



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

The Structure of the Prodromal Questionnaire-16 (PQ-16): Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in a general non-help-seeking population sample

Howie, C., Hanna, D., Shannon, C., Davidson, G., & Mulholland, C. (2022). The Structure of the Prodromal Questionnaire-16 (PQ-16): Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in a general non-help-seeking population sample. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 16(3), 239-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.13147>

Published in:
Early Intervention in Psychiatry

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2021, John Wiley & Sons
This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access
This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

1 **The Structure of the Prodromal Questionnaire-16 (PQ-16): Exploratory and Confirmatory**
2 **Factor Analyses in a General Non-Help-Seeking Population Sample**

3 Clare Howie¹, Donncha Hanna², Ciaran Shannon³, Gavin Davidson⁴, Ciaran Mulholland^{1,3},

4 ¹ School of Medicine, Queen's University Belfast; ²School of Psychology, Queen's University
5 Belfast; ³Northern Health and Social Care Trust; ⁴School of Social Sciences, Education and Social
6 Work, Queen's University Belfast.

7 Corresponding author: Ms Clare Howie, Centre for Medical Education, Queen's University Belfast,
8 Whitla Medical Building, 97 Lisburn Road, Belfast, BT9 7BL.

9 Aims: To examine the structure of the Prodromal Questionnaire (PQ-16) in a non-help-seeking
10 population through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. Previous studies have
11 not looked at the structure of this self-report measure outside clinical settings.

12 Methods: Participants (n=1045) were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), and
13 then completed the PQ-16. The data set was split randomly in two, one being used for exploratory
14 factor analysis (EFA) and the other for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). A polychoric correlation
15 matrix was created and EFA was used to explore the factor structure of the PQ-16. Four models were
16 tested through CFA to determine best fit: one, two, three and four-factor models were all analysed.

17 Results: EFA indicated a two-factor structure in the PQ-16 in a non-help-seeking population (with a
18 mean age = 29.7 years). Factor 1 represented perceptual abnormalities/hallucinations and factor 2
19 general symptoms associated with psychosis-risk. CFA indicated that all the proposed models were
20 suitable fits for the dataset. Fit indices for the three-factor model (factor 1 representing perceptual
21 abnormalities/hallucinations, factor 2 unusual thought content, and factor 3 negative symptom)
22 indicated that it appeared to be a better fit for the data than the one, two, and four factor models.

23 Conclusions: This study suggests that a three-factor model of the PQ-16 is a better fit than other
24 proposed models in a non-help-seeking population. Future research of the structure of the PQ-16 in
25 this population may benefit from recruiting subjects with a lower mean age than the current study.

26 *Keywords: Attenuated symptoms, Prodromal Questionnaire-16, Psychosis, Factor Analysis,*
27 *Screening*

28 Abstract: 248/250

29 Word count: 2967/3000

30 Tables: 4

31 Appendices: 3

32 1. Introduction

33 Individuals who have experienced psychosis often report a period of prodromal symptoms before the
34 onset of the first episode (Addington & Heinssen, 2012). The “at-risk mental state” is a term for such
35 subthreshold psychotic symptoms which may precede the onset of a psychotic episode (Yung and
36 McGorry, 1996). Around the world clinics have been established which seek to identify individuals
37 with an at-risk mental state and then offer interventions to prevent or delay the onset of psychosis
38 (Broome et al., 2005; Yung et al., 2007). Screening tools, such as the Prodromal Questionnaire
39 (Loewy, Bearden, Johnson, Raine, & Cannon, 2005), the Adolescent Psychotic Symptom Screener
40 (Kelleher, Harley, Murtagh, & Cannon, 2011) and the Eppendorf Schizophrenia Inventory (Mass,
41 2000), allow clinicians to identify those who may benefit from a full assessment, utilising tools such
42 as the Comprehensive Assessment for the At-Risk Mental State (CAARMS) (Yung, Yuen, Phillips,
43 Francey, & McGorry, 2005) or the Structured Interview for Prodromal Syndromes (SIPS) (Miller et
44 al., 2003). To date screening tools are typically used in clinical or help-seeking populations, and it is
45 not yet clear if any screening tool could help to determine which individuals may be at risk of
46 developing psychosis in a non-help-seeking population. If a screening tool was demonstrated to be
47 useful in a non-help-seeking populations this may lead to future initiatives which identify those at-risk
48 at an earlier stage, with obvious potential benefits to those so identified. Screening studies in large
49 population samples will also help in the development of sensitivity norms for screening tools (Kline &
50 Schiffman, 2014).

