth in the last six months. Demographic characteristics of the participants are given in Table 2. Out of these 344 women, a further, randomly selected sample of 84 women were mailed the second version of the PRBQ 10 weeks after the first administration. Sixty-six participants (79% response rate) completed this second version the PRBQ-8 (mean time difference between sets = 12.49 weeks, SD = 1.92 weeks); of these, 13 were pregnant (19.7%) and 53 (80.3%) had given birth within the last six months.

## 2.2 Instruments

## 2.2.1 Measure of depression

The Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS; Cox, Holden, & Sagovsky, 1987) is a 10item questionnaire that measures women's depressive symptoms and can be used as a screening tool to identify women at risk for perinatal depression. Respondents are given 10 questions and are asked to choose the answer (scored 0-3) that most closely represents how they have been feeling over the last seven days, with higher scores representing greater depressed mood. The scale has sound psychometric properties and has been used widely in perinatal samples.

## 2.2.2 Measure of general dysfunctional attitudes

The Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (Form A) Revised (DAS-A-17; de Graaf et al., 2009) is a 17-item measure of the presence and intensity of general dysfunctional cognitive style, with two factors: perfectionism/performance evaluation and need for approval by others.

Respondents are asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statements using a seven-point Likert-style scale. Scores range from 17-119 and higher scores indicate more dysfunctional attitudes. Sound psychometric properties of the DAS-A-17 have been reported (de Graaf et al., 2009).

#### 2.2.3 Measures of dysfunctional beliefs specific to the perinatal period

The Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ: Moorhead et al., 2003) is a 54-item questionnaire in its preliminary stages of development used to measure beliefs about motherhood. Respondents are asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with each statement using a 7-point Likert-style scale, with answer options ranging from totally agree (1) to totally disagree (7). Higher scores indicate greater levels of dysfunctional attitudes towards motherhood.

The Attitudes towards Motherhood Scale (AToM; Sockol et al., 2014) is a 12-item questionnaire measuring women's attitudes towards motherhood using a six-point Likert-style scale. Scores range from 0-60, with higher scores representing more dysfunctional attitudes. The AToM has been tested with perinatal samples and possesses good psychometric properties (Sockol et al., 2014; Sockol & Battle, 2015)

## 2.2.4 Study-developed questionnaire

Questions were developed by the researchers to examine demographic factors, such as age, education, ethnicity, marital status, and parity. Past history of mental health difficulties was assessed via a single question asking participants to state whether they have ever consulted their GP or a mental health specialist for emotional difficulties and what problem it was.

Those who answered "yes" and listed a problem were deemed to have a past history of mental health difficulties (PHMHD).

#### 2.3 Procedure

Participants were recruited online through a brief advertisement posted on social media sites for mothers (e.g. Facebook groups for Bristol mothers) and mumsnet.com. The advertisement invited women, aged 18 and above, who were pregnant or had given birth within the last six months, to participate in the study on "maternal attitudes and depression;" those interested were invited to follow a hyperlink to view the information sheet and complete the questionnaires. Recruitment at the NHS North Bristol Trust St. Michael's Hospital took place in the antenatal clinic waiting room. Consecutive women who were 18 and older and attending the clinics were given an information sheet by the researcher. The information sheet outlined the purpose of the study, the anonymity of responses, and explained that consent would be assumed when participants submitted their responses. Women who expressed interest in participating were given the option to complete the questionnaire online or via hard copy. Participants who chose to complete the questionnaires online were emailed a hyperlink, directing them to the study's website, which contained the information sheet about the study, the consent page, and the battery of questionnaires. Participants who chose to complete a hardcopy were provided with a copy of the questionnaires and were asked to return them in the provided stamped and addressed return envelope at their leisure. All participants were given the option to enter into a draw to win one of two £50 Amazon vouchers.

Once the initial data had been collected and analysed, a random sample of women who entered the draw and provided their contact details, were invited via email to follow a hyperlink to complete an eight-item version of the PRBQ (PRBQ-8). Participants who completed the PRBQ-8 were entered into a draw to win a £10 Amazon voucher. Participants were included if they were still pregnant or had given birth within the last six months and if they completed the PRBQ-8 within four months after completing the first set of questionnaires. This research project was approved by both the National Health Service (NHS) Ethics Committee Board and the University ethics committee.

## 3. Results

## 3.1 Principal components analysis

Following the initial scrutiny and elimination of incomplete responses or those completed within an unreasonably short time period (for internet-based responses), we were left with 344 completed questionnaires. From the 54-item PRBQ, we first eliminated items that did not represent attitudes, but expectancies (n = 5; e.g. "After my baby is born, I will never be lonely in my life again"), or were tapping into general, rather than attitudes specific to motherhood (n = 7; e.g. "I should be able to control how I feel"). One item that participants reported to be difficult to understand ("I should be able to bring on milk if I want to") was also eliminated. Items with the inadequate facility index (n = 4) and those with low item-total correlations (<0.3) were also eliminated (n = 17). A principal components factor analysis (PCFA), using SPSS v.23 (SPSS, 2015) was conducted on the remaining 20 items of the PRBQ, using an oblique rotation method (direct oblimin). Based on an analysis of the scree plot, and the eigen values, three factors were retained, accounting for 46.73% of the cumulative variance. Because questions 28 and 38 were very similar ("If my baby was unhappy, it would be because of something I had not done" and "If my baby is unhappy, I will feel that it is my fault"), the item with the lower factor loading, item 28, was removed.

coefficient ( $\alpha = .60$ ).

