



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Fett, A-K., Shergill, S.S., Korver-Nieberg, N., Yakub, F., Gromann, P. M. & Krabbendam, L. (2016). Learning to trust: trust and attachment in early psychosis. *Psychological medicine*, 46(7), pp. 1437-1447. doi: 10.1017/S0033291716000015

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/19367/>

**Link to published version:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291716000015>

**Copyright and reuse:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

# Psychological Medicine

## Learning to trust: Trust and attachment in early psychosis

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	PSM-D-15-00812R1
<b>Full Title:</b>	Learning to trust: Trust and attachment in early psychosis
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Article
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Anne-Kathrin Fett, Ph.D. VU University Amsterdam Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	VU University Amsterdam
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Anne-Kathrin Fett, Ph.D.
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Anne-Kathrin Fett, Ph.D. Sukhi S Shergill, PhD Nikie Korver-Nieberg, PhD Farah Yakub, MSc Paula M. Gromann Lydia Krabbendam, PhD
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Manuscript Region of Origin:</b>	NETHERLANDS
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Background: Distrust and social dysfunction are characteristic in psychosis and may arise from attachment insecurity, which is elevated in the disorder. The relationship between trust and attachment in the early stages of psychosis is unknown, yet could help to understand interpersonal difficulties and disease progression. This study aimed to investigate whether trust is reduced in patients with early psychosis and whether this is accounted for by attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety.</p> <p>Method: We used two trust games with a cooperative and unfair partner in a sample of 39 adolescents with early psychosis and 100 healthy controls.</p> <p>Results: Patients had higher levels of attachment anxiety, but the groups did not differ in attachment avoidance. Basic trust was lower in patients than controls, as indicated by lower initial investments. During cooperation patients increased their trust towards levels of controls, i.e. they were able to learn and to override initial suspiciousness.</p> <p>Discussion: Patients decreased their trust less than controls during unfair interactions. Anxious attachment was associated with higher basic trust and higher trust during unfair interactions and predicted trust independent of group status. Worries about the acceptance by others and low self-esteem are associated with psychosis and attachment anxiety and may explain behaviour that is focussed on conciliation, rather than self-protection.</p>

**Title:** Learning to trust: Trust and attachment in early psychosis

**Running title:** Trust and attachment

**Authors:** Anne-Kathrin J. Fett<sup>1,2</sup>, Sukhi S. Shergill<sup>2</sup>, Nikie Korver-Nieberg<sup>3</sup>, Farah Yakub<sup>2</sup>, Paula M. Gromann<sup>1</sup> and Lydia Krabbendam<sup>1,2</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Neuroscience and LEARN! Research Institute for Learning and Education, Faculty of Psychology and Education, VU University Amsterdam, Van der Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

<sup>2</sup>King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Department of Psychosis Studies, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8 AF, United Kingdom.

<sup>3</sup>AMC, Academic Psychiatric Centre, Department of Early Psychosis, Meibergdreef 5, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

**Corresponding author:**

Dr Anne-Kathrin Fett

Department of Educational Neuroscience, Faculty of Psychology and Education

VU University Amsterdam; Van der Boechorststraat I

1081 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands

T + 31 20 598 8859 / 598 3606; F + 31 20 598 8745; E-mail address: [a.j.fett@vu.nl](mailto:a.j.fett@vu.nl)

**Funding:** Anne-Kathrin Fett: supported by a Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) VENI grant 451-13-03 and a **NARSAD Young Investigator Grant from the Brain & Behaviour research Foundation [24138]**; Lydia Krabbendam: supported by a NWO VICI grant 453-11-005 Sukhi Shergill: supported by a Medical Research Council New Investigator Award Project grant 93641 and an ERC Consolidator Award.

**Word count text: 4700; Word count abstract: 208**

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Distrust and social dysfunction are characteristic in psychosis and may arise from attachment insecurity, which is elevated in the **disorder**. The relationship between trust and attachment in the early stages **of psychosis** is unknown, yet could help to understand interpersonal difficulties and disease progression. This study aimed to investigate whether trust is reduced in patients with early psychosis and whether this is accounted for by attachment **avoidance and attachment anxiety**.

**Method:** We used two trust games with a cooperative and unfair partner in a sample of 39 adolescents with early psychosis and 100 healthy controls.

**Results:** Patients had higher levels of attachment anxiety, but the groups did not differ in attachment avoidance. Basic trust was lower in patients than controls, as indicated by lower initial investments. During cooperation patients increased their trust towards levels of controls, i.e. they were able to learn and to override initial suspiciousness.

**Discussion:** Patients decreased their trust less than controls during unfair interactions. Anxious attachment was associated with higher basic trust and higher trust during unfair interactions and predicted trust independent of **group** status. Worries about the acceptance by others and low self-esteem are associated with psychosis and attachment anxiety and may explain behaviour that is focussed on conciliation, rather than self-protection.

**Keywords:** Trust, Early Psychosis, Paranoia, Attachment, Adolescence

## INTRODUCTION

Psychosis is characterized by problems in interpersonal functioning and distrust towards others (Couture *et al.*, 2006, Fett *et al.*, 2012). Trust is an essential component of successful social interactions and until recently has been difficult to probe experimentally. With the adaption of interactive paradigms from game theory into psychiatric research it became possible to experimentally study trust as a mechanism of social dysfunction in psychopathology (Fett *et al.*, 2014b, Sharp *et al.*, 2011, Sharp *et al.*, 2012). In the trust game the first player (investor) receives an endowment from the experimenter and can then decide whether to share part of that amount with the second player (trustee; (Berg *et al.*, 1995)). The shared amount is tripled and sent to the trustee, who then decides whether to honour the investor's trust (i.e. send part of the money back) or not (i.e. keep all or most of it). For the trustee, the highest earnings are obtained by keeping the money. Thus, sharing money in the first place requires the investor's trust in the benevolence of the trustee. Recent trust game research showed lower levels of trust in adult patients with non-affective psychosis and healthy first-degree relatives with an increased genetic risk of the disorder, compared to controls. Furthermore, lower trust was associated with higher levels of positive psychotic symptoms. Relatives and controls increased their trust when they learned that their counterpart generally behaves trustworthy. Suggestive of a reduced sensitivity to positive social information there was no effect on patients' trust (Fett *et al.*, 2012, Gromann *et al.*, 2013, Gromann *et al.*, 2014).

Anomalous trust and social dysfunction might be rooted in insecure attachment (Fonagy *et al.*, 2007). Attachment styles reflect individual differences in beliefs about relationships. They are thought to emerge from early experiences with primary caregivers, which lead to the formation of internal working models of others and the social world and function as guidance for

social behaviour in interpersonal situations later in life (Sroufe *et al.*, 1999). Attachment is typically classified as secure or insecure. Secure attachment comprises a positive view of the self and others. Insecure attachment comprises two underlying dimensions: (1) attachment anxiety, which is characterized by a rather positive view of others and a negative view of the self, and (2) attachment avoidance, which refers to a negative view of others and a positive view of the self (Berry *et al.*, 2007, 2008, Korver-Nieberg *et al.*, 2013). Attachment avoidance is thought to reduce social approach behaviour and attachment anxiety has been connected to profound worries about being liked by others (Shaver and Mikulincer, 2002).

To date there is surprisingly little research on the link between trust and attachment. In the general population higher levels of trust towards partners have been found in securely attached individuals and secure attachment has been associated with superior coping with trust violations, higher levels of trust in work settings and more prosocial behaviour. In addition, it has been linked to higher trust and cooperation in interactions with strangers in experimental settings (De Dreu, 2012, McClure *et al.*, 2013, Mikulincer, 1998, Simmons *et al.*, 2009, Van Lange *et al.*, 1997). Other research has confirmed that trust related characteristics, such as honesty and openness are promoted by attachment security (Gillath *et al.*, 2010) and that an secure attachment style is associated with a greater reliance of children in their mothers, which might reflect greater trust (Corriveau *et al.*, 2009). More evidence for the putative link between attachment and trust comes from research showing that in relationships between patient and physicians lower levels of trust were attachment dependent and associated with greater emotional distress and more physical limitations (Hinnen *et al.*, 2014, Holwerda *et al.*, 2013).