51 The Prodromal Questionnaire (PQ) was developed by Loewy, Bearden, Johnson, Raine, & Cannon
52 (2005) as a 92-item self-report measure. , based on the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire (Raine,
53 1991) and probe questions in the SIPS (Structured Interview for Prodromal Syndromes; Miller et al.,
54 2003). The PQ has four subscales: positive symptoms (e.g. unusual thinking and perceptual
55 abnormalities), negative symptoms (e.g. social isolation), disorganised symptoms (e.g. odd
56 behaviour), and general symptoms (e.g. depression and functioning). While the PQ is quicker and
57 easier to administer than an interview assessment schedule, the length of the measure means that it is
58 still time-consuming. For this reason a shorter 16-item measure, the Prodromal Questionnaire-16
59 (Ising et al., 2012) was developed by administering the PQ to a sample of 3533 individuals seeking
60 help for mental health concerns. Using regression analyses and Chi-square automatic interaction
61 detection 92 items were reduced to 16. The PQ-16 consists of 9 items from the perceptual
62 abnormalities/hallucinations subscale, 5 items from the unusual thought content/delusional
63 ideas/paranoia subscale, and 2 items from the negative symptoms subscale. A 21-item version of the
64 Prodromal Questionnaire, the Prodromal Questionnaire-Brief (PQ-B; (R.L. Loewy, Pearson,
65 Vinogradov, Bearden, & Cannon, 2011) has also been developed. The authors have chosen to use the
66 PQ-16 in this population as it balanced the greatest sensitivity and specificity and positive predictive

67 values in previous non-help-seeking populations (Howie, Potter, Shannon, Davidson, & Mulholland,
68 2019).

69 There have only been two studies that have examined the structure of the PQ-16, including the
70 original paper (Ising et al, 2012). In a psychometric evaluation of the PQ-16 in a population of post-
71 partum women in Peru, Levey et al (2018) found that the measure was constructed of four factors.
72 They suggested that factor 1 represented an unstable sense of reality, factor 2 represented ideas of
73 reference/paranoia, factor 3 represented sensitivity to sensory experiences, and were unable to
74 characterise factor 4.

75 The current paper is the first study to examine the structure of the PQ-16 in a general non-help-
76 seeking population using factor analysis. The aims of the study are to examine the psychometric
77 properties of the PQ-16, specifically employing exploratory factor analysis to identify the factor
78 structure and comparing models using confirmatory factor analysis to determine the best model-fit for
79 this population.

80 **2. Methods**

81 *2.1 Participants*

82 Participants (n=1045) were a convenience sample recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk
83 (MTurk) in January and February 2019. MTurk recruits participants through ‘crowd sourcing’;
84 registered users can take part in human intelligence tasks (HITs) for financial compensation. Only
85 questionnaires that were completed were included for analysis. Unfinished questionnaires were
86 identified (n=32) and removed from the data set. The final number of participants was 1013.

87 The sample was randomly split in half using SPSS Version 25 (IBM Corp, 2017) to create two data
88 sets for exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis as EFA followed by CFA in the same data is
89 testing factor structure and confirming it again with the same data and not considered best practice.

90 The exploratory analysis data set was comprised of 504 participants, with a mean age of 29.76 years
91 (SD=3.78), and was 51.8% male. The confirmatory analysis data set was comprised of 509
92 participants with a mean age of 29.63 years (SD=3.87) and was 50.1% male. There were no
93 significant differences in the distribution of demographic variables between the two data sets on age,
94 sex, relationship status, level of education, employment status or race (a full break down of these
95 statistics are presented in Table 1). There was also no statistically significant difference in the total
96 PQ-16 scores between the two data sets.

97 *2.2 Measures*

98 The online survey asked participants to provide their socio-demographic information (age, gender,
99 relationship status, education status and employment status) and then to complete the PQ-16.