The PCFA with oblique rotation (direct oblimin) was repeated on the scale with 19 items. Based on an analysis of the scree plot and the eigen values, three factors were retained, with eigen values of 5.19, 2.21, and 1.51, accounting for 46.87% of the cumulative variance. Items that loaded less than .4 on any of the factors were discarded. If an item loaded more than .4 on one factor, and also loaded on another factor within approximately .2 of the loading on the first factor, it was also discarded. This procedure led to the removal of five items, leaving a 14-item, three-factor structure scale. Table 3 shows the factor loadings, after rotation.

3.2 Reliability and validity

Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was used to calculate reliability. The first factor, representing attitudes specific to motherhood and consisting of eight items ( $\alpha$  = .86), demonstrated high reliability. The reliability analysis of the second factor ( $\alpha$  = .57), representing idealistic attitudes towards motherhood, showed that if item 25 were removed, reliability would be slightly improved. After removing item 25, the remaining two items in factor two still possessed a low reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$  = .63). The three items in the third factor, representative of attitudes towards changes in one's body, also had a weak reliability

A series of Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests suggested that study variables significantly differed from normality. Consequently, a series of non-parametric, Spearman's Rho correlation analyses were conducted to examine the association between the three factors of the PRBQ and the EPDS, AToM, and DAS-A-17 scores. Results of the correlation analyses, along with the means, standard deviations, and ranges for our variables of interest are presented in Table 4. Factor one (eight items) was strongly associated with our outcomes of interest: EPDS, DAS-A-17, and AToM. Factor two (two items) was not significantly correlated with either the EPDS or the DAS-A-17, and was only weakly associated with the

AToM. Factor three (three items) also revealed weak correlations with EPDS, DAS, and AToM scores.

Because of the poor reliability indices of the two factors, the lack of meaningful relationship with our outcomes of interest, and the lack of theoretical association with attitudes specific to motherhood that are linked to depression, these factors were discarded from the final version of the PRBQ. Subsequent analyses were carried out on the first factor, labelled 'attitudes specific to motherhood', which formed the PRBQ-8. Temporal stability of the PRBQ-8 was examined using a test-retest reliability analysis. Mean PRBQ-8 scores between time one and time two were highly correlated (r = .70, p < .001 the PRBQ-8 is reliable over time. Spearman's Rho correlational analyses showed the PRBQ-8 was significantly correlated with the EPDS, DAS, and the AToM (see Table 4), demonstrating convergent and concurrent validity.

## 3.3 Predictive validity of the PRBQ-8

In order to test predictive validity, we ran a regression analysis in which the EPDS scores were the dependent variable and the predictor variables were entered stepwise in the following order: demographics, PHMHD, DAS-A-17 scores, and PRBQ-8 scores. The results showed that the regression model was significant: F(9, 334) = 25.04; p < .001; R = .64, explaining 40.3% of the variance in depression scores. The PRBQ-8 was the strongest predictor of depression symptoms, followed by GDA, and PHMHD (Table 5).

### 3.4 Predictive validity of the AToM

We run an additional regression analysis using AToM as the measure of the maternal attitudes in order to compare the predictive relationship between the PRBQ-8 and EPDS, to the previously validated AToM questionnaire. The predictor variables were entered in the following order: demographics, PHMHD, DAS-A-17, and AToM scores; EPDS was the outcome variable. This regression model was significant: F(8,335) = 26.40; p < .001; R = 1.00

.62; it explained 38.7% of the variance in depression scores. In this model, GDA ( $\beta$  = .38, p < .001) was the strongest predictor of depression symptoms, followed by PHMHD ( $\beta$  = -.23, p < .001), and finally the AToM ( $\beta$  = .20, p = .001).

## Study 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and predictive validity of the PRBQ-8

## 4. Introduction

In order to further validate the PRBQ-8, we examined the construct validity of the scale, using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Additionally, using longitudinal data, we tested whether antenatal PRBQ-8 scores would predict postnatal depression scores, after controlling for sociodemographic factors, antenatal depressive symptoms, and GDA.

## 5. Method

## 5.1 Participants

A consecutive sample of participants (n = 210), aged 19-41 years, were recruited from St. Michaels Hospital, NHS North Bristol Trust and completed a battery of questionnaires at two time points: the second trimester (M =14.43 weeks gestation; SD = 1.65) and postnatally (M = 7.21 weeks after birth; SD = 1.97). The majority were Caucasian (92.9%), educated to least A-levels (87.6%), employed (84.3%), and married (67.1%). For the CFA, we randomly selected PRBQ-8 antenatal (n = 104) and postnatal responses (n = 106), ensuring a cross-sectional sample.

### 5.2 Instruments

## 5.2.1 Measure of depression

The EPDS, described in study one, was used to measure perinatal depressive symptoms.

## 5.2.2 Measure of maternal attitudes

The PRBQ-8 was used to measure maladaptive maternal attitudes. Each of eight statements is rated on a 7-point Likert-style scale, ranging from (1) totally agree to (2) totally disagree.

Total scores range from 7-56; higher scores indicate greater levels of maladaptive attitudes towards motherhood.

## 5.2.3 Study-developed questionnaire.

Questions were developed by the researchers to examine demographic factors, such as age, education, ethnicity, marital status, and parity, as reported in Study 1.

