

1 ABSTRACT

2 Communication deviance (CD) reflects features of the content or manner of a
3 person's speech that may confuse the listener and inhibit the establishment of a shared
4 focus of attention. The construct was developed in the context of the study of familial
5 risks for psychosis based on hypotheses regarding its effects during childhood. It is
6 not known whether parental CD is associated with non-verbal parental behaviours that
7 may be important in early development. This study explored the association between
8 CD in a cohort of mothers (n= 287) at 32 weeks gestation and maternal sensitivity
9 with infants at 29 weeks in a standard play procedure. Maternal CD predicted lower
10 overall maternal sensitivity ($B = -.385$; $p < .001$), and the effect was somewhat greater
11 for sensitivity to infant distress ($B = -.514$; $p < .001$) than for sensitivity to non-
12 distress ($B = -.311$; $p < .01$). After controlling for maternal age, IQ and depression,
13 and for socio-economic deprivation, the associations with overall sensitivity and
14 sensitivity to distress remained significant. The findings provide new pointers to
15 intergenerational transmission of vulnerability involving processes implicated in both
16 verbal and non-verbal parental behaviours.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **Communication Deviance (CD)**

2 The concept of CD, first proposed by Lyman Wynne and Margaret Singer (e.g.
3 Wynne & Singer, 1963a, 1963b) in an attempt to understand familial predictors of
4 psychosis, refers to qualities of communication, usually coded from parental speech,
5 that leave a listener uncertain, puzzled and unable to share a focus of attention with
6 the speaker. It is defined in terms of a range of verbal-linguistic atypicalities that are
7 believed to disrupt the establishment and maintenance of focus of attention during
8 communication. These atypicalities are argued to impair the development of
9 conversational alignment between interlocutors, compromising shared meaning, and
10 grounding (i.e. mutual knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions) (Miklowitz & Stackman,
11 1992; Nuechterlein, Goldstein, Ventura, Dawson, & Doane, 1989; Singer & Wynne,
12 1965a, 1965b; Wynne, Singer, Bartko, & Toohey, 1977; Wynne & Singer, 1963a,
13 1963b). They are subtle and can range from ambiguous linguistic references (e.g.
14 “Kid stuff that's one thing but something else is different too”; Velligan, Goldstein,
15 Nuechterlein, Miklowitz, & Ranlett, 1990, p. 18) or contradictions (e.g. “I didn’t get
16 much sleep last night (interviewer: are you tired?) Yeah, I ain’t tired”, Docherty,
17 1993, p. 753) to more overarching non-verbal characteristics at the level of the
18 pragmatics of communication (e.g. mistimed turn-taking, Wynne et al., 1977).

19 The concept of CD possibly overlaps with other constructs measured in
20 developmental longitudinal studies, but has some specific elements. For example,
21 there is a substantial literature on the relationship between parents’ mental
22 representations of attachment, coded from their accounts of their own childhood
23 attachment-related experiences and their sensitivity to their infants’ attachment
24 signals (van Ijzendoorn, Juffer, & Duyvesteyn, 1995; Verhage et al., 2016). The
25 concept of narrative coherence, which is rated from the Adult Attachment Interview

1 (AAI) in terms of representations of attachment that are well-integrated, clear,
2 relevant and reasonably succinct, appears similar to the concept of CD. However, CD
3 differs from narrative incoherence because it is defined entirely in terms of the quality
4 and formal aspects of the speech and communication of the parent (e.g. unintelligible
5 remarks, odd word usage, etc.). Similarly, some developmental studies have measured
6 maternal expressed emotion (EE), with one study showing a significant association
7 between parental EE, measured during pregnancy, and lower levels of sensitive
8 parenting when the child was aged 4 (Lucassen et al., 2015). However, EE is defined
9 in terms of parental over-involvement, criticism or hostility, and not the parents'
10 quality of communication or speech, and the two constructs appear to be readily
11 distinguishable from each other (Velligan et al., 1990).

12 Wynne (1981) proposed that CD in the caregiver, in interaction with genetic
13 vulnerability in the offspring, would lead to the escalation of the cognitive and
14 affective abnormalities, especially thought disorder (TD), later observed in
15 schizophrenia. Consistent with this hypothesis, a recent meta-analysis of 20 studies (N
16 = 1753) found a large magnitude ($g = .97$) association between maternal (but not
17 paternal) CD and offspring diagnosis of psychotic disorder (de Sousa, Varese,
18 Sellwood, & Bentall, 2014). Moreover, in a longitudinal study of children attending a
19 child guidance service, Goldstein (1987), found that both CD and EE were
20 independently strong predictor of later psychosis.