100 *2.2.1. The Prodromal Questionnaire-16*

101 The Prodromal Questionnaire-16 (Ising et al., 2012) requires participants to answer questions as
102 ‘True’ or ‘False’, with True answers then rated on a scale from 0 being true with no distress, 1 being
103 true with mild distress, 2 being true with moderate distress and 3 being true with severe distress. A
104 cut-off score of 6 or more on the symptom score is considered to indicate whether an individual
105 displays a potential at-risk mental state with a high sensitivity (87%) and specificity (87%) (Ising et
106 al., 2012). It is important to note that a recent systematic review has recommended the use of the
107 distress scale, with a score of ≥ 9 , when using the PQ-16 in non-help-seeking populations, and this
108 results in a sensitivity of 85% and specificity of 87% (Savill, D’Ambrosio, Cannon, & Loewy, 2017).
109 The endorsement and distress scales were thus combined for analysis, to represent the continuum of
110 psychotic-like experiences reported in the general population (Nelson, Fusar-Poli, & Yung, 2012).
111 Responses for the PQ-16 were coded from 0 – 4 (0 = False, 1 = True no distress, 2 = True mild
112 distress, 3 = True moderate distress, 4 = True severe distress).

113 *2.3 Procedure*

114 Participants were recruited through MTurk’s listing of available HITs. Participants confirmed that
115 they had read and understood the study information provided, that they were willing to participate in
116 the study and that their data could be used in scientific publications, and consented to this by agreeing
117 to complete and return the HIT. Participants were only from the United States and were paid the
118 equivalent of \$12 per hour upon completion of questionnaires as a compensation for their time.
119 Participants have their own individual MTurk ID codes for payments to be processed. To address
120 quality assurance, the study was only open to MTurk workers with a 95% completion rate on previous
121 assignments, Captcha verification was used, and the authors used attention questions throughout the
122 questionnaire (for example, “There are 53 weeks in a year” where the respondent would have to
123 answer ‘no’ to demonstrate they were attending to the content). Ethical approval for the study was
124 obtained from Queen’s University Belfast, School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee.

125 *2.4 Analyses*

126 As the literature review identified there was limited work conducted on the factor structure of the PQ-
127 16 in the general population the initial step in the analysis was to examine the structure by employing
128 an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The next step was then to test the extent that this factor structure
129 and the three factor structures reported in previous literature fitted the data by using confirmatory
130 factor analysis (CFA) to identify the structure of best fit. The sample was randomly split in half using
131 SPSS Version 25 (IBM Corp, 2017) to allow this two-step analysis strategy. This strategy of first
132 conducting EFA followed by CFA on different samples (to minimise the bias of extracting and
133 confirming the factors within the same data set) is commonly recommended with the psychometric
134 literature (Tashakkori, & Teddlie, 2009; Cabrera-Nguyen, 2010; Matsunaga, 2010; Orcan, 2018).

135 *2.4.1 Exploratory factor analysis*

136 Factor analysis typically requires the use of interval or ratio data to create Pearson correlation
137 matrices. For factor analysis of ordinal data, it is typically recommended that a polychoric correlation
138 matrix is created (Holgado-Tello, Chacón-Moscoso, Barbero-García, & Vila-Abad, 2010). As the
139 PQ-16 was coded into an ordinal scale, a polychoric correlation matrix was created from the data set
140 using the ‘polychor’ package (Fox, 2019) in R version 3.6.1, which was subsequently used for the
141 exploratory analysis. Multivariate normality of the exploratory subsample was assessed using the
142 Mardia’s test function from the ‘psych’ package in R.

143 Oblique rotation was used under the assumption that the factors will be correlated (Child, 1990). To
144 determine the number of factors to retain, parallel analysis (Horn, 1956) and Velicer’s Minimum
145 Average Partial (MAP) test (Velicer, 1976) were conducted using the nFactors package on R (Raiche,
146 2010). Parallel analysis involves the creation of correlation matrices from random variables based on
147 the sample size and number of variables from the original data set. The eigenvalues created from the
148 simulated dataset are then compared to the original dataset. The criterion for retaining factors using
149 parallel analysis according to Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello (2004) is that “..factors corresponding to
150 actual eigenvalues that are greater than the parallel average random eigenvalues should be retained”
151 (p.194). Both indicated that it was suitable to retain two factors.

152 EFA was conducted using R version 3.6.1 ‘psych’ package (Revelle, 2018). Based on parallel analysis
153 and MAP test results, two factors were chosen to be retained, using principal axis factoring with an
154 oblimin rotation. Principal axis factoring was chosen as this does not require the assumption of
155 normally-distributed data (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Items were found to be corresponding to
156 factors based on factor loadings above 0.4 (Comrey & Lee, 1992; P. Kline, 1994). R script for EFA is
157 available in Appendix 2.