## 5.3 Procedure

The recruitment was conducted at the NHS North Bristol Trust St. Michael's Hospital and followed the same procedure as described in Study 1 (only hospital-based recruitment) and with the same study inclusion criteria. Women who agreed to participate and signed the consent form, were given the option to complete the questionnaire online or via hard copy. Participants were offered a £5 Amazon voucher after completion of the second questionnaire. This research project was approved by both the National Health Service (NHS) Ethics Committee Board and University ethics committee.

#### 6. Results

## 6.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to test the fit of the model using AMOS v. 23 (Arbuckle, 2014). Five indices were utilised to evaluate the fit of the model: Chi-square measure of fit, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and p of Close Fit (PCLOSE). The following criteria were adopted in the interpretation of the findings (Lei & Wu, 2007): A non-significant chi-square p-value indicates a failure to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting the model fits the data. The CFI is a goodness of fit index that is used to supplement Chi-square, adjusting for the effect of sample size; a CFI value greater than .95 indicates a good fit. For the SRMR and RMSEA, as absolute fit indices that measure the extent to which the model reproduces the sample covariance matrix, lower values indicate

better model-data fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggest the following criteria for good data-model fit: SRMR less than or equal to .08 and RMSEA less than or equal to .06. PCLOSE is used to test whether the RMSEA is greater than .05. A non-significant PCLOSE value indicates a close fitting model (Lei & Wu, 2007). The confirmatory factor analysis performed on our data confirmed the single factor structure of the PRBQ-8 and showed that the eight item, one factor model, is a good fit to the data,  $x^2(20) = 23.64$ , p = .26, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .03, RMSEA = .03, PCLOSE = .76.

## 6.2 Predictive validity of PRBQ-8

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the incremental predictive validity of the PRBQ-8, after controlling for demographic variables, antenatal depressive symptoms, and GDA. Correlations and descriptive statistics for the variables in the model are given in Table 6. Postnatal EPDS scores were the dependent variable and the predictor variables were entered in the stepwise fashion. The final regression model was significant: F(8, 201) = 16.14; p < .001; R = .62.5, explaining 39.1% of the variance in postnatal depression scores. After taking into account demographic variables, antenatal depression symptoms, GDA, and dysfunctional attitudes specific to the perinatal period, only antenatal depression and the PRBQ-8 significantly predicted postnatal depression symptoms (see Table 7).

#### 7. Discussion

## 7.1 Psychometric Properties of the PRBQ-8

Our psychometric examination of the revised version (PRBQ-8) of the PRBQ (Moorhead et al., 2003) offers evidence that this is a valid and reliable instrument of maternal attitudes. The scale has face validity, as its items tap into attitudes towards the maternal role and what it means to be a 'bad' or a 'good' mother. An exploratory factor analysis of the 19-item PRBQ yielded three factors, of which only one demonstrated construct validity and satisfactory

reliability. The confirmatory factor analysis conducted on the PRBQ-8 supported a one-factor, eight-item measure. The PRBQ-8 demonstrated strong internal and temporal consistency and was significantly associated with the EPDS, the DAS-A-17, and the AToM, demonstrating convergent and concurrent validity. The PRBQ-8 also demonstrated strong predictive validity in both cross-sectional and longitudinal samples. In the longitudinal sample the PRBQ-8 antenatal scores significantly predicted postnatal depressive symptoms, after taking into account demographic variables, antenatal depression, and GDA.

## 7.1 Predictors of Perinatal Depression: GDA and maternal attitudes

Our results, based on cross-sectional data, suggest that amongst demographic variables only, lower educational status was significantly associated with perinatal depression levels, a finding commonly reported by other researchers (O'Hara & Swain, 1996; Rubertsson, Wickberg, Gustavsson, & Rådestad, 2005). In line with previous findings (Biaggi et al., 2016; Leigh & Milgrom, 2008), a reported history of mental health difficulties was also associated with perinatal depression symptoms. Our data support the notion that GDA represent a vulnerability factor for perinatal depressive symptomatology, a finding recently reported by Sockol and colleagues (2014). The particular aspects of GDA assessed in the current study were perfectionism/performance evaluation and need for approval by others, which have also been found to predict depression in the general population (Beck, 2002; Zuroff, Blatt, Sanislow, Bondi, & Pilkonis, 1999).

The results, based on the cross-sectional sample, supported our hypothesis that maternal attitudes would add incrementally to the explained variance in depression scores, after GDA were taken into account. It was therefore surprising that in our longitudinal study antenatal GDA scores were not predictive of postnatal depression symptoms, whilst antenatal attitudes specific to motherhood remained a significant predictor, even after controlling for background factors, antenatal depression, and GDA. Antenatal depression is commonly

reported as one of the most significant predictors of postnatal depression (Biaggi et al., 2016; Leigh & Milgrom, 2008; O'Hara & Swain, 1996). Consistent with Beck's theory (Beck, 2002), specific dysfunctional beliefs activated by relevant stressors, may be more relevant in predicting depression than GDA. Our results suggest that in the context of parenting-related stressors during pregnancy and the postnatal period, holding dysfunctional beliefs about motherhood and, specifically, what it means to be a good or bad mother, may be of greater importance than holding more general dysfunctional attitudes, such as perfectionism and attitudes relating to the need of approval by others. This is a novel finding, as no study, to date, has demonstrated the importance of maternal-specific attitudes in predicting postnatal depression levels prospectively, whilst taking into account background factors, symptoms of antenatal depression, and GDA.

