Wilkinson, L. L., Rowe, A. C., & Millings, A. (2019). Disorganized attachment predicts body mass index via uncontrolled eating. *International Journal of Obesity*, 44, 438-446.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-019-0378-0>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1038/s41366-019-0378-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-019-0378-0)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Springer Nature at <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41366-019-0378-0> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Disorganized attachment predicts body mass index via uncontrolled eating

Laura L. Wilkinson¹ · Angela C. Rowe² · Abigail Millings³

Received: 22 January 2019 / Revised: 16 March 2019 / Accepted: 1 April 2019
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2019

Abstract

Background/Objectives Previous research has demonstrated relationships between attachment orientations (expectations of ourselves and others in interpersonal relationships), eating behaviours and obesity. However, such research has been limited to investigations of ‘organised’ forms of attachment orientations (reflecting coherent and predictable patterns of behaviour). Theoretically, aberrant eating behaviours and body mass index, should also be related to ‘disorganized attachment.’

Subjects Here we test these relationships for the first time in a general population. Secondary data analyses of a pre-existing dataset were conducted ($N = 537$).

Methods used Questionnaire measures of organised (avoidant and anxious) and disorganized attachment were included alongside eating behaviour measures (emotional eating, uncontrolled eating and cognitive restraint) and body mass index (BMI).

Results Parallel multiple mediation analysis (PROCESS) showed that uncontrolled eating (but not emotional eating or cognitive restraint) significantly mediated a relationship between disorganized attachment and body mass index (significant indirect relationship; LLCI = 0.02 ULCI = 0.16) when both attachment anxiety and avoidance were included as covariates.

Conclusions We suggest that the mechanism underpinning this indirect relationship is a form of maladaptive affect regulation, but that the behavioural motivators differ from those observed in anxiously attached individuals. Rather than eating being a premeditated strategy used by individuals high in disorganized attachment to manage emotion, opportunities to eat are simply taken as they present themselves. Professionals engaged in addressing eating problems and weight management should consider attachment orientations in their patient assessments and be mindful that attachment disorganized individuals are especially likely to engage in uncontrolled eating behaviours that are associated with a higher BMI.

Introduction

Recent estimates have suggested that overweight and obesity will affect 2.7 billion people worldwide by 2025 [1]. Overweight and obesity are associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes and cancer

amongst other health issues [2]. As the upward trend in obesity continues [3], the need for effective interventions is of high priority [4].

‘Attachment orientation’ is one psychological factor that has been shown to relate to obesity and overweight in adults [5]. Attachment orientation is a term used to describe the set of expectations that we all possess about how we and others behave in inter-personal relationships. These mental models are thought to be established early in life and reflect interactions with caregivers [6]. Adult attachment orientations reflects the dynamics and feelings associated with our most important long-term relationships in life, including those from early life [7].

Currently, adult attachment orientations tends to be conceptualised in terms of two dimensions [7]. These are attachment *anxiety* which is characterised by a fear of abandonment and attachment *avoidance* which is characterised by a fear of intimacy. A low score on both of these

Supplementary information The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-019-0378-0>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Laura L. Wilkinson
L.L.Wilkinson@Swansea.ac.uk

¹ Department of Psychology, Swansea University, Swansea, UK

² School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

³ Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

dimensions indicates ‘attachment security’. Whilst a high score on either or both of these dimensions indicates ‘attachment insecurity’.

A recent meta-analysis showed that, in a general population, higher attachment insecurity was associated with more unhealthy eating behaviours (e.g., disinhibited eating, uncontrolled eating, emotional eating amongst others) [8]. The strongest relationship was between attachment anxiety and unhealthy eating behaviours, with effects tending to be of medium effect size. Importantly, disinhibited eating (a general propensity to engage in periodic overeating [9]) and emotional eating (episodic overeating in response to negative affect [10]) have been found to mediate a relationship between attachment and BMI [11, 12], respectively. This meta-analysis [8] also showed that higher attachment avoidance related to more unhealthy eating behaviours, however, the effect size for this relationship was small and the weakest amongst those examined (attachment insecurity, anxiety, avoidance and fearfulness).