158 *2.4.2 Confirmatory factor analysis*

159 Multivariate normality of the confirmatory subsample was assessed prior to confirmatory analysis
160 using the Mardia’s test function in ‘psych’ using R. CFA was conducted in R version 3.6.1. using the
161 Lavaan package for R (Rosseel, 2012). As variables were ordinal and multivariate non-normality was
162 demonstrated by the data, CFA was conducted using a weighted least square mean and variance
163 (WLSMV) estimator. Four models were analysed for best fit; a one-factor model, a two-factor model,
164 a three-factor model, and a four-factor model (see Appendix 3 for R script). A one-factor model was
165 examined as it has been proposed that the PQ may be a unidimensional scale (van Bebbber et al.,
166 2017). A two-factor model was proposed based on the EFA results. Two studies were identified from
167 the literature that examined the construct validity of the PQ-16. Ising et al (2012) constructed the PQ-
168 16 with three subscales, based on PQ scoring in a clinical population. Levey et al (2018) found a four

169 factor structure of the PQ-16 when used in a sample of women receiving prenatal care, for the
170 purposes of detecting perinatal psychosis. In their study, they stated that for EFA they used principal
171 components analysis with orthogonal rotation, which does not allow factors to correlate. In order to be
172 as comprehensive as possible, we used CFA to test all 4 possible models. R script for CFA is
173 available in Appendix 2.

174

175 **3. Results**

176 *3.1. Demographic statistics*

177 Unfinished questionnaires were identified (n=32) and removed from the data set. χ^2 test was
178 conducted on the completed and uncompleted questionnaires and gender. There was no significant
179 difference in gender for completed and uncompleted, $\chi^2(2, n=1045) = 1.59, p = .45$, but there was a
180 significant effect of age on completed and uncompleted questionnaires, $t(1040) = 2.09, p = .03$. χ^2
181 tests were conducted on demographic information (gender, race, relationship status, level of education
182 and employment status, see Table 1) and indicated that there were no significant differences between
183 subsamples (see Appendix 1). An independent-group t-test was conducted on age and no significant
184 difference was found between the two subsamples. As PQ responses were ordinal and not normally
185 distributed, differences between PQ responses in the subsamples were analysed using Mann-Whitney
186 U tests and there was found to be no significant differences, with the exception of responses to items
187 10 and 12 of the PQ-16 (see Appendix 2).

188

189 **INSERT TABLE 1 HERE**

190

191 *3.2. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)*

192 To determine if the data was suitable for EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy
193 conducted and found to be 0.92, which indicated that the data was ‘marvelous’ according to values
194 determined by Kaiser (1974). Bartlett’s test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 = 5795.08, df=120, p<.001$) indicated
195 that the strength of relationships among variables were high and the data may benefit from factor
196 analysis (Bartlett, 1951). Mardia’s test of multivariate normality was conducted and highlighted that
197 the data was not normally distributed at the multivariate level (*kurtosis* = 119.35, $p<.05$, see Appendix
198 3 for plot).

199

200

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

201

202 Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 8.83) was comprised of thirteen items, with factor loadings ranging from .45-
203 .97 (see Table 2), accounting for 45% of variance. Ten of the thirteen items on this factor represent
204 hallucinations or perceptual abnormalities and the other three items represent unusual thought content,
205 paranoia, or ideas of reference.

206 Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 1.22) consisted of two items, with factor loadings ranging from .63 – .79,
207 accounting for 13% of variance. The two items represented either avolition or excessive social
208 anxiety. Item 2 of the PQ-16 was excluded from this model for CFA as factor loadings were below the
209 threshold of .4 for either factor.

210

211 3.4. Confirmatory factor analysis

212 Mardia's test indicated that data of the confirmatory subsample was not normally distributed at the
213 multivariate level (kurtosis = 108.69, $p < .05$, see Appendix 3 for plot).

214

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

215 To assess internal consistency of each subscale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. Alpha values
216 ranged from .613 – .920 for subscale (see Table 3), and values did not increase for any scale if any
217 items were deleted.