A closer examination into the content of the PRBQ-8 reveals that most of the items typify attitudes relating to motherhood that are of a conditional nature, "if... then," which Beck termed conditional assumptions. These "if ...then" propositions give rise to 'rules' of how one must, or should, be. Overly rigid and inflexible cognitions regarding what makes a good or a bad mother, likely give rise to negative evaluations of oneself as a mother. Feelings of inadequacy may be triggered which, in turn, may activate ruminative thinking concerning one's own competency as a mother, further undermining the woman's confidence in her mothering ability and triggering low mood. Similar themes of dichotomous attitudes and judgements by the self and others stand out as particularly meaningful in previously-developed measures of dysfunctional attitudes specific to the perinatal period: the AtoM (Sockol et al., 2014) and the RMBS scale (Thomason et al., 2015). In both of these scales, subscales that tap into dichotomous thinking and judgments of what constitutes a good or bad parent were most strongly associated with perinatal depression symptoms, compared to other factors tapping into maternal role idealisation or role identity.

These findings have clear therapeutic implications. The PRBQ-8 could be added to antenatal screening measures (such as the EPDS) aimed at identifying women at risk of PND. The PRBQ-8 offers additional benefits compared to the EPDS; high EPDS antenatal scores indicate presence of depressive symptomatology, which represents a vulnerability risk factor for postnatal depression. However, the EPDS does not identify the presence of cognitive vulnerability in the form of maladaptive maternal attitudes to perinatal depression, which our study shows, independently contributes to the prediction of postnatal depression symptomatology, independently of antenatal depression severity. Where such maladaptive maternal beliefs are identified through the use of the PRBQ-8, therapies aimed at modifying unhelpful maternal beliefs could be initiated during the antenatal period. Future studies could establish whether a change in these maternal beliefs would be associated with lower likelihood of incidence of depression during the postnatal period and, thus, contribute to the development of maternal 'resilience' in the face of parenting challenges.

## 7.3 Limitations

There are a number of limitations to note. First, data are based on self-report questionnaires, which may be subject to social desirability, self-report errors, and poor recall. Future research could use more objective measures of mood problems, as well as objective records of PHMHD. Second, the use of a snowball recruitment method (in part, in Study 1) may lead to a selective sample. Third, the participants in our two studies are not representative of the general population as there was a disproportionately higher level of Caucasian participants present in the sample, as well as those who were educated to a degree level. Future research, using a more diverse sample, is required in order to ascertain cultural and linguistic generalisability of our findings.

Despite the above limitations, the current study extends our understanding of the role of dysfunctional maternal attitudes in predicting the symptoms of perinatal depression and

offers a new, brief assessment tool, i.e. the PRBQ-8, as a valid and reliable instrument for the assessment of such attitudes. The brevity and ease of completion of the PRBQ-8 make it particularly suitable for use as a screening instrument for identification of unhelpful maternal attitudes during the antenatal period. Women identified as holding such attitudes could be offered cognitive interventions aimed at attitude modification, which, in turn, may reduce their risk of developing depression postnatally. If the PRBQ-8 is to be used in routine care as a tool for identifying pregnant women at an increased risk of developing postnatal depression, normative data and cut-off scores for the likely occurrence of a future episode of postnatal depression should be established.

## References

- Affonso, D. D., Mayberry, L. J., Lovett, S. M., & Paul, S. (1994). Cognitive adaptation to stressful events during pregnancy and postpartum: Development and testing of the CASE instrument. *Nursing Research*, *43*(6), 338-343.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2014). Amos, Version 23.0. Chicago, IL: IBM SPSS.
- Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Beck, A. T. (2002). Cognitive models of depression. *Clinical advances in cognitive* psychotherapy: Theory and application, 14(1), 29-61.
- Bennett, H., Einarson, A., Taddio, A., Koren, G., & Einarson, T. (2004). Prevalence of depression during pregnancy: Systematic review. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 103, 698-709.
- Biaggi, A., Conroy, S., Pawlby, S., & Pariante, C. M. (2016). Identifying the women at risk of antenatal anxiety and depression: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 191, 62-77.

- Brouwers, E. P., van Baar, A. L., & Pop, V. J. (2001). Maternal anxiety during pregnancy and subsequent infant development. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 24(1), 95-106.
- Church, N. F., Brechman-Toussaint, M. L., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Do dysfunctional cognitions mediate the relationship between risk factors and postnatal depression symptomatology? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 87(1), 65-72.
- Coleman, P., Nelson, E. S., & Sundre, D. L. (1999). The relationship between prenatal expectations and postnatal attitudes among first-time mothers. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, *17*(1), 27-39.
- Cooper, P. J., & Murray, L. (1995). Course and recurrence of postnatal depression. Evidence for the specificity of the diagnostic concept. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *166*(2), 191-195.
- Cox, J. L., Murray, D., & Chapman, G. (1993). A controlled study of the onset, duration and prevalence of postnatal depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *163*(1), 27-31.
- Cox, J., Holden, J. & Sagovsky, R. (1987). Detection of postnatal depression: development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 140, 111-117.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297-334.
- de Graaf, L. E, Roelofs, J., & Huibers, M. J. (2009). Measuring dysfunctional attitudes in the general population: The Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (form A) revised. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 33, 345-355.
- Dent, J., & Teasdale, J. D. (1988). Negative cognition and the persistence of depression.