These findings suggest that securely attached individuals hold more positive beliefs about others and that this could account for stronger affiliative behaviour in a variety of social settings, including close but also more distant social relationships.

The rates of insecure attachment are higher in individuals with psychosis than in the healthy population and individuals with other psychiatric conditions (Berry *et al.*, 2007). As such, attachment theory may offer a useful explanatory framework for understanding deficits in trust and social functioning in psychosis. Previous research in patients with psychosis has linked attachment insecurity to interpersonal dysfunction, poorer engagement with services (Gumley *et al.*, 2013), poorer social and individual living skills and higher levels of inappropriate community behaviour (Couture *et al.*, 2007). Insecure attachment has also been associated with (subclinical) symptoms of psychosis, in both studies with patients and healthy individuals with high levels of schizotypy (Berry *et al.*, 2006, Liotti and Gumley, 2008, Read and Gumley, 2008). Cognitive models of psychosis propose that negative beliefs about others, which are characteristic of attachment insecurity, could play a role in their instantiation and maintenance (Freeman *et al.*, 2002, Garety *et al.*, 2001). Accordingly, specifically attachment avoidance may drive social withdrawal and paranoia. Attachment anxiety is characterised by a heightened sensitivity to interpersonal threat, which may increase psychotic symptoms. Associations between insecure attachment and higher levels of positive symptoms (Berry *et al.*, 2008, Berry *et al.*, 2006, Kvrjic *et al.*, 2012, MacBeth *et al.*, 2008, Meins *et al.*, 2008, Pickering *et al.*, 2008) and negative symptoms have been established (Gumley *et al.*, 2013, Korver-Nieberg *et al.*, 2013).

Attachment styles are formed early in life and have a long lasting impact. Accordingly, early negative experiences and adverse events during childhood might explain subsequent social

cognitive, emotional and behavioural problems that could increase the risk for psychotic symptoms (Gumley *et al.*, 2014, Read and Gumley, 2008). However, attachment also fluctuates in response to negative life events (Weinfield *et al.*, 2004, Zhang and Labouvie-Vief, 2004). Hence, it is possible that repeated negative social experiences, such as stigma or being in care increase attachment insecurity during the **course of psychosis**. The early stages of psychosis are therefore particularly interesting to investigate the association between attachment, symptoms and social dysfunction; yet, to date there has been surprisingly little research. Higher levels of attachment avoidance and anxiety have been found in first episode psychosis patients (FEP) compared to healthy controls and it has been shown attachment anxiety contributes to social dysfunction (Couture *et al.*, 2007, MacBeth *et al.*, 2011). MacBeth *et al.* (2011) found that patients' attachment styles were unrelated to psychotic symptoms and recent longitudinal study in FEP showed that attachment insecurity predicts the recovery from negative symptoms (Gumley *et al.*, 2014). In sum, some evidence associates attachment style with social dysfunction, but the evidence on the relationship between attachment and symptoms in FEP is mixed.

The aims of this study were twofold: (1) to investigate whether basic trust and the ability to adapt trust during social interactions is reduced in early psychosis compared to controls; and (2) to investigate whether potential differences are explained by attachment **avoidance and attachment anxiety**. Thirty-nine adolescents with early psychosis and 100 controls played two multi-round trust games. Psychosis has been associated with a differential sensitivity (**i.e. learning responses**) **after the provision** of positive and negative feedback (Strauss *et al.*, 2013). We therefore investigated interactions with a cooperative and an unfair game partner. Specifically, we investigated basic trust towards others (initial investments), the changes of trust



(increase/decrease of investments) over repeated interactions and the associations of both with attachment style. In the trust games higher trust (i.e. investments) signals the desire to affiliate, whereas lower trust indicates self-protective behaviour. We hypothesized that patients would show lower basic trust than controls. Research suggests that cognitive biases are more flexible during the early stages **of the disorder** (Dudley *et al.*, 2013). We therefore expected that the patients would increase their trust during interactions with a cooperative counterpart. Due to an elevated sensitivity to negative feedback, we expected lower trust in patients than in controls in interactions with the unfair partner. We hypothesized that group differences in trust would partly be accounted for by higher levels of attachment **avoidance or attachment anxiety** in patients. Finally, we explored the association between trust, symptoms and attachment style in patients. Based on previous research findings and cognitive models of psychosis we expected that lower levels of trust and higher levels of **attachment avoidance and anxiety** would be associated with higher levels of positive psychotic symptoms.

## **METHOD**

### *Participants*

The sample included 100 healthy adolescents and 39 adolescents with early psychosis. Informed consent was obtained from all adolescents and their parents/guardians if they were under 16. The study was approved by the South West London REC. Inclusion criteria for patients consisted of (1) age between 13-19 years, (2) having experienced a psychotic episode according to ICD-10 criteria (World Health Organization, 1992), as diagnosed by their clinician (for diagnoses see supplementary material 1), (3) good command of the English language and (4) being able and willing to give written informed consent. Additional inclusion criteria for the control group were

(5) no psychiatric diagnosis, including a personal or family history of a psychosis. Patients were recruited via consultant psychiatrists and the Mental Health Research Network in the SLAM-, Oxleas-, NELFT- and SEPT NHS Foundation Trusts. Control participants were recruited from local schools, the Institute of Psychiatry volunteer database ‘Mindsearch’, via colleagues and previous participants. For the controls, a telephone screening was completed to ensure that there were no psychiatric diagnoses within this group.

### *Instruments*

#### *The Trust Game*

All participants played two trust games, each consisting of 20 game rounds. They were told that they were playing with two anonymous human counterparts. However, in reality two probabilistic computer algorithms were used to model the counterparts, one reflecting a cooperative and one reflecting an unfair decision-making style. Participants took the investor role throughout both games. In each game round they had to transfer an (integer) amount between £0 and £10 to the trustee. The transferred amount was tripled and the subsequent trustee repayment depended on the previous investments and the computer algorithm (see supplementary material 2).

#### *Attachment*

Attachment style was assessed with the ‘Psychosis Attachment Measure’ (PAM; (Berry et al., 2006)), a 16-item questionnaire that is rated on 4-point scales ranging from 0 “not at all” to 4 “very much”. The PAM has a good reliability and validity (Berry *et al.*, 2008, Berry *et al.*, 2006, Wearden *et al.*, 2008). Cronbach alphas in the current sample reflect a good to acceptable internal consistency (anxiety subscale  $\alpha = 0.79$ ; avoidance subscale  $\alpha = 0.67$ ).

### *Symptom Assessment*

*Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale* (PANSS; (Kay et al., 1987)). The PANSS was used to assess symptoms during 2 weeks prior to testing on a scale ranging from 1 (absent) to 7 (extreme), which represents increasing levels of psychopathology. It consists of a positive, negative and general symptoms scale. **The PANSS was only completed for the adolescents with early psychosis and not for the healthy controls.**

*Green Paranoid Thoughts Scale* (GPTS; (Green et al., 2008)). The GPTS measures ‘social reference’ and ‘persecution’ paranoia with 16 items each that are answered on scales ranging from 1 (‘not at all’) to 5 (‘totally’). The GPTS has a high internal consistency and test-retest reliability and the indices in the current sample reflect a good internal consistency (social reference paranoia  $\alpha = 0.87$ , persecution paranoia  $\alpha = 0.88$ ).

### *Neuropsychological Assessment*

The vocabulary subtest of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI) was used as indicator of general estimated cognitive ability (Wechsler, 1999).

### *Procedure*

Participants were tested individually. They were assessed on the WASI vocabulary subtest, the PANSS **(patients only)**, GPTS and PAM and took part in the trust games subsequently. Before the trust game participants were given detailed written information about the procedure and two game rounds were illustrated by means of examples. The experimenter explained the game and asked comprehension questions to ensure that all participants fully understood how it works.

Participants were told that their game partners were in a different location and that they would interact via the internet. 50 controls and 22 patients completed the trust games in an MRI scanner and 50 controls and 17 patients completed them outside the scanner. Only some of the participants completed the trust games in the MRI scanner, as this was part of a larger study investigating underlying neural processes. Being in a scanner or not had no impact on the participants' behaviour during the trust games. Participants filled in a questionnaire about their perception of the game partner at the end of the testing session. Thirty-three % of the participants did not doubt that they were playing with real people, 53% said they had occasional doubts, and 14% indicated that they had strong doubts about whether they were interacting with real others. Finally, the earnings from one randomly selected round of the trust game were paid out to the participants in addition to the participation fee.