The mechanism underpinning these associations is thought to be affect regulation; anxiously attached individuals are relatively poor at managing their emotions by comparison to their attachment secure counterparts. When upsetting events take place, they may seek support, but the interaction is characterised by mistrust and fear of rejection rather than reassurance. Moreover, the attachment system is hyperactivated leading to a hyper-vigilance to potentially upsetting stimuli [13, 14]. To ‘break the cycle’ of hyper-activation, highly anxiously attached individuals rely on external sources of affect regulation such as food [15]. Indeed, in recent work, it was shown that attachment anxiety was specifically related to an inability to disengage from the source of upset and engage in goal-oriented behaviour, which was in turn related to eating in response to stress and body mass index [12]. By contrast, attachment avoidance is associated with deactivating strategies, that is, the avoidance of emotions and suppression of stress and help-seeking (Mikulincer and Orbach, 1995). It has been suggested that this maladaptive approach does not actually eliminate stress and therefore remaining physiological stress markers and negative affect precipitate a need to engage in external affect regulation (i.e., eating) [See 8]. It should be noted that support for this theoretical explanation linking attachment avoidance and eating behaviour is scant compared with the better understood relationship between attachment anxiety and eating behaviour.

However, these findings focus only on ‘organised’ forms of attachment orientations. That is, where mental models and strategies are ‘coherent’ and allow individuals to select (which may be explicit or implicit) strategies to manage situations that are adaptive and predictable based on their experience of inter-personal relationships [16]. For example, it is logical and adaptive for the child of a neglectful

caregiver to deactivate their attachment system as in attachment avoidance and seek to minimise intimacy. Even when individuals are high in both attachment avoidance and anxiety, an orientation called fearful-avoidance, they will use the hyperactivating and deactivating strategies intermittently. By contrast, adult disorganized attachment is characterised by a general fear of romantic attachment figures and refers to a lack of coherent and predictable strategies to manage the self and others [16]. This leads to contradictory and confused behaviour in response to distress; approach behaviours may be initiated but are left incomplete due to fear and a simultaneous desire to distance themselves [17]. A recent development has been the measurement of disorganisation as a construct that is separate and additional to the organised dimensions of adult attachment [16].

While attachment avoidance reflects punitive or neglectful relationship experiences and attachment anxiety reflects inconsistency in relational experiences, disorganized attachment is related to child abuse, loss, trauma and otherwise frightening interpersonal experiences. Research has shown that 80% of maltreated children had a disorganized attachment pattern [18]. Such adverse childhood experiences are also relevant to the understanding of obesity [19]. A systematic review and meta-analysis [20] not only showed a clear relationship between childhood experience of abuse and adult obesity but also severe abuse was significantly more related to obesity than less severe abuse. Suggested mechanisms underpinning this relationship included maladaptive coping responses, stress and emotional perturbations.

Considering the shared aetiology of disorganized attachment and obesity, with respect to the experience of abuse in childhood, we investigated whether a relationship between disorganized attachment, eating behaviour and BMI existed. Here, our approach was to focus on a general population and sub-clinical eating behaviours, of the kind investigated previously in relation to attachment anxiety and its relationship with BMI [12]. The ability to investigate this relationship in a large general population has been facilitated by the recent development of the adult disorganized attachment scale [16], which assesses the construct of disorganization as a continuous dimension. Importantly, for the assessment of disorganized attachment in a general population, this approach can assess a range of levels, including relatively low scores.

Therefore, we hypothesised that higher disorganized attachment scores would relate to higher BMI and that this relationship would be mediated by measures of disinhibited eating. Specifically, we expected this relationship to exist independent of attachment anxiety (i.e., when attachment anxiety is controlled for). Following previous research, we examined the construct of disinhibited eating with measures

of uncontrolled eating and emotional eating. Uncontrolled eating is a measure of opportunistic eating in response to both internal (e.g., extreme hunger) and external (e.g., the smell of a tempting food) cues to eat [10]. This is a separate construct to eating as a response to negative emotion (emotional eating).

Given the contradictory nature of patterns of behaviour associated with disorganized attachment, we also tentatively hypothesised that a relationship with BMI might also be mediated by dietary restraint. Dietary restraint refers to the cognitive control over intake in order to influence body weight or shape [10] and has been conceptualised as antagonistic to disinhibited eating [21]. One possibility is that the hypothesised use of eating to regulate affect by attachment disorganized individuals might precipitate reactionary dietary restraint (which has been shown to ironically lead to further disinhibited eating behaviours [22]).

In addition, using an exploratory approach based on the primary hypotheses being supported, we produced a comprehensive model that incorporated both disorganized attachment *and* attachment anxiety as predictors of body mass index via disinhibited eating behaviours.

Methods

This study is a secondary data analysis of an unpublished dataset collected for a different purpose. A brief description of the primary study and its results can be found in the supplementary information. The hypotheses were pre-registered with the Open Science Framework (osf.io/2dr74) following data collection but before the data analyses associated with this paper. The dataset has been deposited for open access with the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/2dr74/?view_only=a7bfeeal1614401ca9464545ab4f620c).