  \*Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97(1), 29.
- Dyck, M. J. (1992). Subscales of the dysfunctional attitude scale. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *31*(3), 333-335.

Eberhard (200) M., Eskild, A., Tai

Depression in postpartum and non

Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 106(6), 426-433.

- Green, J. M., & Kafetsios, K. (1997). Positive experiences of early motherhood: Predictive variables from a longitudinal study. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 15(2), 141-157.
- Harwood, K., McLean, N., & Durkin, K. (2007). First-time mothers' expectations of parenthood: What happens when optimistic expectations are not matched by later experiences? *Developmental Psychology*, 43(1), 1.
- Heron, J., O'Connor, T., Evans, J., Golding, J. & Glover, V. (2004). The course of anxiety and depression through pregnancy and the postpartum in a community sample.

  Journal of Affective Disorders, 80, 65-73.
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Ediger, E. (1996). Perfectionism and depression: Longitudinal assessment of a specific vulnerability hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105(2), 276.
- Hilsman, R., & Garber, J. (1995). A test of the cognitive diathesis-stress model of depression in children: Academic stressors, attributional style, perceived competence, and control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 370.
- 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.
- Jones, L., Scott, J., Cooper, C., Forty, L., Smith, K. G., Sham, P., ... & Jones, I. (2010).
  Cognitive style, personality and vulnerability to postnatal depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 196(3), 200-205.

-postpartum wo

- Kumar, R., Robson, K. M., & Smith, A. M. R. (1984). Development of a self-administered questionnaire to measure material adjustment and material attitudes during pregnancy and after delivery. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 28(1), 43-51.
- Lei, P. W., & Wu, Q. (2007). Introduction to structural equation modelling: Issues and practical considerations. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26(3), 33-43.
- Leigh, B., & Milgrom, J. (2008). Risk factors for antenatal depression, postnatal depression and parenting stress. *BMC Psychiatry*, 8, 24-35.
- Madar, A. (2013). Maternal Attitudes and Beliefs Scale: Development and piloting.

  \*Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 78, 415-419.
- Moorhead, S., Owens, J. & Scott, J. (2003). Developing and piloting of the Pregnancy

  Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ). *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*,

  31, 207-213.
- Munk-Olsen, T., Laursen, T. M., Pedersen, C. B., Mors, O., & Mortensen, P. B. (2006). New parents and mental disorders: A population-based register study. *Jama*, 296(21), 2582-2589.
- Murray, L. & Cooper, P. (1996). The impact of postpartum depression on child development.

  \*International Review of Psychiatry, 8, 55-63.
- NICE (2007). Antenatal and postnatal mental health; clinical management and service guidelines. Retrieved from http://www.guidance.nice.org.uk/cg45
- O'Hara, M. W. (1994). Postpartum depression: Identification and measurement in a crosscultural context. *Perinatal psychiatry: Use and misuse of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. London: Gaskell*, 145-68.
- O'Hara, M. & Swain, A. (1996). Rates and risk of postpartum depression: a meta-analysis.

  International Review of Psychiatry, 8, 37-54.

- Reilly-Harrington, N. A., Alloy, L. B., Fresco, D. M., & Whitehouse, W. G. (1999).

  Cognitive styles and life events interact to predict bipolar and unipolar symptomatology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 108(4), 567.
- Rubertsson, C., Wickberg, B., Gustavsson, P., & Rådestad, I. (2005). Depressive symptoms in early pregnancy, two months and one year postpartum-prevalence and psychosocial risk factors in a national Swedish sample. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 8(2), 97-104.
- Sockol, L., & Battle, C. (2015). Maternal attitudes, depression, and anxiety in pregnant and postpartum multiparous women. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 18, 585-593.
- Sockol, L., Epperson, N., & Barber, J. (2014). The relationship between maternal attitudes and symptoms of depression and anxiety among pregnant and postpartum first-time mothers. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, *17*, 199-212.
- SPSS, I. (2012). Statistics for windows, version 20.0. IBM Corp., Armonk, NY.
- Thomason, E., Flynn, H., Himle, J., & Volling, B. (2015). Are women's parenting-specific beliefs associated with depressive symptoms in the perinatal period? Development of the Rigidity of Maternal Beliefs Scale. *Depression and Anxiety*, *32*(2), 141-148.
- Warner, R., Appleby, L., Whitton, A., & Faragher, B. (1997). Attitudes toward motherhood in postnatal depression: Development of the maternal attitudes questionnaire. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 43(4), 351-358.
- Weissman, A. N., & Beck, A. T. (1978). Development and validation of the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale: A preliminary investigation. Retrieved 6 June, 2016 from <a href="http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED167619">http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED167619</a>
- Zuroff, D. C., Blatt, S. J., Sanislow III, C. A., Bondi, C. M., & Pilkonis, P. A. (1999).
  Vulnerability to depression: Reexamining state dependence and relative stability.
  Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 108(1), 76.

