Shearman, N., Millings, A., Carroll, D., & Rowe, A. (2019). A preliminary exploration of the links between attachment disorganisation and schizotypy dimensions in adulthood. *Schizophrenia Research*, 208, 493-495.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.01.004>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.schres.2019.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.01.004)

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

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.01.004> . 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/>

Letter to the Editor

A preliminary exploration of the links between attachment disorganisation and schizotypy dimensions in adulthood

Nate Shearman^{a,*}, Abigail Millings^b, Daniel Carroll^b, Angela Rowe^c

^a Clinical Psychology Unit, University of Sheffield, Cathedral Court, 1 Vicar Lane, Sheffield S1 2LT, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

^b Psychology Department, University of Sheffield, Cathedral Court, 1 Vicar Lane, Sheffield S1 2LT, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

^c School of Experimental Psychology, University of Bristol, Priory Road Complex, 12A Priory Road, Clifton BS8 1TU, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ARTICLE INFO

© 2018.

Article history:

Available online xxx

Dear Editor,

The cognitive, emotional and behavioural correlates of attachment insecurity are a growing area of clinical interest within the psychosis literature (e.g., Sitko et al., 2014), due to the established links between adversity and trauma in relationships and psychosis (Varese et al., 2012). Researchers have examined whether and how individual differences in social-cognitive conceptualisations of attachment insecurity, i.e., attachment anxiety and avoidance (Mikulincer et al., 2003), might underpin the development of psychosis experiences. This interest has extended to examine observable characteristics of psychosis phenomena, i.e., schizotypy, within the general population, due to a shift towards dimensional approaches to psychosis experiences, in order to better understand the psychosis continuum (Mason and Claridge, 2006). Researchers have identified links between attachment anxiety and avoidance and schizotypy in general and clinical populations (Korver-Nieberg et al., 2014). However, the contribution of attachment disorganisation to schizotypy has been neglected.

Whilst the behavioural correlates of attachment anxiety (approach behaviours) and avoidance (avoid behaviours) together capture what can be seen in disorganisation, they do not capture the key hallmark of disorganisation: fear of the attachment figure (Paetzold et al., 2015). Fear of the attachment figure is relevant to schizotypy, because researchers have argued that disorganisation is orthogonal to the anxious and avoidant patterns in its influence on the development of fearful psychosis experiences (Berry et al., 2017) and a fearful attachment style, thought to share similarities with attachment disor-

ganisation, mediates the relationships between abuse and schizotypy (Scheinbaum et al., 2014).

The paucity of research on attachment disorganisation could be explained by the historical absence of a dimensional measure for adult close relationships. Fortunately, such a measure was recently developed and focuses on the distinct aspect of relational fear (Paetzold et al., 2015). Therefore, for the first time, we examined attachment anxiety, avoidance and disorganisation as predictors of schizotypy.

We examined the relationships between attachment anxiety, avoidance and disorganisation, and schizotypy, amongst university students in the UK, using three measures: the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Brennan et al., 1998), the Attachment Disorganisation Scale (Paetzold et al., 2015), and the Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences tapping four schizotypy dimensions (Mason and Claridge, 2006), i.e., unusual experiences (UE), cognitive disorganisation (CD), introverted anhedonia (IA) and impulsive nonconformity (IN). Ethical approval was granted by the university's ethics committee and participants provided informed consent. Participants were 303 females and 106 males, of which 277 were undergraduates and 132 were postgraduates, and 226 were in a romantic relationship whilst 183 were single. The mean age of participants was 22 years ($SD=6.17$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed to examine whether attachment disorganisation explained statistically significant amounts of variance in schizotypy dimensions, whilst controlling for demographics and attachment anxiety and avoidance. Table 1 provides a summary of the data, including R^2 change values. Our findings show for the first time that attachment disorganisation in adulthood predicts schizotypy experiences.