Participants

A total of 752 participants began the study but 163 participants failed to complete all of the measures and were therefore excluded. We excluded a further 52 participants from our dataset because either they reported a height and weight that yielded an ambiguous or spurious BMI value (e.g., unlikely to be possible) or a BMI that was valid but considered to be below healthy-range (i.e., below 18) to minimise risk of inadvertently including disordered individuals in our sample. This resulted in a sample size of 537 (Male = 126, female = 404, other = 6, prefer not to say = 1; mean age = 25.5 years old, $SD = 9.9$). This sample size met with our requirements for adequately powering our analyses to detect effects; considering the novelty of our hypotheses a prudent approach was to power for small

effect sizes within our model. Following Fritz and MacKinnon's [23] guidance for detecting mediated effects with sample sizes providing 0.8 power using bias-corrected bootstrap approaches, we required a sample size of at least 462. To be eligible for the study, participants had to be over the age of 18 years old and have no current or previous diagnosis of an eating disorder.

Participants were recruited in two cohorts. In the first cohort ($n = 130$ completers), a consortium-led approach (Button et al. [24]) was taken by university students based at the University of Sheffield ($n = 63$ completers) and Swansea University ($n = 67$ completers). The cohort 1 sample consisted mainly of university students and staff, as the study was advertised to potential participants who could attend a session at the universities via campus posters and student-study participation systems only. The second cohort ($n = 459$) provided only self-report height and weight and therefore were able to complete the study entirely online. They were recruited via social media, posters and student-study participation systems.

For cohort 1, ethical approval was obtained from local human research ethics committees at both sites. For cohort 2, an ethical amendment outlining a change to an online only approach was approved by local human research ethics committees at both sites. All participants provided informed consent.

Measures

Disorganized attachment

The 9-item Disorganized Attachment scale [16] was used. This consists of a single subscale and for the current study Cronbach's alpha for this measure was .88. Participants rated their agreement to statements about their general experience of relationships (as opposed to a specific current relationship). For example, "I never know who I am with romantic partners". Responses were provided on a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Attachment anxiety and avoidance

The 12-item short-form Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire [25] was used to assess attachment anxiety (6 items) and attachment avoidance (6 items). For the current study, Cronbach's alpha for the attachment anxiety subscale was .88 and for the attachment avoidance subscale was .84. On a seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, participants stated their level of agreement with statements referring to the experience of interpersonal relationships. For example, "I worry a fair amount about losing my relationships" (attachment anxiety) and "I don't

feel comfortable opening up to others” (attachment avoidance).

Eating style

The 18-item short-form three factor eating questionnaire [10] was used to assess three constructs, cognitive restraint, emotional eating and uncontrolled eating. Participants responded with the extent to which statements applied to them on a 4-point scale ranging from definitely true to definitely false or a variant of this scale depending on the question. For the cognitive restraint scale (6 items; Cronbach’s alpha for this study = .85), statements concerned the extent to which they consciously apply restraint to their eating behaviour (e.g., “I consciously hold back at meals in order not to gain weight”). For the uncontrolled eating scale (9 items; Cronbach’s alpha for this study = .86), statements concerned the extent to which they lost control over their eating behaviour (e.g., “Sometimes when I start eating, I just can’t seem to stop”). For the emotional eating scale (3 items; Cronbach’s alpha for this study = .87), statements concerned eating in response to emotional states (e.g., “When I feel lonely, I console myself with food”).

Anthropometric measures

For cohort 1, participants attended a lab session where their height and weight were measured by a researcher using a portable stadiometer and non-medical grade weighing scales respectively. For cohort 2, current height and weight were self-reported by participants using their preferred units. These were converted to metric measures. Across both cohorts, height and weight measures were used to calculate BMI (kg/m^2).

Procedure

The study was hosted on Qualtrics survey software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA) and participants had to click an anonymised link to access the study. They were asked to read an information sheet and informed consent screen and to tick a box if they consented. Following this they were asked to complete all measures (those outlined here for the current study as well as those outlined in the supplementary information for the full version of the study) as well as basic demographic questions. Upon completion participants were either asked about their availability and contact information for a follow-up session for the measurement of height and weight and then debriefed (cohort 1) or asked to self-report their height and weight and then debriefed (cohort 2).

Data analysis

Following Price et al. [26], we merged the BMI data from the two cohorts. This decision was made on the basis that self-reported BMI and researcher-measured BMI have been found to be highly-correlated for both younger [27] and older adults [28]. Nevertheless, height can be overestimated and weight can be underestimated, therefore cohort (i.e., self-report vs. measured) was entered as a covariate into our analyses, however, as it was not a significant covariate and made no difference to the results of our analyses it was trimmed from our final models.