Table 1. Summary of Measures on Maternal Cognition

No	Measure	Design & Sample	Items, factors themes	Validity	Reliability	Limitations
1	Maternal	Cross-sectional;	60-items representing beliefs	Criterion	Test-retest	No factor analysis; no
	Adjustment &	119 primiparous	regarding body image, somatic	validity	and split half	information relating to
	Maternal Attitudes	women in early	symptoms, marital relationship,		reliability	concurrent or predictive
	(MAMA; Kumar,	pregnancy	attitudes towards sex, attitudes		were	validity; internal
	Robson, & Smith;		towards pregnancy/the baby		acceptable	reliability was not
	1984)					reported; Long
						questionnaire
2.	Cognitive	Longitudinal;	37-items; one factor: items	Factor analysis;	High internal	The scale assesses the
	Adaptation to	202 women from	assess cognitive adaptation to	Predictive,	reliability	frequency of engagement
	Stressful Events	early pregnancy	threatening events using	discriminant,		in self-questioning
	during Pregnancy	to postpartum	dimensions of meaning, mastery	and convergent		relating to adaptation to
	(CASE; Affonso,		and self-esteem	validity		pregnancy and
	Mayberry, Lovett,					postpartum rather than
	& Paul, 1994)					attitudes related to
						motherhood

3	Maternal Attitudes Questionnaire (MAQ: Warner et al., 1997)	Cross-sectional; 483 post-partum women	14 items representing expectations of motherhood, expectations of the self, as a mother, and role conflicts	Concurrent and discriminant validity	High internal reliability	No factor analysis; Restricted to use in the postnatal period
4	Pregnancy Related Beliefs Questionnaire (PRBQ; Moorhead et al., 2003)	Cross-sectional; 41 pregnant women	54 items representing beliefs about the maternal role, perceptions of changing body image, expectations about the behaviours of new-borns, and relationship insecurity	Concurrent and criterion validity	High internal reliability	Small sample size; No factor analysis; Long questionnaire
5	Maternal Attitudes & Beliefs Scale (MABS; Madar, 2013)	Cross-sectional; 36 pregnant & 32 postnatal women	55 items, themes of irrationality, rationality, demandingness, self-downing, frustration tolerance, & awfulizing	Concurrent and convergent validity	High internal reliability	Small sample sizes; No factor analysis; Long questionnaire; High correlations (.7095) between MABS and EPDS and BDI-II, suggest conceptual overlap

## RUNNING HEAD: Maternal attitudes and perinatal depression

6	Attitudes towards	Cross-sectional;	12 items, EFA and CFA	Concurrent and	High internal	Concurrent validity was
	Motherhood Scale	381 pregnant &	confirmed three factors: beliefs	convergent	reliability	not reported for each
	(AToM; Sockol,	postnatal women	about other's judgements,	validity		factor
	Epperson, &		beliefs about maternal			
	Barber, 2014;		responsibility, and maternal role			
	Sockol & Battle,		idealization			
	2015)					
7	The Rigidity of	Longitudinal; 113	24 items; EFA four factor	Discriminant,	Good internal	Role identity factor had
	Maternal Beliefs	women from early	solution: perceptions of societal	convergent, and	and test-retest	low internal reliability in
	Scale (RMBS;	pregnancy to	expectations, role identify,	predictive	reliability	postnatal sample ( $\alpha = .51$ )
	Thomason, Flynn,	postpartum	maternal confidence/efficacy,	validity		
	Himle, & Volling,		and maternal dichotomy			
	2015)					

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of study one participants (N = 344)

	N	%	
Ethnicity			
Caucasian	310	90.1	
Asian	11	3.2	
Hispanic	11	3.2	
Black	5	1.5	
Mixed	5	1.5	
Other	2	.6	
Education			
O levels/GCSE or equivalent	35	10.2	
A levels or equivalent	70	20.4	
University degree	136	39.7	
Postgraduate degree	101	29.4	
No answer	1	.3	
Employment status			
Employed full time	199	57.8	
Employed part-time	71	20.6	
Homemaker	50	14.5	
Student	5	1.5	
Unemployed	4	1.2	
Other	15	4.4	
Marital status			
Married	220	64	
Not married	124	36	
Pregnancy status			
Pregnant	213	61.9	
Postpartum	131	38.1	
<u>Children</u>			
Primiparous	167	48.5	
Multiparous	177	51.5	
<u>PHMHD</u>			
Yes	146	42.4	

Table 3. Rotated factor loadings from the 19-item PRBQ exploratory factor analysis.

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1.	If some else's baby is happier than mine, it is	.88		
	probably because I am an inadequate mother			
2.	If I am unable to satisfy my baby, I am a bad mother	.88		
3.	If I can't look after my baby properly, it shows I am	.83		
1	useless  If I do not feel maternal, it means I am bad	.74		
4.	ii i do not reel maternal, it means i am bad	./4		
5.	If my baby is unhappy, I will feel that it is my fault	.68		
6.	If I do not feel completely emotionally attached to	.55		
	my baby, I should worry about what this means			
7.	If someone important pays me less attention after	.52		
	the birth, it is because the baby is more important to			
	them than I am			
8.	I am as enthusiastic as I should be about my role as	51		
	a mother			
9.	I should appreciate every single moment of the early		.69	
	part of my baby's life			
10	. I have to do all it takes to make my baby completely		.69	
	happy			
11	. Motherhood is an instinctive and natural state for a woman		.62	
12	. I should try hard to keep my figure during			.82
	pregnancy			
13	. I have got to do regular exercise after the birth to			.78
	get my figure back			
14	. I welcome the changes in my body, even those like			58
	odours (not including any illnesses)			