#### *Data analysis*

The analysis was conducted in Stata 11.2. First, differences between the patient and the control group in social demographics, estimated cognitive ability, attachment style and social reference- and persecutory paranoia were analysed with chi-square tests or regression analyses.

Second, we analysed group differences in the first investments across the two trust game conditions (basic trust) and the development of investments (changes in trust) across repeated interactions with each game partner. We used multilevel random regression analyses (XTREG), to account for multiple observations (investments (level 1); within participants (level 2)). To simplify the investigation of changes in trust across the repeated game rounds we divided each game into four *blocks* of five game rounds. Attachment style was added to the regression model to assess its impact on group differences in trust. Age, gender, estimated cognitive ability and the degree of belief in the experimental manipulation were controlled in all between-group analyses.

Finally, associations between attachment and symptom levels were investigated within patients by means of simple regression analyses. Associations between attachment and trust were analysed with multilevel random regression analyses.

## RESULTS

### *Sample characteristics*

Patients were older and had a lower estimated cognitive ability than controls. The groups differed significantly in ethnicity and living status. Patients had significantly higher levels of attachment anxiety than controls, but there were no group differences in attachment avoidance. Social reference and persecution paranoia were higher in patients than controls (see table 1).

-----Table 1 -----

### *Group differences in trust and the effect of attachment **avoidance and anxiety**.*

The groups did not differ in attachment avoidance and only attachment anxiety was included as potential explanatory factor of group differences in trust. For the analysis results see table 2.

*Basic trust.* Patients made significantly lower initial investments than controls (mean = 4.92, SD = 3.0 vs. mean = 5.85, SD = 2.86). The effect became stronger when attachment anxiety was added to the model. Attachment anxiety was significantly and positively associated with initial investments. There was no significant attachment anxiety by group interaction.

*Cooperative interactions: changes in trust.* Main effects of group and block (were qualified by a significant interaction, which remained significant when attachment anxiety was

added to the model. The attachment anxiety by block interaction was not significant, i.e. attachment anxiety did not explain change in investments. Analyses by group showed a stronger association between block and investments in patients than controls (patients:  $b = 0.29$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; controls:  $b = 0.11$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , see Figure 1).

*Unfair interactions: changes in trust.* Main effects of group and block were qualified by a significant interaction, which became stronger and remained significant when attachment anxiety was added to the model. The attachment anxiety by block interaction was not significant, i.e. attachment anxiety did not explain change in investments. Analyses by group showed a weaker, negative association between block and investments in patients than controls (patients:  $b = -0.19$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ; controls:  $b = -0.46$ ,  $p < 0.00$ , see Figure 1).

#### Figure 1 & Table 2

#### *Within patient analyses*

*Symptoms and trust.* There were no significant associations between initial or average investments and PANSS positive symptoms ( $b = -0.67$ ), social reference- ( $b = 0.03$ ), or persecution paranoia ( $b = 0.001$ , all  $p > 0.14$ ). Higher negative symptoms were significantly associated with lower initial- ( $b = -1.03$ ,  $p = 0.009$ ) and lower average investments towards the cooperative ( $b = -0.81$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ) and the unfair game partner ( $b = -0.64$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ). Interactions between block, positive and negative symptoms, social reference- and persecution paranoia were non-significant during interactions with both game partners (all  $p > 0.18$ ), i.e. symptoms were unrelated to change in investments.

*Symptoms and attachment.* Associations between attachment anxiety and PANSS positive and negative symptoms were non-significant ( $\beta$ 's = 0.17 and -0.19, both  $p > 0.26$ ). Attachment anxiety was significantly associated with social reference- ( $\beta = 0.70$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and persecution paranoia ( $\beta = 0.49$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Attachment avoidance was significantly associated with PANSS positive symptoms ( $\beta = 0.41$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ), higher social reference- ( $\beta = 0.52$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and persecution paranoia ( $\beta = 0.52$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), but not negative symptoms ( $\beta = 0.17$ ,  $p = 0.32$ ).

## **DISCUSSION**

The current study is the first to use the trust game to examine interpersonal trust and the explanatory role of attachment style in early psychosis. Our results showed reduced basic trust towards others in adolescent patients compared to healthy controls. As expected, patients had higher levels of attachment anxiety than controls; however the groups did not differ in attachment avoidance. Therefore, only attachment anxiety was considered as explanatory factor of group differences in trust. Against our expectations, attachment anxiety was associated with higher basic trust and did not account for group differences in trust. Patients and controls increased their trust during repeated interactions with the cooperative game partner and patients reached levels of trust similar in magnitude to those of controls. During interactions with the unfair partner in contrast patients decreased their levels of trust less than controls. Again, attachment anxiety did not account for these group differences.

### *Trust and the explanatory value of attachment style*

The finding of reduced basic trust in early psychosis is in line with research in adults with chronic psychosis and healthy first-degree relatives of patients, who have an increased genetic

risk for the **disorder** (Fett *et al.*, 2012, Gromann *et al.*, 2013). This suggests that reduced trust is related to the risk for psychosis. However, the young patients were sensitive to positive social signals and learned to trust, as indicated by increasing investments during cooperative interactions. Previous research in non-social settings showed that patients have a normal sensitivity to negative feedback and a reduced sensitivity to positive feedback (Strauss *et al.*, 2013) and that adults with chronic psychosis are also less sensitive to positive social cues (Fett *et al.*, 2012). In sum this might suggest that the sensitivity to positive social signals is still intact in the early stages **of the disorder**.

Patients were less reactive to trust violations by the unfair partner than controls. Previous research showed that patients also had a higher acceptance of unfair offers in the ultimatum game than controls (Csukly *et al.*, 2011, Wischniewski and Brüne, 2011). Reduced basic trust and a lower propensity to adapt to malevolent behaviour have been associated with lower perspective-taking (Fett *et al.*, 2014a), which is also prevalent in psychosis (Sprong *et al.*, 2007). Accordingly, this finding might reflect a reduced understanding of others' intentions. However, another possible explanation might be that patients have a reduced inclination for altruistic punishment, i.e. the retribution of unfair treatment by others (Boyd *et al.*, 2003, Csukly *et al.*, 2011).

We expected to see higher attachment **avoidance and attachment anxiety** in patients than in controls and that this would partly account for patients' reduced basic trust and a reduced ability to learn to trust in response to trustworthy others. Against our expectations the groups did not differ in attachment avoidance. Attachment avoidance reflects the aim to minimize the need for others and measured by items such as '*I try to cope with stressful situations on my own*'.



Attachment avoidance in healthy adolescents in the current sample was substantially higher than attachment anxiety scores and attachment avoidance ratings of healthy adults (Pos *et al.*, 2014). Adolescence is a period of major relationship changes with parents and peers that is characterized by increasing independence. A possible explanation for high attachment avoidance in controls might be that it reflects a normal developmental push for autonomy (Harrop, 2002, McElhaney *et al.*, 2009). In controls, the need to express independence from others may decrease with increasing age when they successfully attained a sense of agency and ownership over their own lives. Due to the disrupting effect of their **disorder**, those affected by psychosis may show a disturbed development, characterized by continued struggle for autonomy and higher attachment avoidance in adulthood (Harrop and Trower, 2001).

Attachment anxiety was substantially higher in patients than controls. It reflects concerns such as *'If other people disapprove of something I do, I get very upset'* or *'I worry that if I displease other people, they won't want to know me anymore'*. Adolescents with high attachment anxiety often have poor self-concepts (Cooper *et al.*, 1998). Also, psychosis in adolescence is frequently accompanied by decreased self-esteem (Guillon *et al.*, 2003) and anxiety about discord with others (Harrop and Trower, 2001). Thus, being affected by a severe mental **disorder** may further increase concerns about being accepted. We found that higher attachment anxiety was associated with higher basic trust and higher trust during interactions with the unfair partner. Individuals with high attachment anxiety are thought to have a strong desire for closeness and acceptance, combined with a fear of rejection (Berry *et al.*, 2007). Thus, our findings might reflect the wish to affiliate and to be liked, as opposed to self-protection. Importantly, our findings showed that attachment anxiety did not account for the group differences in trust between patients and controls, i.e. it explained trusting behaviour independent of illness status.