In order to examine our primary hypotheses, a parallel mediation model was conducted. This approach was selected because it allows for the simultaneous entry of multiple mediators within a single model, such that the independent contributions of each mediator as part of an indirect pathway can be assessed. It also allowed for covariates to be entered into the model.

Our model was conducted with disorganized attachment (predictor), BMI (outcome) and parallel multiple mediators (cognitive restraint, emotional eating and uncontrolled eating). In order to isolate an effect of disorganized attachment we controlled for both attachment avoidance and anxiety. Also, following Wilkinson et al. [11, 12], we controlled for gender and age. This model was conducted using PROCESS v3.1 [29]. The covariates were controlled for at the level of both the mediator and the outcome.

Following this, a comprehensive model was produced that incorporated both findings associated with disorganized attachment (i.e., the results of the first analysis) and a replication of the significant indirect relationship between attachment anxiety, disinhibited eating measures and BMI reported in previous research [11, 12]. This approach allows, for the first time, for the indirect effect of attachment anxiety on BMI to be tested whilst also controlling for disorganized attachment.

Therefore, path analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS AMOS. v.25.0. We included disorganized attachment, attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, age and gender as exogenous variables, and uncontrolled eating, emotional eating and BMI as endogenous variables. Cognitive restraint was not included, as our primary analysis (above) failed to support a role for this factor. Covariance relationships were specified between each of the exogenous variables and error terms were included for each endogenous variable. Direct relationships were specified from each exogenous variable to each endogenous variable; therefore both direct and indirect relationships could be examined. Both of our models ran 5000 bootstrap samples and 95% confidence intervals are reported.

Results

Means and standard deviations for each measure and correlations between them can be found in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Confirmatory analyses of primary pre-registered hypotheses: Disorganized attachment, eating behaviours (cognitive restraint, emotional and uncontrolled eating) and BMI

Our parallel multiple mediation model (Fig. 1) showed that there was no significant direct relationship between disorganized attachment and BMI when no mediators were included in the model (total effects) and this remained the case when mediators were included (direct effects). However, a significant indirect effect that ran between disorganized attachment and BMI via uncontrolled eating was identified. There were no significant indirect effects associated with cognitive restraint or emotional eating.

Table 1 For each measure, mean scores, standard deviation (SD) and score range are shown

	Mean scores	SD	Score range
Disorganised attachment (a.u.)	2.8	1.2	1–7
Attachment anxiety (a.u.)	4.3	1.4	1–7
Attachment avoidance (a.u.)	3.5	1.2	1–7
Uncontrolled eating (a.u.)	20.2	4.9	9–36
Emotional eating (a.u.)	7.1	2.4	3–12
Cognitive restraint (a.u.)	12	3.8	6–24
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.7	4.3	18.04–47.5

Units are shown including indication when scores are arbitrary units (a.u.)

Table 2 Pearson's correlations between each measure are shown (* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$)

	Emotional eating	Cognitive restraint	Attachment anxiety	Attachment avoidance	Disorganised attachment	BMI	Age	Gender
Uncontrolled eating	.53**	0.06	.24**	0.03	.23**	.14**	-.24**	0.05
Emotional eating		.13**	.32**	0.07	.14**	.204**	-.17**	.17**
Cognitive restraint			.2**	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.02	.16**
Attachment anxiety				.095*	.36**	-0.05	-.31**	.12**
Attachment avoidance					.37**	-0.004	0.01	-.11**
Disorganised attachment						-0.05	-.19**	0.003
BMI							.31**	-0.03
Age								-.1*

Path analysis testing a comprehensive model of the relationships between attachment orientations, disinhibited eating behaviours and BMI

Our path analysis revealed the significant indirect pathway between disorganized attachment and BMI via uncontrolled eating that was observed within our primary analysis. Also, a significant indirect pathway between attachment anxiety and BMI via emotional eating was identified. No direct effects between attachment orientations and BMI (without mediators included) were observed. Figure 2 provides a visualisation of our model, however, for the sake of legibility we have only included key relationships and statistics. Comprehensive information regarding direct relationships relating to our specific hypotheses can be found in Tables 3 and 4 and other direct relationships can be found in the supplementary information file.

Overall, a good model fit was indicated with a chi square goodness of fit statistic that was not significant ($p = 0.672$), a comparative fit index (CFI) of 1.00 and a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of 0.00

Discussion

This study has identified disorganized attachment as a novel predictor of BMI in a non-clinical population via the mechanism of uncontrolled eating. Our hypotheses were partially confirmed. The relationship between disorganized attachment and BMI was mediated by uncontrolled eating only (and not emotional eating or cognitive restraint). This highlights the importance of accounting for uncontrolled eating in individuals who present to health professionals with disorganized attachment and a high BMI.

