

### Scoring the Cognitive Style Questionnaire (CSQ)

The CSQ has 24-items. 12 items are negative event scenarios and 12 items are positive event scenarios. An individual's CSQ score is his or her composite score for the negative event scenario items -- the average score on stability + globality + consequences + self-worth implications for the 12 negative event items. When calculating a person's level of cognitive vulnerability, you only include scores from the 12 negative event items. The 12 negative event items are numbers: 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23.

For each scenario there are 6 questions, labeled A - F. Here is what each item assesses: (A) cause, (B) internality/externality, (C) globality, (D) stability, (E) consequences, and (F) self-worth implications.

The hopelessness theory is concerned with items: C, D, E, and F. Those items assess the three components that contribute to vulnerability for depression (stable/global attributions about cause, negative consequences, and self-worth implications).

Thus, to calculate a person's vulnerability score you calculate their average score for items C, D, E, and F for the 12 negative event scenarios (numbers 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23). Average scores can range from 1-7 with higher scores indicating greater levels of cognitive vulnerability.

#### Note:

Most published articles have administered and scored the CSQ using the system described above. However, there are other potential strategies for using and scoring the CSQ:

- A researcher could potentially use only the negative events and/or positive events depending on the research need.
- To ensure equal weighting among the three vulnerability components (cause, consequence, and self-worth implications), a researcher could first create a composite score for the cause component by averaging the stability and globality items. Then, this cause composite score would be averaged with the consequence and self-worth implication items to create the overall composite score (e.g., Gibb, Beevers, Andover, & Holleran, 2006; Metalsky & Joiner, 1992).