*Associations between attachment, trust and symptoms*

Unlike expected, basic trust and positive symptoms, persecution- or social reference paranoia were unrelated. Only higher levels of negative symptoms were significantly associated with reduced basic trust. In the light of this, reduced trust in the early stages of psychosis could be explained by lack of social motivation, rather than paranoia and suspiciousness. Kéri et al. (2009) suggested that negative symptoms in schizophrenia may reflect the inability to accept risk in social interactions in a trust-related task that involved sharing of secrets. Their research also presented initial evidence suggesting that lower oxytocin levels in patients might be an underlying mechanism linking negative symptoms to lower levels of trust (Kéri *et al.*, 2009).

These findings are particularly interesting because other studies have shown that oxytocin increases trust in social interactions in healthy individuals (Kosfeld *et al.*, 2005). Yet, the effect of oxytocin seems to be dependent on attachment style. For example, negative effects of administered oxytocin on trust and cooperation in the trust game have been reported in borderline patients with insecure attachment styles and experiences of childhood trauma (Bartz *et al.*, 2011a, Ebert *et al.*, 2013). Other studies showed that participants who experienced childhood trauma, which is often linked to insecure attachment, have increased plasma oxytocin in response to social stress (Pierrehumbert *et al.*, 2010, Seltzer *et al.*, 2014). Kiss and colleagues further reported that oxytocin secretion was particularly increased during a trust related interactions in individuals with anxious attachment (Kéri and Kiss, 2011, Kiss *et al.*, 2011). These findings point towards complex association between attachment anxiety, trust and symptoms, which may partly be explained by oxytocin function and would be of high interest for future investigations.

We found no significant association between symptoms and the ability to adapt trust during repeated interactions. It could be argued that this might be due to the low symptom levels in our sample. Yet, slightly higher symptoms in the present adolescent- compared to the adult sample in our previous research suggests otherwise (Fett *et al.*, 2012). Alternatively, rigid belief systems and the inability to modify trust might be specifically associated with residual symptoms in the more chronic stages of the disorder. The current sample was heterogeneous and included individuals with affective and non-affective psychosis. An alternative explanation for the absent association between symptoms and the ability to adapt to others could be that this association is only present in the schizophrenia spectrum.

Positive symptoms were associated with higher attachment avoidance, with a medium effect size, similar to those reported in adult samples (Berry *et al.*, 2008). In line with other studies in FEP there were no significant associations between PANSS positive symptoms and attachment anxiety and negative symptoms and both, anxious and avoidant attachment (MacBeth *et al.*, 2011). The robust associations between attachment anxiety and the specific measures of social reference and persecution paranoia could suggest that the absence of the relationship with the PANSS positive scale is due to the nature of the measure, which also includes other features such as hostility that appear to be closer to attachment avoidance. Persecution paranoia was relatively strongly associated with both dimensions of attachment avoidance and anxiety. Not surprisingly, social reference paranoia, which refers to concerns about affiliation and being judged (e.g., *'I have been upset by friends and colleagues judging me critically'* or *'I spent time thinking about friends gossiping about me'*) was more strongly associated with attachment anxiety (0.70) than attachment avoidance (0.52).

The current findings have to be interpreted in the light of some limitations. First, the patient sample had heterogeneous diagnoses. This could have led to issues in detecting associations between trust, attachment style and symptoms that are specific to affective or non-affective psychoses. Future research should include larger samples of each group to investigate differential effects. Second, the PAM was developed for adults and has not been validated for the use in adolescents. However, the questionnaire was designed to be easy to administer; including simple answer scales with exclusively positively worded items and it seems unlikely that the adolescents did not understand the questions. Third, it is possible that the social interaction in the cooperative trust game may not have activated the attachment system sufficiently and that attachment therefore had no effect in this condition. Research by Balliet and Van Lange (2013) found that trust matters most when there is a large conflict of interest. It is unlikely that cooperation elicits feelings of conflict. However for future studies, it would be important to investigate the emotional responses elicited by the respective experimental tasks to ensure that these sufficiently activate the attachment system. Fourth, it is also important to consider that the trust game may not elicit the same social processes as face-to-face contacts, which are influenced by a range of factors such as gender, age or looks; or experimental paradigms that probe intimate social interactions (Kéri *et al.*, 2009, Kiss *et al.*, 2011). However, to date few studies investigated the role of attachment during anonymous social interactions (Bartz *et al.*, 2011b, McClure *et al.*, 2013, Van Lange *et al.*, 1997). f With regard to the anonymous nature of the trust game it is important to consider that attachment has mostly been viewed as important for relationship phenomena that involve significant others. However, this and previous investigations on attachment in the context of relationship formation have shown that it is not only important for close relationships, but that it also impacts upon behaviour towards unknown others in minimally

defined situations (Bartz *et al.*, 2011b, McClure *et al.*, 2013, Roisman, 2006, Van Lange *et al.*, 1997).

### *Conclusion*

Patients with early psychosis have reduced basic trust but adapt their trust in response to others' positive social signals. This suggests that the early stages of the disorder could present a window of opportunity for interventions that aim to keep the behavioural flexibility towards others and social functioning intact. While attachment anxiety seems to be important for trusting behaviour, it does not account for the differences in trust between patients and controls. The fact that patients' symptoms were associated with higher attachment anxiety, but not with lower levels of trust suggests a complex relationship which may be explained by other factors, such as oxytocin function (Bakermans-Kranenburg and van Ijzendoorn, 2011, De Dreu, 2012, Insel and Young, 2001, Kapur *et al.*, 2005, Kéri *et al.*, 2009), which been linked to attachment, trust and psychosis and that can interact with the (social) environment, for instance through experiences of early trauma (Strathearn *et al.*, 2009).

**Acknowledgement:**

We would like to thank the MHR support team, the clinical studies officers at NELFT, SEPT, SLAM and OXLEAS and specifically Partha Banerjea, Uttom Chowdhury, Philip Collins, Sophia Frangou, Giovanni Giaroli, Daniel Hayes, Kah Mirza, Viviana Porcari, Kurinji Semmanpalayam, Derek Tracy and the local schools for their help with the recruitment of our participants.

**Conflict of interest:** The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. & van Ijzendoorn, M. H.** (2011). Differential susceptibility to rearing environment depending on dopamine-related genes: New evidence and a meta-analysis. *Development and Psychopathology* **23**, 39-52.
- Balliet, D. & Van Lange, P. A. M.** (2013). Trust, conflict, and cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* **139**, 1090-1112.
- Bartz, J., Simeon, D., Hamilton, H., Kim, S., Crystal, S., Braun, A., Vicens, V. & Hollander, E.** (2011a). Oxytocin can hinder trust and cooperation in borderline personality disorder. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* **6**, 556-63.
- Bartz, J., Simeon, D., Hamilton, H., Kim, S., Crystal, S., Braun, A., Vicens, V. & Hollander, E.** (2011b). Oxytocin can hinder trust and cooperation in borderline personality disorder. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* **6**, 556-63.
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J. & McCabe, K.** (1995). Trust, reciprocity and social history. *Games and Economic Behavior* **10**, 122-142.
- Berry, K., Barrowclough, C. & Wearden, A.** (2007). A review of the role of adult attachment style in psychosis: Unexplored issues and questions for further research. *Clinical Psychology Review* **27**, 458-475.
- Berry, K., Barrowclough, C. & Wearden, A.** (2008). Attachment theory: a framework for understanding symptoms and interpersonal relationships in psychosis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* **46**, 1275-82.
- Berry, K., Wearden, A., Barrowclough, C. & Liversidge, T.** (2006). Attachment styles, interpersonal relationships and psychotic phenomena in a non-clinical student sample. *Personality and Individual Differences* **41**, 707-718.