For the first time, we can provide evidence to support a comprehensive theoretical model that incorporates both organised and disorganized attachment orientations and their relationship to eating psychopathology and BMI (Fig. 2).

Fig. 1 Unstandardised regression coefficients are shown with standard error in brackets $B(SE)$. Values in brackets are direct effects when controlling for indirect effects. Significant indirect relationships between disorganized attachment and BMI are denoted by an asterisk and were found via uncontrolled eating ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.04$), LLCI

$= 0.02$, ULCI = 0.16) but not via cognitive restraint ($B = -0.0004$, $SE = 0.01$, LLCI = -0.02 , ULCI = 0.02) or emotional eating ($B = 0.006$, $SE = 0.04$, LLCI = -0.08 , ULCI = 0.1). The overall R^2 for the model was 0.18

Importantly, this speaks to a broader theoretical model that links attachment orientations to health outcomes more generally [15], suggesting that an extension is required, such that it goes beyond organised forms of attachment orientations to include effects of disorganization on health outcomes.

The most theoretically sound explanation for why disorganized attachment relates to BMI via uncontrolled eating is that these behaviours serve affect regulatory need. Specifically, whilst the motivator for eating might not be emotion, it is some other eating-related cue, the incidental reward associated with such eating behaviours may have the unintended consequence of regulating affect. This suggestion is consistent with Paetzold et al.'s [16] view of disorganized attachment in two ways; firstly, disorganized attachment is associated with problematic emotion regulation - anger and hostility. When these are experienced they are associated with impulsivity and general negative emotionality, which in turn may precipitate a need for affect regulation. However, due to their conflict around support seeking (a general fear of relationships “encourages simultaneous and confused approach and avoidance of the attachment figure for support and solace in times of need” [16]), highly disorganized individuals are likely to receive less support and perceive support as poorer than less disorganized individuals. External forms of affect regulation, such as disinhibition related to food consumption, may provide one of the few ways for disorganized individuals to manage their emotions.

Secondly, the characteristic incoherence of a disorganized attachment strategy is borne out here; specifically, it is likely that the affect regulatory effects of uncontrolled eating behaviours are reinforced but have

failed to be translated into a coherent strategy such as ‘emotional eating’. Future research is required to test these theoretical pathways; specifically, approaches to emotion regulation that might explain the relationship between disorganized attachment orientation and such eating behaviour. Moreover, the extent to which there is shared (or not) aetiology with attachment anxiety merits scrutiny.

For anxiously attached individuals, the indirect relationship between attachment anxiety and BMI via emotional eating is consistent with previous research [12]. However, it is notable, that it in our model it was necessary to specify a relationship running from emotional eating to uncontrolled eating (for improved model fit). This is consistent with the broader literature; recent commentary by Van Strien [30] reports on the co-occurrence of such constructs (this paper refers to external eating which is conceptually similar to uncontrolled eating) and explains it in terms of the ‘escape-of-self-awareness’ theory [31], whereby emotional eaters narrow their attention to their immediate environment. Indeed, previous work suggests that attachment anxiety is associated with an inability to disengage with a source of upset [12] and eating in this context allows for escape/ disengagement.

Contrary to one of our hypotheses, there was no significant relationship between disorganized attachment and cognitive restraint. This is inconsistent with traditional ‘restraint theory’ [22], which suggests that disinhibited eating is a response to restraint. Rather, relationships with disinhibited eating behaviours were shown without respective relationships with cognitive restraint. This is more consistent with psychosomatic theory, which suggests that personality traits and psychopathology can cause disinhibited eating irrespective of restraint status [10]. One

Fig. 2 An updated theoretical model of the relationship between attachment orientations and BMI via eating behaviour is presented that for the first time includes disorganized attachment. Unstandardised regression coefficients are shown with standard error in brackets *B* (SE). Significant indirect relationships are denoted by an asterisk and

were found for disorganized attachment and BMI via uncontrolled eating ($B = 0.08$, $LLCI = 0.02$, $ULCI = 0.17$, $p = 0.002$) and attachment anxiety and BMI via emotional eating ($B = 0.19$, $LLCI = 0.09$, $ULCI = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$)

Table 3 Unstandardized path coefficients, standard errors, and *t*-values for path analysis