Attachment disorganisation and anxiety significantly predicted UE (e.g., voice hearing). Researchers suggest that fear might contribute to voice-hearing, and that schizotypy experiences might develop as defences against distress (Tiliopoulos and Goodall, 2009). Whilst avoidant individuals seek distance, UE might enable proximity seeking (despite fear) for individuals with higher levels of anx-

* Corresponding author at: Early Intervention Service, Sheffield Health and Social Care NHS Foundation Trust, Limbrick Centre, Limbrick Road, Sheffield S6 2PE, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Email addresses: nate.shearman@shsc.nhs.uk (N. Shearman); a.millings@sheffield.ac.uk (A. Millings); d.carroll@sheffield.ac.uk (D. Carroll); a.c.rowe@bristol.ac.uk (A. Rowe)

Table 1
Summary of hierarchical regression analyses.

Dependent variables	Independent variables	F value	R ²	ΔR ²	B	SE B	β
Unusual experiences	Step 1	–	0.038	–	0.95	0.130	0.036
					–0.005	0.011	–0.028
					–0.165	0.147	–0.067
	Step 2	–	0.188	0.15	0.368	0.116	0.158*
					0.086	0.119	0.033
					0.005	0.010	0.028
					–0.093	0.135	–0.037
					0.231	0.110	0.099*
					0.342	0.054	0.317**
	Step 3	16.427	0.223	0.035	0.162	0.052	0.154*
					0.145	0.118	0.055
					0.009	0.010	0.046
					–0.090	0.133	–0.036
					0.173	0.108	0.074
					0.261	0.056	0.242**
Cognitive disorganisation	Step 1	–	0.049	–	0.026	0.061	0.025
					0.852	0.202	0.262**
					1.901	0.681	0.136*
					–0.036	0.058	–0.036
					–1.814	0.771	–0.138*
					0.397	0.612	0.032
	Step 2	–	0.394	0.345	0.794	0.546	0.128*
					0.054	0.047	0.055
					–1.278	0.618	–0.097*
					–0.581	0.501	–0.047
					2.968	0.245	0.520**
					0.968	0.239	0.174**
	Step 3	38.338	0.401	0.007	1.931	0.547	0.138**
					0.062	0.047	0.063
					–1.271	0.616	–0.097*
					0.503		
					–0.717		–0.058
					2.781	0.259	0.487**
Introverted anhedonia	Step 1	–	0.024	–	0.652	0.281	0.117*
					1.981	0.937	0.115*
					0.011	0.104	0.005
					0.020	0.009	0.136*
					–0.290	0.118	–0.147*
					0.136	0.094	0.073
	Step 2	–	0.352	0.328	0.042	0.085	0.020
					0.022	0.007	0.144*
					–0.186	0.096	–0.094
					–0.100	0.078	–0.054
					0.056	0.038	0.065
					0.474	0.037	0.565**
	Step 3	31.141	0.352	0	0.042	0.086	0.020
					0.022	0.007	0.144*
					–0.186	0.097	–0.094
					–0.100	0.079	–0.054
					0.057	0.041	0.066
					0.475	0.044	0.566**
Impulsive nonconformity	Step 1	–	0.051	–	–0.007	0.147	–0.003
					–0.226	0.080	–0.137*
					–0.014	0.007	–0.119*
					–0.139	0.091	–0.090
					–0.001	0.072	–0.001
					–0.001	0.072	–0.001
	Step 2	–	0.129	0.078	–0.230	0.077	–0.139*
					–0.009	0.007	–0.078
					–0.107	0.088	–0.069
					–0.062	0.071	–0.042
					0.156	0.035	0.232**
					0.070	0.034	0.106*
	Step 3	12.460	0.179	0.05	–0.186	0.076	–0.112*
					–0.007	0.007	–0.057
					–0.105	0.085	–0.067
					–0.106	0.070	–0.072
					0.096	0.036	0.142*
					–0.033	0.039	–0.049

Table 1 (Continued)

Dependent variables	Independent variables	F value	R ²	ΔR ²	B	SE B	β
	Attachment disorganisation				0.641	0.130	0.316**

Notes.