218

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

219 The chi-square statistic was significant for all the proposed models (see Table 4), however due to the
220 sample size this is to be expected and therefore models did not need to be rejected at this stage
221 (Schermelel-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). The one-factor model produced a RMSEA value
222 than was below the proposed cut-off of $< .08$ (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996), however it
223 had a SRMR value of 0.062, which is above the $< .060$ cut-off (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The TLI and CFI
224 values for the one-factor model produced satisfactory values. The two-factor model produced a
225 RMSEA of 0.06, fitting the proposed cut-off of $< .08$. It also had a SRMR value of 0.059, which falls
226 below the recommended $< .060$ cut-off. The TLI and CFI values were above the 0.95 cut-off value
227 recommended by Hu & Bentler (1999). This indicated that the two-factor model was a good fit for the
228 data. Similarly, the three-factor model produced satisfactory values for fit; the RMSEA and SRMR
229 were below the recommended cut-offs, as were the TLI and CFI. They produced values that indicated
230 a slightly better model fit for the data than the two-factor model. The four-factor model produced a
231 SRMR value that was on the cut-off for good fit, however the RMSEA was lower than the cut-off,
232 and the TLI and CFI values were above the 0.95 recommendation.

233 All the proposed models produced fit indices that indicated that they were a good fit for the data,
234 however, the three-factor model produced the lowest RSMEA and SRMR values and highest CFI and
235 TLI values. Therefore, the three-factor model appears to be the best fit for the data.

4. Discussion

4.1. Main results

This study aimed to examine the structure of the PQ-16 in a non-help-seeking population through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. Previous studies have not looked at the structure of this self-report measure outside clinical settings.

The exploratory factor analysis indicated a two-factor structure in the PQ-16 in a general non-help-seeking population: Factor 1 represented perceptual abnormalities/hallucinations and factor 2 represented general symptoms associated with psychosis-risk. Four models were tested through CFA to determine best fit. A one-factor, two-factor, three-factor and four-factor model were all analysed.

Fit indices for the three-factor model (factor 1 representing perceptual abnormalities/hallucinations, factor 2 unusual thought content, and factor 3 negative symptom) indicated that it appeared to be a better fit for the data than the one, two, and four factor models.

4.2. Limitations

This study has a number of strengths. There are legitimate questions to be asked regarding the use of MTurk for studies of this nature. MTurk is an effective method of gaining rapid recruitment, with the potential for a variety of participants, but concerns have been expressed regarding the validity and reliability of using MTurk ‘workers’, and the potential for the use of “bots” to complete online studies and creating a drop in the quality of responses (Dreyfuss, 2018).

On the other hand it has also been argued that MTurk can produce more diverse samples than other methods of convenience recruitment, such as the common use of undergraduate students in psychological research (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Nevertheless the use of MTurk comes with disadvantages, including the limited generalisability of these samples, as they typically underrepresent ethnic minorities (Bornstein, Jager, & Putnick, 2013). In the current study white participants made up 76% of the total sample.

The age range of the study sample was 18 to 36 years, which means that an important group of those who are often seen in at-risk mental state clinics (age 14 to 17 years) were not included. Further studies of this nature would benefit from including a younger demographic.

5. Conclusions

The study findings indicate that the PQ-16 may be a good measure for attenuated psychotic symptoms in non-help-seeking populations though as this is the first study to examine this further work will be required to confirm whether this is the case. Further research on the factor structure of the PQ-16 in a

non-help-seeking population would benefit from recruiting subjects to a lower age range than the current study.

Whether this finding is generalisable to other non-clinical samples remains to be seen but at this point it will be of assistance to clinicians and researchers seeking to deepen their understanding of prodromal symptoms of psychosis as present in the general youth population.

Acknowledgments

The study was funded by the Northern Health and Social Care Trust. This work was conducted as part of Clare Howie's PhD project, a studentship funded by the Northern Ireland Department of the Economy.

Conflict of Interest statement

All authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Addington, J., & Heinsen, R. (2012). Prediction and Prevention of Psychosis in Youth at Clinical High Risk. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 8(1), 269–289. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143146>
- Bartlett, M. S. (1951). The effect of standardization on a Chi-square approximation in factor analysis. *Biometrika*, 38(3), 337–344.
- Bornstein, M. H., Justin Jager, & Putnick, D. L. (2013). Sampling in Developmental Science: Situations, Shortcomings, Solutions, and Standards. *Developmental Review*, 33(4), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2014.371>
- Broome, M. R., Woolley, J. B., Johns, L. C., Valmaggia, L. R., Tabraham, P., Gafoor, R., ... McGuire, P. K. (2005). Outreach and support in south London (OASIS): Implementation of a clinical service for prodromal psychosis and the at risk mental state. *European Psychiatry*, 20(5–6), 372–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2005.03.001>
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon’s mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- Cabrera-Nguyen, P. (2010). Author guidelines for reporting scale development and validation results in the Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 1(2), 99-103.
- Child, D. (1990). *The Essentials of Factor Analysis* (2nd Editio). London, UK: Cassell Educational Limited.
- Comrey, A., & Lee, H. (1992). *A First Course in Factor Analysis* (2nd editio). New York, NY, US: Routledge.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, Vol 10, No 7, 10(7), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1234/2013/999990>.
- Dreyfuss, E. (2018). A Bot Panic Hits Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. *Wired*. Retrieved from <https://www.wired.com/story/amazon-mechanical-turk-bot-panic/>
- Fox, J. (2019). polycor: Polychoric and Polyserial Correlations. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=polycor>
- Fusar-Poli, P., Bonoldi, I., Yung, A. R., Borgwardt, S., Kempton, M. J., Valmaggia, L., ... McGuire,