Path	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Disorganised attachment to UE	0.7	0.18	3.9	<0.001
Disorganised attachment to EE	0.02	0.1	0.15	0.88
Disorganised attachment to BMI	−0.15	0.16	−0.92	0.36
Attachment anxiety to UE	−0.01	0.15	−0.09	0.93
Attachment anxiety to EE	0.47	0.08	5.96	<0.001
Attachment anxiety to BMI	−0.04	0.14	−0.31	0.76
UE to BMI	0.11	0.04	2.58	0.01
EE to BMI	0.4	0.09	4.5	<0.001

*Additional information about other direct pathways can be found in the supplementary information file

speculation is that the interplay between restrained eating and disinhibited eating described within traditional restraint theory actually represents a relatively coherent strategy, whereby disinhibition is a predictable response to restraint and restraint is a predictable response to disinhibition. Such a coherent pattern of behaviour is uncharacteristic of attachment disorganized individuals. Given the novelty of this finding and our limited understanding of disorganized attachment relative to organised attachment orientations, future research should attempt to replicate this finding.

Some of our findings here are also contrary to a recent meta-analysis [8], which showed a significant relationship between attachment avoidance and emotional eating. We failed to find a significant relationship of this kind despite our larger sample size. A greater understanding of the role of attachment avoidance in models of attachment orientations and eating behaviour is needed, especially given recent results suggesting that attachment avoidance actually

relates to restricted eating via the mechanism of ‘emotional cut-off’ [32]. This latter finding and the failure to find a significant relationship between attachment avoidance and emotional eating in the current study are generally more consistent with our theoretical understanding of attachment avoidance; attachment avoidant individuals engage in deactivating strategies that actively minimise the experience of negative affect and cognitions [33], therefore there is no requirement to affect regulate using food in the first place.

It is notable that our findings were evident even when the mean disorganized attachment score for the overall sample was relatively low on the scale (2.82 arbitrary units; a.u.) and the maximum (6.67 a.u.) was just below the top of the scale (7 a.u.). Stronger relationships may be evident in a more clinically-relevant sample, for example patients undergoing bariatric-metabolic surgery. Previous research has shown that attachment insecurity is more prevalent in patients undergoing bariatric-metabolic surgery than in lean control populations [34, 35] and that there is a relationship between attachment anxiety and binge eating mediated by emotion-regulation difficulties for candidates for surgery [36]. Future weight-loss surgery research should consider a role for disorganized attachment given that eating psychopathologies (including those related to uncontrolled eating) initially decrease following surgery but then significantly and problematically increase in follow ups beyond a year after surgery [37, 38].

Previous research has shown that maternal attachment anxiety is associated with the use of feeding practices that promote child emotional eating, amongst other bidirectional effects [39]. Future research might consider exploring the effect of parental disorganized attachment on child feeding practices. More generally it has been found that parents with

Table 4 Specific indirect effects and their respective confidence intervals and p-values for the path model

Path	Indirect effect	Bias-corrected 95% CI	p value
Disorganised attachment to UE to BMI	0.08	0.02, 0.17	0.002
Disorganised attachment to EE to BMI	0.01	−0.08, 0.1	0.91
Attachment anxiety to UE to BMI	−0.001	−0.04, 0.04	0.87
Attachment anxiety to EE to BMI	0.19	0.09, 0.32	<0.001

disorganized attachment behave in ways that may engender disorganized attachment in a child [40]. Whether eating behaviours form some part of this complex relationship remains to be explored.

More generally it should be noted that only a relatively small percentage of the variance associated with BMI was explained by our models (16–18%), which is in line with previous studies [11, 12]. Furthermore, only correlational relationships were examined here and therefore causal inferences cannot be made. One possibility is reverse causality which would suggest that a higher BMI leads to disinhibited eating behaviours and this affects attachment orientations. In all likelihood, a more complex non-recursive relationship exists which future longitudinal work might consider. A strength of our study is the inclusion of a subset of researcher-measured height and weight to derive the body mass index rather than just self-reported height and weight alone.

This work represents a theoretical advancement of this area in line with the general attachment literature which is growing with respect to our understanding of adult disorganized attachment. Future work should build on the models presented here to include additional demographic and individual difference level factors, for example socioeconomic status, which is associated with both attachment [41] and BMI [42] and/ or neuroticism which is also associated with both eating behaviours [43] and attachment orientations [44].

In addition, given that attachment orientations are fundamentally rooted in experiences with close others, it is vital that future research consider roles for social relationship level variables (e.g., relationship status and social network perceptions). Of particular interest is that perceived social support has been shown to moderate the relationship between attachment anxiety and health-related measures [45]. Specifically, future work could examine whether, like highly anxiously attached individuals, highly attachment disorganized individuals' health is poorer despite a high level of perceived social support compared to low attachment disorganized individuals.