Table 4. Correlations and descriptive statistics for study one variables (N = 344)

Descriptive statistics of study variables						
	Mean	SD		Range	Cron	bach's α
EPDS	8.53	5.38		0-29	.89	
DAS-A-17	49.05	18.14		17-96	.93	
PRBQ factor 1	25.44	9.14		8-54	.86	
PRBQ factor 2	11.68	3.68		3-20	.63	
PRBQ factor 3	11.17	2.39		4-14	.60	
AToM	24.99	10.93		0-59	.88	
	Sp	earman's Rho	Correlat	ions		
	EPDS	DAS-A-17	PRBQ-8	PRBQ	PRBQ	AToM
				factor 2	factor 3	
DAS-A-17	.52 **	1				
PRBQ factor 1	.49**	.75**	1			
PRBQ factor 2	.07	.01	.11*	1		
PRBQ factor 3	.19**	.34**	.26**	.02	1	
AToM	.41 **	.57**	.71**	.33 **	.18**	1

<sup>\*</sup>*p* < .05

<sup>\*\*</sup>p<.01

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis assessing the incremental predictive validity of the PRBQ-8 (factor 1) with EPDS as the outcome variable

Block of variables									
Model	R <sup>2</sup>	F(df)	Sig of F						
1	.04	2.01 (336)	.06						
2	.15	8.63 (335)	<.001						
3	.36	24.00 (334)	<.001						
4	.40	25.04 (333)	<.001						
	dual variables in								
eta t $p$									
Model 1									
Age	12	-2.11	.04						
Education	.03	.57	.57						
Ethnicity	07	-1.27	.20						
Marital status	.05	.88	.38						
Pregnant vs postpartum	.13	2.44	.02						
Parity	.07	1.14	.26						
Model 2									
Age	13	-2.37	.02						
Education	.06	1.13	.26						
Ethnicity	09	-1.73	.09						
Marital status	.04	.66	.51						
Pregnant vs postpartum	.10	1.97	.05						
Parity	.04	.83	.41						
PHMHD	35	-6.83	<.001						
Model 3									
Age	02	34	.73						
Education	10	-2.07	.04						
Ethnicity	06	-1.48	.16						
Marital status	.03	.69	.49						
Pregnant vs postpartum	.01	.27	.79						
Parity	.02	.38	.70						
PHMHD	22	-4.88	<.001						
DAS-A-17	.51	10.57	<.001						
Model 4									
Age	01	12	.91						
Education	10	-2.02	.04						
Ethnicity	06	-1.48	.14						
Marital status	.02	.39	.69						
Pregnant vs postpartum	.00	.03	.97						
Parity	.02	.44	.66						
PHMHD	22	-4.88	<.001						
DAS-A-17	.28	4.10	<.001						
PRBQ-8	.31	4.64	<.001						

Note: N=344, Age and Education were entered as continuous variables; Ethnicity: Non-white = 1, White = 2; Marital status: Married = 1, Not married = 2; Pregnant vs postpartum: Currently pregnant = 1, Given birth in the last six months = 2; Parity: First child = 1, Not first child = 2; PHMHD = Past history of mental health difficulties: Yes = 0, No = 1; DAS-A-17 = Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale-Revised; PRBQ-8 = Pregnancy-Related Beliefs Questionnaire-8; EPDS = Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale

Table 6. Correlations and descriptive statistics for study two variables (N=210)

Descriptive statistics of study variables								
Mean SD Range Cronbach's α								
Antenatal PRBQ-8	26.16	9.14	8-53	.85				
Antenatal DAS-A-17	46.40	16.89	17-102	.92				
Antenatal EPDS	6.68	4.83	0-23	.86				
Postnatal PRBQ-8	24.87	9.80	8-53	.87				
Postnatal EPDS	6.94	4.73	0-25	.87				
	Spearn	nan's Rho Corre	lations					
	Antenatal	Antenatal	Postnatal	Postnatal				
	DAS-A-17	EPDS	PRBQ-8	EPDS				
Antenatal PRBQ-8	.64**	.45**	.66**	.38**				
Antenatal DAS-A-17	1	.37	.50	.36				
Antenatal EPDS		1	.37	.59				
Postnatal PRBQ-8			1	.54				

<sup>\*\*</sup>p<.01

Postnatal EPDS

1

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis assessing the incremental predictive validity of antenatal PRBQ-8 scores on postnatal depression