- P. (2012). Predicting Psychosis: Meta-analysis of Transition Outcomes in Individuals at High Clinical Risk. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *69*(3), 220–229.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.1472>
- Hafner, H., Maurer, K., Löffler, W., Fatkenheuer, B., An der Heiden, W., Riecher-Rössler, A., ... Gattaz, W. F. (1994). The epidemiology of early schizophrenia. Influence of age and gender on onset and early course. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *164*(APR. SUPPL. 23), 29–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125000292714>
- Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor Retention Decisions in Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Tutorial on Parallel Analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, *7*(2), 191–205.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428104263675>
- Holgado-Tello, F. P., Chacón-Moscoso, S., Barbero-García, I., & Vila-Abad, E. (2010). Polychoric versus Pearson correlations in exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of ordinal variables. *Quality and Quantity*, *44*(1), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-008-9190-y>
- Howie, C., Potter, C., Shannon, C., Davidson, G., & Mulholland, C. (2019). Screening for the at-risk mental state in educational settings: A systematic review. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12926>
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- IBM Corp. (2017). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, New York.
- Ising, Helga K., Veling, W., Loewy, R. L., Rietveld, M. W., Rietdijk, J., Dragt, S., ... Van Der Gaag, M. (2012). The validity of the 16-item version of the prodromal questionnaire (PQ-16) to screen for ultra high risk of developing psychosis in the general help-seeking population. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *38*(6), 1288–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbs068>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*, 31–36.
- Kelleher, I., Harley, M., Murtagh, A., & Cannon, M. (2011). Are Screening Instruments Valid for Psychotic-Like Experiences? A Validation Study of Screening Questions for Psychotic-Like Experiences Using In-Depth Clinical Interview, *37*(2), 362–369.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbp057>
- Kirkbride, J. B., Errazuriz, A., Croudace, T. J., Morgan, C., Jackson, D., Boydell, J., ... Jones, P. B. (2012). Incidence of schizophrenia and other psychoses in England, 1950-2009: A systematic review and meta-analyses. *PLoS ONE*, *7*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031660>

- Kline, E., & Schiffman, J. (2014). Psychosis risk screening: A systematic review. *Schizophrenia Research, 158*(1–3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2014.06.036>
- Kline, P. (1994). *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Levey, E. J., Zhong, Q.-Y., Rondon, M. B., Sanchez, S., Li, J., Williams, M. A., & Gelaye, B. (2018). The psychometric properties of the 16-item version of the prodromal questionnaire (pq-16) as a screening instrument for perinatal psychosis. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, No-Specified. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00737-018-0833-2>
- Li, C. H. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. *Behavior Research Methods, 48*(3), 936–949. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0619-7>
- Loewy, R.L., Pearson, R., Vinogradov, S., Bearden, C. E., & Cannon, T. D. (2011). Psychosis risk screening with the Prodromal Questionnaire - Brief Version (PQ-B). *Schizophrenia Research, 129*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2011.03.029>
- Loewy, Rachel L, Bearden, C. E., Johnson, J. K., Raine, A., & Cannon, T. D. (2005). The prodromal questionnaire (PQ): preliminary validation of a self-report screening measure for prodromal and psychotic syndromes. *Schizophrenia Research, 79*(1), 117–125. Retrieved from <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med5&NEWS=N&AN=16276559>
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods, 1*(2), 130–149. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130>
- Mass, R. (2000). Characteristic Subjective Experiences of Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 26*(4), 921–931. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.schbul.a033506>
- Matsunaga, M. (2010). How to Factor-Analyze Your Data Right: Do's, Don'ts, and How-To's. *International Journal of Psychological Research, 3*(1), 97-110.
- Miller, T. J., McGlashan, T. H., Rosen, J. L., Cadenhead, K., Ventura, J., McFarlane, W., ... Woods, S. W. (2003). Prodromal Assessment with the Structured Interview for Prodromal Syndromes and the Scale of Prodromal Symptoms: Predictive Validity, Interrater Reliability, and Training to Reliability. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 29*(4), 703–715. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.schbul.a007040>
- Nelson, B., Fusar-Poli, P., & R. Yung, A. (2012). Can We Detect Psychotic-like Experiences in the General Population? *Current Pharmaceutical Design, 18*(4), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.2174/138161212799316136>