* $p > .05$.

** $p > .001$.

iety and disorganisation - voices might represent displacement of fear associated with the attachment figure.

Attachment disorganisation and anxiety also predicted **IN** (e.g., impulsive and anti-social behaviours). **IN** suggests lower self-control so the lack of relationship with avoidance, characteristic of over-regulation, is unsurprising. Conversely, anxiety and disorganisation, might predict **IN** due to escalating displays of distress to ensure needs are met and/or attempts to protect the self from perceived or actual threat in close relationships respectively.

Attachment disorganisation and anxiety did not predict **IA**, whereas attachment avoidance did – again, indicating differences between disorganisation, anxiety, and avoidance. **IA** describes a lack of enjoyment and avoidance of intimacy, which arguably resembles the flat affective and distancing style of attachment avoidance.

Finally, attachment disorganisation, anxiety, and avoidance predicted cognitive disorganisation (e.g., poorer attention). However, we are cautious with our interpretation of attachment-related cognitive processes. Theorists have posited that attachment anxiety and avoidance yield individual differences in cognitive processes, as part of affect regulation (Mikulincer et al., 2003). However, experimental studies of student samples have yet to provide consistent support for attachment-related differences. We strongly advocate for clearer synthesis of the social-cognitive evidence of attachment-related differences in cognition.

We recognise the limitations of our method, including our sample. However, attachment and schizotypy studies have typically relied on student samples so our sample is readily comparable. Our findings indicate that further investigation of relationships between attachment disorganisation in adulthood and psychosis phenomena is warranted, particularly with links to life events (e.g., maltreatment) and other implicated mechanisms, e.g., dissociation (Berry et al., 2017).

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no known conflicts of interest.

References

- Berry, K., Varese, F., Bucci, S., 2017. Cognitive attachment model of voices: evidence base and future implications. *Front. Psych.* 8 (111), 1–13.
- Brennan, K.A., Clark, C.L., Shaver, P.R., 1998. Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: an integrative overview. In: Simpson, J.A., Rholes, W.S. (Eds.), *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*. Guilford Press, New York, pp. 46–76.
- Korver-Nieberg, N., Berry, K., Meijer, C.J., de Haan, L., 2014. Adult attachment and psychotic phenomenology in clinical and non-clinical samples: a systematic review. *Psychol. Psychother. Theory Res. Pract.* 87 (2), 127–154.
- Mason, O., Claridge, G., 2006. The Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences (O-LIFE): further description and extended norms. *Schizophr. Res.* 82 (2–3), 203–211.
- Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P., Pereg, D., 2003. Attachment theory and affect regulation: the dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motiv. Emot.* 27 (2), 77–102.
- Paetzold, R.L., Rholes, W.S., Kohn, J.L., 2015. Disorganized attachment in adulthood: theory, measurement, and implications for romantic relationships. *Rev. Gen. Psychol.* 19 (2), 146–156.
- Sheinbaum, T., Kwapil, T.R., Barrantes-Vidal, N., 2014. Fearful attachment mediates the association of childhood trauma with schizotypy and psychotic-like experiences. *Psychiatry Res.* 220 (1–2), 691–693.
- Sitko, K., Bentall, R.P., Shevlin, M., O'Sullivan, N., Sellwood, W., 2014. Associations between specific psychotic symptoms and specific childhood adversities are mediated by attachment styles: an analysis of the national comorbidity survey. *Psychiatry Res.* 217 (3), 202–209.
- Tiliopoulos, N., Goodall, K., 2009. The neglected link between adult attachment and schizotypal personality traits. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 47 (4), 299–304.
- Varese, F., Smeets, F., Drukker, M., Lieverse, R., Lataster, T., Bentall, R.P., 2012. Childhood adversities increase the risk of psychosis: a meta-analysis of patient-control, prospective- and cross-sectional cohort studies. *Schizophr. Bull.* 38 (4), 661–671.