- Boyd, R., Gintis, H., Bowles, S. & Richerson, P. J.** (2003). The evolution of altruistic punishment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**, 3531-3535.
- Cooper, M. L., Shaver, P. R. & Collins, N. L.** (1998). Attachment styles, emotion regulation, and adjustment in adolescence. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **74**, 1380.
- Corriveau, K. H., Harris, P. L., Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Arnott, B., Elliott, L., Liddle, B., Hearn, A., Vittorini, L. & de Rosnay, M.** (2009). Young Children's Trust in Their Mother's Claims: Longitudinal Links With Attachment Security in Infancy. *Child Development* **80**, 750-761.
- Couture, S. M., Lecomte, T. & Leclerc, C.** (2007). Personality Characteristics and Attachment in First Episode Psychosis: Impact on Social Functioning. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* **195**, 631-639 10.1097/NMD.0b013e31811f4021.
- Couture, S. M., Penn, D. L. & Roberts, D. L.** (2006). The Functional Significance of Social Cognition in Schizophrenia: A Review. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* **32**, S44-S63.
- Csukly, G., Polgár, P., Tombor, L., Réthelyi, J. & Kéri, S.** (2011). Are patients with schizophrenia rational maximizers? Evidence from an ultimatum game study. *Psychiatry Research* **187**, 11-17.
- De Dreu, C. K.** (2012). Oxytocin modulates the link between adult attachment and cooperation through reduced betrayal aversion. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **37**, 871-880.
- Dudley, R., Daley, K., Nicholson, M., Shaftoe, D., Spencer, H., Cavanagh, K. & Freeston, M.** (2013). 'Jumping to conclusions' in first-episode psychosis: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* **52**, 380-393.



**Ebert, A., Kolb, M., Heller, J., Edel, M. A., Roser, P. & Brune, M.** (2013). Modulation of interpersonal trust in borderline personality disorder by intranasal oxytocin and childhood trauma. *Soc Neurosci* **8**, 305-13.

**Fett, A.-K. J., Shergill, S. S., Gromann, P. M., Dumontheil, I., Blakemore, S.-J., Yakub, F. & Krabbendam, L.** (2014a). Trust and social reciprocity in adolescence – A matter of perspective-taking. *Journal of Adolescence* **37**, 175-184.

**Fett, A.-K. J., Shergill, S. S., Joyce, D. W., Riedl, A., Strobel, M., Gromann, P. M. & Krabbendam, L.** (2012). To trust or not to trust: the dynamics of social interaction in psychosis. *Brain* **135**, 976-84.

**Fett, A. K., Shergill, S. S. & Krabbendam, L.** (2014b). Social neuroscience in psychiatry: unravelling the neural mechanisms of social dysfunction. *Psychol Med*, 1-21.

**Fonagy, P., Gergely, G. & Target, M.** (2007). The parent–infant dyad and the construction of the subjective self. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry* **48**, 288-328.

**Freeman, D., Garety, P. A., Kuipers, E., Fowler, D. & Bebbington, P. E.** (2002). A cognitive model of persecutory delusions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* **41**, 331-347.

**Garety, P. A., Kuipers, E., Fowler, D., Freeman, D. & Bebbington, P. E.** (2001). A cognitive model of the positive symptoms of psychosis. *Psychol Med* **31**, 189-95.

**Gillath, O., Sesko, A. K., Shaver, P. R. & Chun, D. S.** (2010). Attachment, authenticity, and honesty: Dispositional and experimentally induced security can reduce self- and other-deception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **98**, 841-855.

**Gromann, P. M., Heslenfeld, D. J., Fett, A.-K. J., Joyce, D. W., Shergill, S. S. & Krabbendam, L.** (2013). Trust versus paranoia: abnormal response to social reward in psychotic illness. *Brain* **136**, 1968-1975.

- Gromann, P. M., Shergill, S. S., de Haan, L., Meewis, D. G. J., Fett, A.-K. J., Korver-Nieberg, N. & Krabbendam, L.** (2014). Reduced brain reward response during cooperation in first-degree relatives of patients with psychosis: an fMRI study. *Psychological Medicine FirstView*, 1-10.
- Guillon, M. S., Crocq, M.-A. & Bailey, P. E.** (2003). The relationship between self-esteem and psychiatric disorders in adolescents. *European Psychiatry* **18**, 59-62.
- Gumley, A., Schwannauer, M., Macbeth, A., Fisher, R., Clark, S., Rattrie, L., Fraser, G., McCabe, R., Blair, A., Davidson, K. & Birchwood, M.** (2014). Insight, duration of untreated psychosis and attachment in first-episode psychosis: prospective study of psychiatric recovery over 12-month follow-up. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*.
- Gumley, A., Taylor, H., Schwannauer, M. & MacBeth, A.** (2013). A systematic review of attachment and psychosis: measurement, construct validity and outcomes. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*.
- Harrop, C.** (2002). The development of schizophrenia in late adolescence. *Current Psychiatry Reports* **4**, 293-298.
- Harrop, C. & Trower, P.** (2001). Why does schizophrenia develop at late adolescence? *Clinical Psychology Review* **21**, 241-265.
- Hinnen, C., Pool, G., Holwerda, N., Sprangers, M., Sanderman, R. & Hagedoorn, M.** (2014). Lower levels of trust in one's physician is associated with more distress over time in more anxiously attached individuals with cancer. *General Hospital Psychiatry* **36**, 382-387.
- Holwerda, N., Sanderman, R., Pool, G., Hinnen, C., Langendijk, J. A., Bemelman, W. A., Hagedoorn, M. & Sprangers, M. A. G.** (2013). Do patients trust their physician? The role of

attachment style in the patient-physician relationship within one year after a cancer diagnosis.

*Acta Oncologica* **52**, 110-117.

**Insel, T. R. & Young, L. J.** (2001). The neurobiology of attachment. *Nature Reviews*

*Neuroscience* **2**, 129-136.

**Kapur, S., Mizrahi, R. & Li, M.** (2005). From dopamine to salience to psychosis--linking

biology, pharmacology and phenomenology of psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research* **79**, 59-68.

**Keri, S. & Kiss, I.** (2011). Oxytocin response in a trust game and habituation of arousal. *Physiol*

*Behav* **102**, 221-4.

**Kéri, S., Kiss, I. & Kelemen, O.** (2009). Sharing secrets: Oxytocin and trust in schizophrenia.

*Social Neuroscience* **4**, 287-293.

**Kiss, I., Levy-Gigi, E. & Kéri, S.** (2011). CD 38 expression, attachment style and habituation of

arousal in relation to trust-related oxytocin release. *Biological Psychology* **88**, 223-226.

**Korver-Nieberg, N., Berry, K., Meijer, C. J. & Haan, L.** (2013). Adult attachment and

psychotic phenomenology in clinical and non - clinical samples: A systematic review.

*Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*.

**Kosfeld, M., Heinrichs, M., Zak, P. J., Fischbacher, U. & Fehr, E.** (2005). Oxytocin increases

trust in humans. *Nature Neuroscience* **435**, 673-676.

**Kvrgic, S., Beck, E. M., Cavelti, M., Kossowsky, J., Stieglitz, R. D. & Vauth, R.** (2012).

Focusing on the adult attachment style in schizophrenia in community mental health centres:

validation of the Psychosis Attachment Measure (PAM) in a German-speaking sample.

*International Journal of Social Psychiatry* **58**, 362-73.

- Liotti, G. & Gumley, A.** (2008). An attachment perspective on schizophrenia: The role of disorganized attachment, dissociation and mentalization. *Psychosis, trauma and dissociation: Emerging perspectives on severe psychopathology*, 117-133.
- MacBeth, A., Gumley, A., Schwannauer, M. & Fisher, R.** (2011). Attachment states of mind, mentalization, and their correlates in a first-episode psychosis sample. *Psychological Psychotherapy* **84**, 42-57; discussion 98-110.
- MacBeth, A., Schwannauer, M. & Gumley, A.** (2008). The association between attachment style, social mentalities, and paranoid ideation: An analogue study. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice* **81**, 79-93.
- McClure, M. J., Bartz, J. & Lydon, J. E.** (2013). Uncovering and Overcoming Ambivalence: The Role of Chronic and Contextually Activated Attachment in Two - Person Social Dilemmas. *Journal of personality* **81**, 103-117.
- McElhaney, K. B., Allen, J. P., Stephenson, J. C. & Hare, A. L.** (2009). Attachment and Autonomy During Adolescence. In *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Meins, E., Jones, S. R., Fernyhough, C., Hurndall, S. & Koronis, P.** (2008). Attachment dimensions and schizotypy in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences* **44**, 1000-1011.
- Mikulincer, M.** (1998). Attachment working models and the sense of trust: An exploration of interaction goals and affect regulation. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **74**, 1209.
- Pickering, L., Simpson, J. & Bentall, R. P.** (2008). Insecure attachment predicts proneness to paranoia but not hallucinations. *Personality and Individual Differences* **44**, 1212-1224.