Moreover, this work should inform our broader understanding of the association between attachment orientations and health outcomes [46], models *must* consider the role of disorganized attachment over and above organised forms of attachment. Clinicians engaged in addressing eating

problems and weight management should consider attachment orientations in their patient assessments and be mindful that attachment disorganized individuals are especially likely to engage in uncontrolled eating behaviours that are associated with a higher BMI. Future work might also consider whether specific interventions are more or less appropriate for use with individuals who have different attachment profiles.

Acknowledgements We thank Lameise Al-Hashimi and Rebecca Buckley. (Swansea University), and Laurie Hutchinson, Imogen Titjen & Ee Jing Loh. (University of Sheffield) for their assistance with data collection for the primary study.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

References

1. World Obesity Federation. Obesity infographics. World Obesity Federation website 2017. <https://www.obesityday.worldobesity.org/world-obesity-day-2017>.
2. World Health Organisation. Obesity and overweight, WHO website 2016. <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight>.
3. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration. Trends in adult body-mass index in 200 countries from 1975 to 2014: a pooled analysis of 1698 population-based measurement studies with 19·2 million participants. *The Lancet*. 2016;387:1377–96.
4. Ells LJ, Demaio A, Farpour-Lambert N. Diet, genes, and obesity. *BMJ: Br Med J*. 2018;360:k7.
5. Diener MJ, Geenen R, Koelen JA, Aarts F, Gerdes VEA, Brandjes DPM, et al. The significance of attachment quality for obesity: a meta-analytic review. *Can J Behav Scit*. 2016;48:255–65.
6. Bowlby J. Attachment and loss: attachment. New York, U.S.A: John Bowlby, Basic Books, 1969.
7. Brennan KA, Clark CL, Shaver PR. Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In: Simpson JA, Rholes WS, editors. Attachment theory and close relationships. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press. 1998 pp. 46–76.
8. Faber A, Dubé L, Knäuper B. Attachment and eating: A meta-analytic review of the relevance of attachment for unhealthy and healthy eating behaviors in the general population. *Appetite*. 2017;123:410–38.
9. Westenhoefer J, Broeckmann P, Münch A-K, Pudel V. Cognitive control of eating behavior and the disinhibition effect. *Appetite*. 1994;23:27–41.