Model   R²   F(df)   Sig of F	Block of variables									
1       .04       1.55 (204)       .18         2       .37       19.82 (203)       <.001         3       .38       17.47 (202)       <.001         4       .39       16.14 (201)       <.001         Individual variables in final equation         β       r       p         Model 1         Age       .03       .36       .72         Education       .17       2.20       .03         Ethnicity      08       -1.11       .27         Marital status       .11       1.42       .16         Parity       .04       .47       .64         Model 2       .2       .4       .22         Education       .09       1.41       .16         Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001         Model 3       .25       .21       Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78       .78 <th>Model</th> <th>R<sup>2</sup></th> <th>F(df)</th> <th>Sig of F</th>	Model	R <sup>2</sup>	F(df)	Sig of F						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	.04	1.55 (204)							
Individual variables in final equation           β         t         p           Model I           Age         .03         .36         .72           Education         .17         2.20         .03           Ethnicity        08         -1.11         .27           Marital status         .11         1.42         .16           Parity         .04         .47         .64           Model 2         .47         .64           Age         .08         1.24         .22           Education         .09         1.41         .16           Ethnicity        03        61         .55           Marital status         .01         .21         .84           Parity        03        50         .62           Antenatal EPDS         .59         10.35         <.001	2	.37	19.82 (203)	<.001						
Individual variables in final equation $β$ $t$ $p$ Model 1	3	.38	17.47 (202)	<.001						
Model 1         Age         .03         .36         .72           Education         .17         2.20         .03           Ethnicity        08         -1.11         .27           Marital status         .11         1.42         .16           Parity         .04         .47         .64           Model 2         .08         1.24         .22           Education         .09         1.41         .16           Ethnicity        03        61         .55           Marital status         .01         .21         .84           Parity        03        50         .62           Antenatal EPDS         .59         10.35         <.001	4	.39	16.14 (201)	<.001						
Model I         Age         .03         .36         .72           Education         .17         2.20         .03           Ethnicity        08         -1.11         .27           Marital status         .11         1.42         .16           Parity         .04         .47         .64           Model 2										
Age       .03       .36       .72         Education       .17       2.20       .03         Ethnicity      08       -1.11       .27         Marital status       .11       1.42       .16         Parity       .04       .47       .64         Model 2       .08       1.24       .22         Education       .09       1.41       .16         Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001		β	t	p						
Education         .17         2.20         .03           Ethnicity        08         -1.11         .27           Marital status         .11         1.42         .16           Parity         .04         .47         .64           Model 2         .08         1.24         .22           Education         .09         1.41         .16           Ethnicity        03        61         .55           Marital status         .01         .21         .84           Parity        03        50         .62           Antenatal EPDS         .59         10.35         <.001	Model 1									
Ethnicity      08       -1.11       .27         Marital status       .11       1.42       .16         Parity       .04       .47       .64         Model 2	Age	.03	.36	.72						
Marital status       .11       1.42       .16         Parity       .04       .47       .64         Model 2	Education	.17	2.20	.03						
Parity       .04       .47       .64         Model 2  .		08	-1.11	.27						
Model 2         Age       .08       1.24       .22         Education       .09       1.41       .16         Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Marital status	.11	1.42	.16						
Age       .08       1.24       .22         Education       .09       1.41       .16         Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Parity	.04	.47	.64						
Education       .09       1.41       .16         Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Model 2									
Ethnicity      03      61       .55         Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Age	.08	1.24	.22						
Marital status       .01       .21       .84         Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Education	.09	1.41	.16						
Parity      03      50       .62         Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001	Ethnicity	03	61	.55						
Antenatal EPDS       .59       10.35       <.001         Model 3       Age       .06       .91       .37         Education       .08       1.25       .21         Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Marital status	.01	.21	.84						
Model 3         Age       .06       .91       .37         Education       .08       1.25       .21         Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Parity	03	50	.62						
Age       .06       .91       .37         Education       .08       1.25       .21         Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Antenatal EPDS	.59	10.35	<.001						
Education       .08       1.25       .21         Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Model 3									
Ethnicity      04      65       .52         Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Age	.06	.91	.37						
Marital status       .02       .28       .78         Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Education	.08	1.25	.21						
Parity      02      35       .73         Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Ethnicity	04	65	.52						
Antenatal EPDS       .55       8.86       <.001	Marital status	.02	.28	.78						
DAS-A-17       .10       1.58       .12         Model 4       .06       .96         Age       .06      06       .96         Education       .07       -1.52       .13         Ethnicity      04       -1.38       .17         Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001         DAS-A-17       .01       .17       .86	Parity	02	35	.73						
Model 4         Age       .06      06       .96         Education       .07       -1.52       .13         Ethnicity      04       -1.38       .17         Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	Antenatal EPDS	.55	8.86	<.001						
Age       .06      06       .96         Education       .07       -1.52       .13         Ethnicity      04       -1.38       .17         Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	DAS-A-17	.10	1.58	.12						
Education       .07       -1.52       .13         Ethnicity      04       -1.38       .17         Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	Model 4									
Ethnicity      04       -1.38       .17         Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	Age	.06	06	.96						
Marital status       .02       .47       .64         Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	Education	.07	-1.52	.13						
Parity      01      16       .88         Antenatal EPDS       .50       7.59       <.001	Ethnicity	04	-1.38	.17						
Antenatal EPDS .50 7.59 <.001 DAS-A-17 .01 .17 .86	Marital status	.02	.47	.64						
DAS-A-17 .01 .17 .86	Parity	01	16	.88						
	Antenatal EPDS	.50	7.59	<.001						
Antenatal PRBQ-8 .17 2.16 .03	DAS-A-17	.01	.17	.86						
`	Antenatal PRBQ-8	.17	2.16	.03						

Note: N = 210, Age and Education were entered as continuous variables; Ethnicity: Non-white = 1, White = 2; Marital status: Married = 1, Not married = 2; Pregnant vs postpartum: Currently pregnant = 1, Given birth in the last six months = 2; Parity: First child = 1, Not first child = 2; Antenatal EPDS: First trimester scores of Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale; DAS-A-17 = Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale-Revised; PRBQ-8 = Pregnancy-Related Beliefs Questionnaire-8.

**Acknowledgements -** The authors would like to thank Dr Rachel Liebling and staff at St. Michael's Hospital for their support of this study, as well as all the participants.