**Pierrehumbert, B., Torrisi, R., Laufer, D., Halfon, O., Ansermet, F. & Beck Popovic, M.**

(2010). Oxytocin response to an experimental psychosocial challenge in adults exposed to traumatic experiences during childhood or adolescence. *Neuroscience* **166**, 168-77.

**Pos, K., Bartels-Velthuis, A. A., Simons, C. J. P., Korver-Nieberg, N., Meijer, C. J., de**

**Haan, L., Bruggeman, R., Cahn, W., Kahn, R. S. & Myin-Germeys, I.** (2014). Theory of Mind and attachment styles in people with psychotic disorders, their siblings, and controls.

*Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 0004867414546386.

**Read, J. & Gumley, A.** (2008). Can attachment theory help explain the relationship between

childhood adversity and psychosis? *Attachment: New Directions in Psychotherapy and*

*Relational Psychoanalysis* **2**, 1-35.

**Roisman, G. I.** (2006). The role of adult attachment security in non-romantic, non-attachment-

related first interactions between same-sex strangers. *Attachment & Human Development* **8**, 341-352.

**Seltzer, L. J., Ziegler, T., Connolly, M. J., Prosofski, A. R. & Pollak, S. D.** (2014). Stress-

induced elevation of oxytocin in maltreated children: Evolution, neurodevelopment, and social behavior. *Child development* **85**, 501-512.

**Sharp, C., Ha, C. & Fonagy, P.** (2011). Get them before they get you: Trust, trustworthiness,

and social cognition in boys with and without externalizing behavior problems. *Development and Psychopathology* **23**, 647-658.

**Sharp, C., Monterosso, J. & Montague, P. R.** (2012). Neuroeconomics: a bridge for

translational research. *Biol Psychiatry* **72**, 87-92.

**Shaver, P. R. & Mikulincer, M.** (2002). Attachment-related psychodynamics. *Attachment &*

*Human Development* **4**, 133-161.

- Simmons, B. L., Gooty, J., Nelson, D. L. & Little, L. M.** (2009). Secure attachment: implications for hope, trust, burnout, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **30**, 233-247.
- Sprong, M., Schothorst, P., Vos, E., Hox, J. & van Engeland, H.** (2007). Theory of mind in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* **191**, 5-13.
- Sroufe, L., Carlson, E. A., Levy, A. K. & Egeland, B.** (1999). Implications of attachment theory for developmental psychopathology. *Development and psychopathology* **11**, 1-13.
- Strathearn, L., Fonagy, P., Amico, J. & Montague, P. R.** (2009). Adult attachment predicts maternal brain and oxytocin response to infant cues. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology* **34**, 2655-2666.
- Strauss, G. P., Waltz, J. A. & Gold, J. M.** (2013). A Review of Reward Processing and Motivational Impairment in Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, sbt197.
- Van Lange, P. A., De Bruin, E., Otten, W. & Joireman, J. A.** (1997). Development of prosocial, individualistic, and competitive orientations: theory and preliminary evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **73**, 733.
- Wearden, A., Peters, I., Berry, K., Barrowclough, C. & Liversidge, T.** (2008). Adult attachment, parenting experiences, and core beliefs about self and others. *Personality and Individual Differences* **44**, 1246-1257.
- Weinfield, N. S., Whaley, G. J. L. & Egeland, B.** (2004). Continuity, discontinuity, and coherence in attachment from infancy to late adolescence: Sequelae of organization and disorganization. *Attachment & Human Development* **6**, 73-97.
- Wischniewski, J. & Brüne, M.** (2011). Moral reasoning in schizophrenia: An explorative study into economic decision making. *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry* **16**, 348-363.

**Zhang, F. & Labouvie-Vief, G.** (2004). Stability and fluctuation in adult attachment style over a 6-year period. *Attachment & Human Development* **6**, 419-437.

**Figure Captions**

*Figure 1.* The development of trust (in £) across interactions by group and condition.

*Note.* Coop = cooperative partner, Unfair = Unfair partner, Pat = Patient, Cont = Control, each block represents average investments of 5 game rounds



**Table 1. Sample Characteristics**

Variable	Patients (n = 39)	Controls (n = 100)	Chi Square	p-value
Male (%)	58	50	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = 1	0.32
Ethnicity (%)				
White british	45	49	X <sup>2</sup> (4) = 2	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Black british	49	30.5		
Asian british	0	2.2		
Other	13.3	15.7		
Missing	2.7	2.1		
Living status (%)				
Family home	77	95	X <sup>2</sup> (4) = 13	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Alone	2.6	2		
Foster home	7.7	0		
Other	7.7	1		
Missing	5	2		
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Beta (β)	p-value
Age	17 (1.21)	16 (1.51)	0.29	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Estimated cognitive ability	45.1 (10.58)	52.4 (11)	-0.29	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Attachment anxiety	1.18 (0.71)	0.84 (0.48)	0.25	<b>0.01</b>
Attachment avoidance	1.49 (0.52)	1.39 (0.39)	0.10	0.2
GPTS social reference paranoia	26.86 (12.96)	22.84 (8.63)	0.23	<b>0.015</b>
GPTS persecution paranoia	21.25 (11.60)	17.81 (7.60)	0.18	<b>0.049</b>
PANSS positive symptoms	1.81 (0.86)			
PANSS negative symptoms	1.93 (0.91)			
PANSS general symptoms	1.32 (0.56)			
Admissions to hospital	1.2 (range 0-4)			
Average illness duration (months)	15.8 (range 1-59)			


Note. Significant values in bold. GPTS = Green Paranoid Thought Scale, PANSS = Positive and Negative

Syndrome Scale.

Table 2. Regression analyses

Dependent Variable	Step	Predictor	b	P-value	
Attachment Anxiety	1	Group	-0.29	< <b>0.001</b>	
Attachment Avoidance		Group	0.25	<b>0.01</b>	
Basic trust	2	Group	-1.01	<b>0.03</b>	
	3	Group	-1.13	<b>0.01</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.83	<b>0.01</b>	
	4	Group	-2.83	<b>0.05</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.47	0.29	
		Group x Attachment Anxiety	0.83	0.21	
<i>Cooperative game</i>					
Trust	2	Group	-0.55	0.23	
		Block	0.12	<b>0.009</b>	
		Group x Block	0.19	<b>0.04</b>	
	3	Group	-0.53	0.25	
		Block	0.12	<b>0.01</b>	
		Group x Block	0.21	<b>0.03</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.32	0.30	
	3	Group	-0.53	0.26	
		Block	0.12	0.5	
		Group x Block	0.21	<b>0.04</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.32	0.30	
		Attachment Anxiety x Block	0.01	0.86	
	<i>Unfair game</i>				
	Trust	2	Group	-0.97	<b>0.03</b>
			Block	-0.45	< <b>0.001</b>
Group x Block			0.29	<b>0.006</b>	
3		Group	-1.15	<b>0.01</b>	
		Block	-0.47	< <b>0.001</b>	
		Group x Block	0.31	<b>0.004</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.62	<b>0.02</b>	
4		Group	-1.20	<b>0.01</b>	
		Block	-0.31	0.06	
		Group x Block	0.33	<b>0.02</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety	0.84	<b>0.02</b>	
		Attachment Anxiety x Block	-0.84	0.31	

Note: All analyses were controlled for age, gender, estimated cognitive ability and degree of belief in the experimental manipulation.



# Supplementary Material

Fett et al.

Manuscript:

Learning to trust: Trust and attachment in early  
psychosis

### *1. Patients' diagnoses*

Twenty-eight patients had diagnoses in the non-affective psychosis spectrum (7 x schizophrenia, 10 x acute and transient psychotic disorder, 3 x schizoaffective disorder, 8 x unspecified non-organic psychosis) and 11 patients had diagnoses in the affective psychosis spectrum (1 x mania with psychotic symptoms, 6 x bipolar affective disorder with psychotic symptoms, 4 x depressive episode with psychotic symptoms). Twenty-eight patients were taking anti-psychotics, 5 patients were taking a combination of anti-psychotics and anti-depressants, 2 patients were taking anti-depressants only, 2 patients were taking antipsychotics and benzodiazepines and 2 patients who were previously on anti-psychotics were medication free at the time of testing.