10. Karlsson J, Persson L-O, Sjöström L, Sullivan M. Psychometric properties and factor structure of the Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire (TFEQ) in obese men and women. Results from the Swedish Obese Subjects (SOS) study. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*. 2000;24:12.
11. Wilkinson LL, Rowe AC, Bishop RJ, Brunstrom JM. Attachment anxiety, disinhibited eating, and body mass index in adulthood. *Int J Obes*. 2010;34:1442–5.
12. Wilkinson LL, Rowe AC, Robinson E, Hardman CA. Explaining the relationship between attachment anxiety, eating behaviour and BMI. *Appetite*. 2018;127:214–22.
13. Mikulincer M. Adult attachment style and affect regulation: strategic variations in self-appraisals. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1998;75:420.
14. Mikulincer M, Florian V. The relationship between adult attachment styles and emotional and cognitive reactions to stressful events. 1998.
15. Maunder R, Hunter J. Attachment and psychosomatic medicine: developmental contributions to stress and disease. *Psychosom Med*. 2001;63:556–67.
16. Paetzold RL, Rholes WS, Kohn JL. Disorganized attachment in adulthood: Theory, measurement, and implications for romantic relationships. *Rev Gen Psychol*. 2015;19:146.
17. Main M, Solomon J. Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. In: Greenberg MT, Cicchetti D, Cummings EM, editors. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research, and intervention*. Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press, 1990. pp. 121–60.
18. Cicchetti D, Barnett D. Attachment organization in maltreated preschoolers. *Dev Psychopathol*. 1991;3:397–411.
19. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, Williamson DF, Spitz AM, Edwards V, et al. Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *Am J Prev Med*. 1998;14:245–58.
20. Hemmingsson E, Johansson K, Reynisdottir S. Effects of childhood abuse on adult obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*. 2014;15:882–93.
21. Van Strien T, Cleven A, Schippers G. Restraint, tendency toward overeating and ice cream consumption. *Int J Eat Disord*. 2000;28:333–8.
22. Herman CP, Mack D. Restrained and unrestrained eating 1. *J Pers*. 1975;43:647–60.
23. Fritz MS, MacKinnon DP. Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychol Sci*. 2007;18:233–9.
24. Button K, Lawrence N, Chambers C, Munafò M. Instilling scientific rigour at the grassroots. In: *The Psychologist*. NY, U.S.A.: British Psychological Society, 2016. pp 158–67.
25. Lafontaine M-F, Brassard A, Lussier Y, Valois P, Shaver PR, Johnson SM. Selecting the best items for a short-form of the Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire. *Eur J Psychol Assessment*. 2016;32:140.
26. Price M, Higgs S, Lee M. Self-reported eating traits: underlying components of food responsiveness and dietary restriction are positively related to BMI. *Appetite*. 2015;95:203–10.
27. Pursey K, Burrows TL, Stanwell P, Collins CE. How accurate is web-based self-reported height, weight, and body mass index in young adults? *J Med Internet Res*. 2014;16:1.
28. Ng SP, Korda R, Clements M, Latz I, Bauman A, Bambrick H, et al. Validity of self-reported height and weight and derived body mass index in middle-aged and elderly individuals in Australia. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2011;35:557–63.
29. Hayes AF. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. NY, U.S.A.: Guilford Press, 2013.
30. van Strien T. Causes of emotional eating and matched treatment of obesity. *Curr Diab Rep*. 2018;18:1–8.
31. Heatherton TF, Baumeister RF. Binge eating as escape from self-awareness. *Psychol Bull*. 1991;110:86.
32. Han S, Kahn JH. Attachment, emotion regulation difficulties, and disordered eating among college women and men. *Couns Psychol*. 2017;45:1066–90.
33. Mikulincer M, Shaver PR, Pereg D. Attachment theory and affect regulation: The dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motiv Emot*. 2003;27:77–102.
34. Nancarrow A, Hollywood A, Ogden J, Hashemi M. The role of attachment in body weight and weight loss in bariatric Patients. *Obes Surg*. 2018;28:410–4.
35. Wilkinson L, Rowe A, Sheldon C, Johnson A, Brunstrom J. Disinhibited eating mediates differences in attachment insecurity between bariatric surgery candidates/recipients and lean controls. *Int J Obes*. 2017;41:1831.
36. Shakory S, Van Exan J, Mills JS, Sockalingam S, Keating L, Taube-Schiff M. Binge eating in bariatric surgery candidates: The role of insecure attachment and emotion regulation. *Appetite*. 2015;91:69–75.
37. Devlin MJ, King WC, Kalarchian MA, Hinerman A, Marcus MD, Yanovski SZ, et al. Eating pathology and associations with long-term changes in weight and quality of life in the longitudinal assessment of bariatric surgery study. *Int J Eat Disord*. 2018;51:1322–1330.
38. Nasirzadeh Y, Kantarovich K, Wnuk S, Okrainec A, Cassin SE, Hawa R, et al. Binge Eating, Loss of Control over Eating, Emotional Eating, and Night Eating After Bariatric Surgery: Results from the Toronto Bari-PSYCH Cohort Study. *Obes Surg*. 2018;28:2032–9.
39. Hardman CA, Christiansen P, Wilkinson LL. Using food to soothe: Maternal attachment anxiety is associated with child emotional eating. *Appetite*. 2016;99:91–96.
40. Madigan S, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Van IJzendoorn MH, Moran G, Pederson DR, Benoit D. Unresolved states of mind, anomalous parental behavior, and disorganized attachment: A review and meta-analysis of a transmission gap. *Attach Hum Dev*. 2006;8:89–111.
41. Van IJzendoorn MH, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ. Invariance of adult attachment across gender, age, culture, and socioeconomic status? *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2010;27:200–8.
42. Spinosa J, Christiansen P, Dickson J, Lorenzetti V, Hardman C. From socio-economic disadvantage to obesity: The mediating role of psychological distress and emotional eating. *Obesity*. 2019;27:559–64.
43. Ellickson-Larew S, Naragon-Gainey K, Watson D. Pathological eating behaviors, BMI, and facet-level traits: the roles of conscientiousness, neuroticism, and impulsivity. *Eat Behav*. 2013;14:428–31.
44. Crawford TN, Shaver PR, Goldsmith HH. How affect regulation moderates the association between anxious attachment and neuroticism. *Attach Hum Dev*. 2007;9:95–109.
45. Stanton SC, Campbell L. Psychological and physiological predictors of health in romantic relationships: an attachment perspective. *J Pers*. 2014;82:528–38.
46. Lewczuk K, Kobylińska D, Marchlewska M, Krysztofiak M, Glica A, Moiseeva V. Adult attachment and health symptoms: The mediating role of emotion regulation difficulties. *Curr Psychol*. 2018;1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0097-z>.