- Orcan, F. (2018). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: which one to use first. *Journal of Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*, 9(4), 414-421.
- Raiche, G. (2010). nFactors: an R package for parallel analysis and non graphical solutions to the Cattell scree test. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=nFactors>
- Raine, A. (1991). The SPQ: A Scale for the Assessment of Schizotypal Personality based on DSM-III-R Criteria. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 17(4), 555–564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/17.4.555>
- Revelle, W. (2018). psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-package.org/package=psych>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/>
- Savill, M., D'Ambrosio, J., Cannon, T. D., & Loewy, R. L. (2017). Psychosis risk screening in different populations using the Prodromal Questionnaire: A systematic review. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12446>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the Fit of Structural Equation Models: Tests of Significance and Descriptive Goodness-of-Fit Measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23–74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470010940>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2009). Integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to research. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, 2, 283-317.
- van Bebber, J., Wigman, J. T. W., Meijer, R. R., Ising, H. K., van den Berg, D., Rietdijk, J., ... Wunderink, L. (2017). The Prodromal Questionnaire: a case for IRT-based adaptive testing of psychotic experiences?. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1518>
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321–327.
- Yung, A. R., & McGorry, P. D. (1996). The Prodromal Phase of First-episode Psychosis: Past and Current Conceptualizations. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 22(2), 353–370. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/22.2.353>
- Yung, A. R., McGorry, P. D., Francey, S. M., Nelson, B., Baker, K., Phillips, L. J., ... Amminger, G. P. (2007). PACE: a specialised service for young people at risk of psychotic disorders. *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 187(7 Suppl), S43-46. Retrieved from <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0->

38449109204&partnerID=40&md5=c295427698886f636fb958ecbe843f03

Yung, A., Yuen, H. P., Phillips, L. J., Francey, S. M., & McGorry, P. D. (2005). Mapping the onset of psychosis: The comprehensive assessment of at risk mental states (CAARMS). *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 39(December 2004), 964–971. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-9964\(03\)80090-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-9964(03)80090-7)

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of overall population and two subsamples

Characteristics	All participants (n=1013)		EFA subsample (n=504)		CFA subsample (n=509)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
PQ-16 score: mean (SD)	9.38 (9.65)		9.95 (10.31)		8.81 (8.91)	
Age: mean (SD)	29.70 (3.83)		29.64 (3.88)		29.76 (3.78)	
Age (years)						
18-20	12	1.2	7	1.4	5	1
21-25	150	14.9	67	13.4	83	16.3
26-30	385	38	198	39.3	187	36.8
31-35	466	46	232	45.9	234	46
Gender						
Female	510	50.3	261	51.8	249	48.9
Male	492	48.6	237	47	255	50.1
Rather not say	6	0.6	3	0.6	3	0.6
Relationship status						
Divorced	12	1.2	7	1.4	5	1
Domestic partnership	43	4.2	17	3.4	26	5.1
Married	348	34.4	191	37.9	157	30.8
Separated	8	0.8	2	0.4	6	1.2
Single, cohabiting	144	14.2	69	13.7	75	14.7
Single, never married	457	45.1	217	43.1	240	47.2
Widowed	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0
Level of education						
Associate degree	113	11.2	52	10.3	61	12
Bachelor's degree	438	43.2	216	42.9	222	43.6
Graduate degree	145	14.3	80	15.9	65	12.8
High school diploma	106	10.5	51	10.1	55	10.8
Less than HS diploma	4	0.4	2	0.4	2	0.4
Some college, no degree	207	20.4	103	20.4	104	20.4
Employment status						
Disabled, unable to work	6	0.6	5	1	1	0.2
Employed, Full-time	712	70.3	361	71.6	351	69
Employed, Part-time	173	17.1	73	14.5	100	19.6
Not employed, looking for work	62	6.1	31	6.2	31	6.1
Not employed, not looking	60	5.9	34	6.7	26	5.1
Race						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	7	0.7	2	0.4	5	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	93	9.2	47	9.3	46	9
Black/African American	55	5.4	24	4.8	31	6.1
Hispanic	60	5.9	29	5.8	31	6.1
Multiple ethnicities	28	2.8	12	2.4	16	3.1
White/Caucasian	770	76	390	77.4	380	74.7

Table 2. PQ-16 items, prodromal experience it is measuring, median of each item and factor loadings from EFA.