### *2. The trust game algorithm*

In the cooperative strategy, the first repayment was 100%, 150% or 200% of the invested amount. Each possible first repayment occurred with a probability of 33%. Subsequent repayments increased in a probabilistic way if the current investment increased relative to the previous investment, but remained stable otherwise. Hence, with each increase in investor trust, the chance of a repayment of 200% increased by 10%. In the unfair algorithm, the first repayment was 50%, 75% or 100% of the investment. Each possible first repayment occurred with a probability of 33%. Subsequent repayments decreased if the current investment reflected an increase in trust relative to the previous investment, but remained stable otherwise. Hence, with each increase in investor trust, the chance of a repayment that was 50% of the investment increased by 10%. The order of the games (cooperative/unfair) was counterbalanced.

Dear Professor Murray,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and to thank you for inviting us to resubmit a revised version of the manuscript. We feel that we were able to address all issues that were raised by the reviewers and have outlined our reply and the revision in the following. We highlighted changes in the manuscript in yellow. To respond to the reviewers comments adequately we had to add some extra information so that we now exceed the word limit by 200 words. We are happy to shorten the manuscript if required.

In addressing some other general comments. The abstract has been split into 4 sections; Background, Method, Results, Discussion. Second, the formatting of the figure has been updated where all text is Size 8 font Arial.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Anne-Kathrin Fett for all the co-authors

## Reviewer 1

- 1) Terms such as Attachment security / insecurity as used interchangeably with attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. The measurement constructs here are clearly the latter. Higher levels of self-reported attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance may indicate the presence of a secure or insecure attachment but this is not possible to infer. Self-report methods do not provide a strong measure of attachment security. The measurement of attachment security and organisation is rooted in behaviourally based developmental traditions rooted in Ainsworth's Strange Situation Procedure and Main's Adult Attachment Interview. Self-reported attachment and behavioural indices of attachment such as AAI show poor correspondence. I don't think one approach is better than the other here but clarity over constructs is important if the attachment in psychosis literature is going to develop meaningfully and provide new opportunities for mechanism identification and therapy development.

**Reply:** In order to better define the constructs mentioned, we now refer to these terms as “attachment avoidance or attachment anxiety”, throughout the article where we previously referred to “attachment insecurity”.

- 2) Self-reported attachment anxiety did not predict behaviour during the task and other credible reasons for this are not considered:

(a) there is no relationship or at least attachment anxiety does not predict trust behaviour in this task. This may be because the measure of attachment anxiety used in this study doesn't predict behaviour in this context. This opens up important research questions.

(b) The experimental task does not activate the attachment system to observe its influence on behaviour. A recent meta-analysis by Balliet and Van Lange (2013) Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 139, No. 5, 1090-1112 found that trust matters the most when there is a larger conflict of interest. There is little evidence shown that the task created enough conflict to stimulate the attachment system. In addition, it would have been strength of the study to include a dispositional measure of trust to show the self-reported association exists.

(c) other factors influenced participants (patients' behaviour during the task - e.g. cognitive flexibility).

**Reply:** In the current paradigm, attachment anxiety did predict higher trust during interactions with an unfair partner. It is very well possible that the trust game did not create sufficient conflict in the cooperative condition and that it has not activated the attachment system sufficiently to elicit an effect of attachment anxiety on trust. For

future research it would be useful to include other measures to assess the emotional response to the task. We have added this point to the limitation section in the revised manuscript on p. 18.

*'Third, it is possible that the social interaction in the cooperative trust game may not have activated the attachment system sufficiently and that attachment therefore had no effect in this condition. Research by Balliet and Van Lange (2013) found that trust matters most when there is a large conflict of interest. It is unlikely that cooperation elicits feelings of conflict. However for future studies, it would be important to investigate the emotional responses elicited by the respective experimental tasks to ensure that these sufficiently activate the attachment system.'*

- 3) The importance of attachment and trust is assumed in the introduction. The attachment and trust literature is surprisingly not well developed (although trust is implicit in attachment related constructs such as openness, curiosity, forgiveness etc) and this isn't particularly evident from the literature review in the manuscript. The word Trust does not even appear in the index of the most recent edition of the Handbook of Attachment. A few studies of important demonstrating that attachment is related to trust are important. Corriveau et al (Child Development. 80(3):750-61) showed that secure children show greater trust in their mothers in an experimental paradigm; security priming increases honesty in an experimental task (Gillath et al Journal of Personality & Social Psychology. 98(5):841-55, 2010); "insecurely attached" oncology patients have less trust in their clinicians (Holwerda et al. Acta Oncologica. 52(1):110-7, 2013) and attachment anxiety moderates oncology patients trust in clinicians using an experimental paradigm (Hinnen et al. General Hospital Psychiatry. 36(4):382-7, 2014).

**Reply:** We agree that there is surprisingly little research on trust and attachment, despite the generally assumed link between the two concepts and now mention this on p. 4 of the revised manuscript. We previously discussed a few relevant studies of de Dreu, Mc Clure, Mikulincer, Simmons and Van Lange in the introduction of the manuscript. We added the suggested references that clearly add to this body of research on p. 4 of the revised manuscript.

*'Other research has confirmed that trust related characteristics, such as honesty and openness are promoted by attachment security (Gillath et al., 2010) and that an secure attachment style is associated with a greater reliance of children in their mothers, which might reflect greater trust (Corriveau et al., 2009). More evidence for the putative link between attachment and trust comes from research showing that in relationships between patient and physicians lower levels of trust were attachment*



*dependent and associated with greater emotional distress and more physical limitations (Hinnen et al., 2014, Holwerda et al., 2013).'*

- 4) The reference at the end to Oxytocin was a surprise and did not logically arise from the preceding discussion. Either remove or develop. My preference would be to develop because it is an important link and potential application given the points above. I was surprised though by the reference to De Dreu (2012) who found that attachment anxiety had few effects and was not modulated by oxytocin rather it was attachment avoidance. Another important study is Kiss et al (Biological Psychology Volume 88, Issues 2-3, December 2011, Pages 223-226) who found that CD38 (a regulator of Oxytocin) was linked oxytocin secretion, whereas habituation of arousal and attachment anxiety are specifically related to situations involving intimate trust. This was an experimental study using a secret sharing paradigm which may or may not be more effective in terms of activating the attachment system (see comment above). Also there is a recent meta-analysis by Gumley et al on oxytocin and schizophrenia emphasising the role of therapies aimed at enhancing affiliation and compassion (Br J Clin Psychol. 2014 Mar;53(1):42-61. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12041).

**Reply:** We agree that the link between trust, symptoms, attachment and oxytocin is of importance and we therefore extended the discussion in the revised manuscript (p. 16).

*'These findings are particularly interesting because other studies have shown that oxytocin increases trust in social interactions in healthy individuals (Kosfeld et al., 2005). Yet, the effect of oxytocin seems to be dependent on attachment style. For example, negative effects of administered oxytocin on trust and cooperation in the trust game have been reported in borderline patients with insecure attachment styles and experiences of childhood trauma (Bartz et al., 2011, Ebert et al., 2013). Other studies showed that participants who experienced childhood trauma, which is often linked to insecure attachment, have increased plasma oxytocin in response to social stress (Pierrehumbert et al., 2010, Seltzer et al., 2014). Kiss and colleagues further reported that oxytocin secretion was particularly increased during a trust related interactions in individuals with anxious attachment (Keri and Kiss, 2011, Kiss et al., 2011). These findings point towards complex association between attachment anxiety, trust and symptoms, which may partly be explained by oxytocin function and would be of high interest for future investigations.'*

These issues may create pressure on word count. If this is the case the secondary analyses exploring associations with positive symptoms etc. could be deleted or

minimised. These are less interesting given the extensive literature already on cross sectional correlations.

**Reply:** We kept the remainder of the article as it was. The word count is now 4,700. We are happy to shorten the manuscript if required.

## **Reviewer 2**

The clinical sample is relatively small and heterogeneous but the study is novel and the findings are of interest.

Minor comments in relation to the write up.