Items	Experience it is measuring	Median	Factor loadings	
			Factor 1	Factor 2
1. I feel uninterested in the things I used to enjoy	Avolition	1	.01	.79
2. I often live through events exactly as they happened before (déjà vu)	Unusual thought content	1	.39	.23
3. I sometimes smell or taste things that other people can't smell or taste	Olfactory hallucination	0	.72	-.12
4. I often hear unusual sounds like banging, clicking, hissing, clapping, or ringing in my ears.	Auditory hallucination	0	.53	.21
5. I have often been confused at times whether something I experienced was real or imaginary	Unusual thought content (perplexity)	0	.69	.06
6. When I look at a person, or look at myself in a mirror, I have seen the face change right before my eyes	Visual hallucination	0	.88	-.02
7. I get extremely anxious when meeting people for the first time.	Excessive social anxiety	2	.09	.63
8. I have seen things that other people apparently can't see.	Visual hallucination	0	.97	-.18
9. My thoughts are sometimes so strong I can almost hear them.	Perceptual abnormalities	0	.46	.37

10. I sometimes see special meanings in advertisements, shop windows, or in the way things are arranged around me	Ideas of reference	0	.71	.05
11. Sometimes I have felt that that I'm not in control of my own ideas or thoughts.	Perceptual abnormalities	0	.45	.36
12. Sometimes I feel distracted by distant sounds that I am not normally aware of.	Auditory hallucination	0	.69	.19
13. I have heard things other people can't hear, like voices of people whispering or talking.	Auditory hallucination	0	.88	.00
14. I often feel that others have it in for me.	Paranoia	0	.53	.32
15. I have had the sense that some person or force is around me, even though I could not see anyone.	Perceptual abnormalities	0	.81	.02
16. I feel that parts of my body have changed in some way, or that parts of my body are working differently than before.	Somatic hallucination	0	.61	.19
Note. Extraction method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation method: Oblimin.				

Table 3. Proposed confirmatory factor models, items on each factor and Cronbach's alpha for each scale

Model	Factor: Items	α
One-factor model	F1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16	.91
Current study	F1 (Perceptual abnormalities and unusual thought content): 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 F2 (Avolition and excessive social anxiety): 1, 7,	.92 .61
Ising et al (2012)	F1 (Perceptual abnormalities): 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16 F2 (Unusual thought content): 2, 5, 10, 11, 14 F3 (Negative): 1, 7	.89 .78 .61
Levey et al (2018)	F1 (Unstable sense of reality): 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16 F2 (Paranoia/ideas of reference): 10, 13, 14, 15, F3: 4, 8 F4: 1, 2, 3	.81 .78 .71 .63

Table 4. Fit indices of confirmatory factor mode

Model	χ^2	RMSEA (CI)	SRMR	TLI	CFI	Correlation between factors
1 factor model	$\chi^2 = 349.51$ $df = 104$ $p < .001$	0.07 (0.06-0.07)	0.06	0.96	0.97	N/A
2-factor model (current study)	$\chi^2 = 280.82$ $df = 89$ $P < 0.001$	0.06	0.06	0.97	0.97	F1 – F2 = 0.43
3-factor model (Ising et al, 2012)	$\chi^2 = 270.36$ $df = 101$ $p < .001$	0.05 (0.04 – 0.06)	0.05	0.97	0.98	F1 – F2 = 0.52 F2 – F3 = 0.41 F1 – F3 = 0.44
4-factor model (Levey et al, 2018)	$\chi^2 = 339.61$ $df = 98$ $p < .001$	0.07 (0.06 – 0.07)	0.06	0.96	0.97	F1 – F2 = 0.58 F1 – F3 = 0.60 F1 – F4 = 0.47 F2 – F3 = 0.61 F2 – F4 = 0.45 F3 – F4 = 0.45
Abbreviations: RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI, Comparative Fit Index.						