- 1)** Could the authors avoid using the term 'illness'. Many psychologists do not consider psychosis an illness.

**Reply:** The term 'illness' has been replaced with either 'disorder' or 'psychotic disorder'. All of those within the patient group, had experienced a psychotic episode and a diagnosis according to the ICD-10 criteria.

- 2)** The paper by Berry et al 2008 cited in the introduction doesn't compare attachment security in patients and controls as the authors referencing implies.

**Reply:** This was indeed an error, we removed the reference.

- 3)** Several of the references used to support associations between insecure attachment and positive symptoms are non-clinical studies measuring schizotypy not psychosis.

**Reply:** We now explicitly mention the studies in which schizotypy has been measured instead of full-blown clinical psychosis, this has been stated so in the revised manuscript on p.5 (see also reply to point 4 below).

- 4)** I am not sure the paper by Garety et al 2001 makes reference to attachment avoidance as implied by the authors referencing.

**Reply:** The references provided here were indeed in the wrong lines so that the references did not refer to the correct content. We amended this (see p. 5 of the revised manuscript).

*'Insecure attachment has also been associated with (subclinical) symptoms of psychosis, in both studies with patients and healthy individuals with high levels of schizotypy (Berry et al., 2006, Liotti and Gumley, 2008, Read and Gumley, 2008). Cognitive models of psychosis propose that negative beliefs about others, which are characteristic of attachment insecurity, could play a role in their instantiation and maintenance (Freeman et al., 2002, Garety et al., 2001).'*

- 5) It would be helpful if the authors clarify what they mean by 'psychosis has been associated with a differential sensitivity to positive and negative feedback' in the introduction.

**Reply:** Previous research has shown that individuals with psychosis might learn differently in response to negative and positive feedback. To make this more explicit we added the following on p. 6 of the revised manuscript to clarify this point.

*'Psychosis has been associated with a differential sensitivity (i.e. learning responses) after the provision of positive and negative feedback (Strauss et al., 2013).'*

- 6) How did the authors verify that the controls had no psychiatric diagnoses?

**Reply:** Controls were screened in telephone interviews and excluded if they had a psychiatric diagnosis. We have elaborated on this in the revised version of the article. The following has been inserted into the Methods section (p. 7)

*'For the controls, a telephone screening was completed to ensure there were no psychiatric diagnoses within this group.'*

- 7) The authors cite alphas but it isn't clear if these are for both samples? It would make more sense to present alphas for each subsample?

**Reply:** The Cronbach alphas have been computed for the entire sample. It makes sense here to assess the internal consistency across all participants. This reliability estimation uses a single measurement instrument administered to a group of people on one occasion. Our presumption is that the PAM will pick up the same underlying construct in both groups. The results over the whole sample show that across all participants the items of each subscale reflect the same constructs good to reasonably well with values of around .80 and .70, hence there should be no reasons for concern.

- 8) It isn't clear from the write up why some participants were in an MRI scanner and how this influenced their behaviour/the results.

**Reply:** We clarified this point and added the following information into the revised Methods section of the revised article (p. 10)

*‘Only some of the participants completed the trust games in the MRI scanner, as this was part of a larger study investigating underlying neural processes. Being in a scanner or not had no impact on the participants’ behaviour during the trust games.’*

- 9) Did the non-clinical sample complete the PANSS - the method implies that all participants completed the same measures?

**Reply:** The PANSS was only conducted in patients. The following has been inserted into the Methods section of the revised article to clarify this (p. 8)

*‘The PANSS was only completed for the adolescents with early psychosis and not for the healthy controls.’*

- 10) Could the authors be more specific in the discussion when they say 'research should set out to investigate more complex determinants of social behaviour'?

**Reply:** The trust game is played between anonymous individuals and strips the social interaction down to its basic components. However, in real life social interaction several other factors are of impact. To clarify this we added the following to the discussion of the revised manuscript on p. 18.

*‘To investigate these relationships, it is therefore useful to strip the social interaction down to its basic components (e.g. by removing the influence of factors such as gender or age of the interaction partners). Once the basic processes have been elucidated, research should set out to investigate more complex determinants of social behaviour as those mentioned above.’*

## References

- Balliet, D. & Van Lange, P. A. M.** (2013). Trust, conflict, and cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* **139**, 1090-1112.
- Bartz, J., Simeon, D., Hamilton, H., Kim, S., Crystal, S., Braun, A., Vicens, V. & Hollander, E.** (2011). Oxytocin can hinder trust and cooperation in borderline personality disorder. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* **6**, 556-63.
- Berry, K., Wearden, A., Barrowclough, C. & Liversidge, T.** (2006). Attachment styles, interpersonal relationships and psychotic phenomena in a non-clinical student sample. *Personality and Individual Differences* **41**, 707-718.
- Corriveau, K. H., Harris, P. L., Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Arnott, B., Elliott, L., Liddle, B., Hearn, A., Vittorini, L. & de Rosnay, M.** (2009). Young Children's Trust in Their Mother's Claims: Longitudinal Links With Attachment Security in Infancy. *Child Development* **80**, 750-761.
- Ebert, A., Kolb, M., Heller, J., Edel, M. A., Roser, P. & Brune, M.** (2013). Modulation of interpersonal trust in borderline personality disorder by intranasal oxytocin and childhood trauma. *Soc Neurosci* **8**, 305-13.
- Freeman, D., Garety, P. A., Kuipers, E., Fowler, D. & Bebbington, P. E.** (2002). A cognitive model of persecutory delusions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* **41**, 331-347.
- Garety, P. A., Kuipers, E., Fowler, D., Freeman, D. & Bebbington, P. E.** (2001). A cognitive model of the positive symptoms of psychosis. *Psychol Med* **31**, 189-95.
- Gillath, O., Sesko, A. K., Shaver, P. R. & Chun, D. S.** (2010). Attachment, authenticity, and honesty: Dispositional and experimentally induced security can reduce self- and other-deception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **98**, 841-855.
- Hinnen, C., Pool, G., Holwerda, N., Sprangers, M., Sanderman, R. & Hagedoorn, M.** (2014). Lower levels of trust in one's physician is associated with more distress over time in more anxiously attached individuals with cancer. *General Hospital Psychiatry* **36**, 382-387.
- Holwerda, N., Sanderman, R., Pool, G., Hinnen, C., Langendijk, J. A., Bemelman, W. A., Hagedoorn, M. & Sprangers, M. A. G.** (2013). Do patients trust their physician? The role of attachment style in the patient-physician relationship within one year after a cancer diagnosis. *Acta Oncologica* **52**, 110-117.
- Keri, S. & Kiss, I.** (2011). Oxytocin response in a trust game and habituation of arousal. *Physiol Behav* **102**, 221-4.
- Kiss, I., Levy-Gigi, E. & Kéri, S.** (2011). CD 38 expression, attachment style and habituation of arousal in relation to trust-related oxytocin release. *Biological Psychology* **88**, 223-226.
- Kosfeld, M., Heinrichs, M., Zak, P. J., Fischbacher, U. & Fehr, E.** (2005). Oxytocin increases trust in humans. *Nature Neuroscience* **435**, 673-676.
- Liotti, G. & Gumley, A.** (2008). An attachment perspective on schizophrenia: The role of disorganized attachment, dissociation and mentalization. *Psychosis, trauma and dissociation: Emerging perspectives on severe psychopathology*, 117-133.
- Pierrehumbert, B., Torrisi, R., Laufer, D., Halfon, O., Ansermet, F. & Beck Popovic, M.** (2010). Oxytocin response to an experimental psychosocial challenge in adults exposed to traumatic experiences during childhood or adolescence. *Neuroscience* **166**, 168-77.
- Read, J. & Gumley, A.** (2008). Can attachment theory help explain the relationship between childhood adversity and psychosis? *Attachment: New Directions in Psychotherapy and Relational Psychoanalysis* **2**, 1-35.
- Seltzer, L. J., Ziegler, T., Connolly, M. J., Prosofski, A. R. & Pollak, S. D.** (2014). Stress-induced elevation of oxytocin in maltreated children: Evolution, neurodevelopment, and social behavior. *Child development* **85**, 501-512.
- Strauss, G. P., Waltz, J. A. & Gold, J. M.** (2013). A Review of Reward Processing and Motivational Impairment in Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, sbt197.