21 The relationship between CD and genetic risk for schizophrenia was explored
22 by Wahlberg et al. (1997, 2000), who used an adoption study design to show that the
23 interaction between having a biological mother diagnosed with schizophrenia and
24 adoptive parents' CD was a significant predictor of TD in the adoptee. In this study,

1 high genetic risk alone did not predict TD (in fact, high genetic-risk adoptees, when
2 exposed to low CD parents, displayed less TD than low risk adoptees).

3 Despite these important findings, it is important to acknowledge that it
4 remains unclear whether parental CD is a risk factor specific to TD, schizophrenia or
5 a wider range of psychiatric conditions (Roisko, Wahlberg, Miettunen, & Tienari,
6 2014). Indeed, it is possible that CD may reflect an important environmental risk for a
7 range of mental health disorders (Wahlberg et al., 2004).

8

9 **The influence of CD on cognitive and social development**

10 Given that parental, especially maternal CD is associated with later psychiatric
11 symptoms in offspring, it is important to investigate mechanisms that could account
12 for this relationship. Wynne and Singer argued that parental CD has this effect
13 through its pervasive impact on the offspring's social and cognitive development
14 during formative years (Wynne et al., 1977). According to them, this development is
15 embedded in different facets of family relatedness such as caregiving, problem
16 solving, mutuality and intimacy, and these facets represent evolving and increasingly
17 complex levels of interconnected dyadic and familial interaction (Wynne, 1984,
18 1988). Within this framework, children learn to share and sustain foci of attention,
19 and thereby derive meaning from the world around them, through communication
20 with their caregivers (Wynne, 1981, 1984). Atypicalities at the level of
21 communication in the caregiver can therefore disrupt very early development through
22 their expression at the more basic level of relatedness with the infant during early pre-
23 verbal dialogues (Wynne, 1968). In this context, CD is conceptualized as a risk
24 marker for parental mental processes that might give rise to disruptions to the
25 caregiving system (Singer & Wynne, 1966b).

1 However, empirical evidence on mechanisms linking CD to specific
2 developmental processes in early childhood has so far been limited. Cross-sectional
3 studies have found that CD in the caregiver is associated with poorer social, cognitive
4 and emotional development in the 7 and 10 year old children of parents diagnosed
5 with severe mental health disorders (Doane et al., 1982), and with social withdrawal
6 and behavioral problems in 9 year olds (Velligan, Christensen, Goldstein, &
7 Margolin, 1988). Drawing from data collected in a high-risk longitudinal study (the
8 University of Rochester Child and Family Study, Wynne, Cole, & Perkins, 1987),
9 Wynne and his colleagues reported associations between parental communication that
10 is vague, contradictory and unresponsive and both anxiety (Wichstrøm, Holte, &
11 Wynne, 1993) and poorer social competence in 7 and 10 year old children
12 (Wichstrøm, Holte, Husby, & Wynne, 1994; Wichstrøm, Holte, Husby, & Wynne,
13 1993). Interestingly, in the same high-risk cohort, but at longer follow-up (≥ 18 years
14 of age), unresponsive communication in parents significantly predicted psychological
15 distress, poorer well-being, and global mental health in the offspring (Wichstrøm,
16 Anderson, Holte, Husby, & Wynne, 1996), and disconfirmatory communication, that
17 ignores or rejects what the child says, was a significant predictor of poor interpersonal
18 functioning and mental health hospitalization (Wichstrøm et al., 1996).

19 The study of parental representations may provide further clues about the
20 likely developmental impact of CD. An important body of literature on the Working
21 Model of the Child Interview (WMCI; Vreeswijk, Maas, & van Bakel, 2012)
22 emerging during the last decade has shown that distorted maternal representations of
23 offspring are a predictor of atypical and non-contingent maternal behaviours
24 (Schechter et al., 2008) and poorer quality of dyadic interactions between the
25 caregiver and the child (Korja et al., 2010). In this literature, distorted representations

1 are characterised by descriptions of the child that are incoherent, confused,
2 contradictory or even bizarre (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). Of particular significance for
3 the present purposes, some studies have explored mothers' representations of their
4 future children using a prenatal version of the WMCI, observing that distorted
5 maternal representations during pregnancy are associated with higher levels of
6 hostility and anger in caregiver's interaction with the infant at 12 months post-partum
7 (Dayton, Levendosky, Davidson, & Bogat, 2010) and more disengagement and less
8 sensitive and warm parenting (Theran, Levendosky, Bogat, & Huth-Bocks, 2005),

9

10 **Maternal sensitivity**

11 Maternal sensitivity is defined in terms of the extent to which the caregiver's
12 responses to infant cues are contingent, appropriate, interested and warm (Bornstein
13 & Tamis-LeMonda, 1997). Its importance during infancy is supported by diverse
14 findings. For example, low maternal sensitivity during infancy predicts harsh parental
15 discipline during toddlerhood (Joosen, Mesman, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van
16 Ijzendoorn, 2012), and interacts with MAOA polymorphisms in offspring to predict
17 temperamental anger proneness (Pickles et al., 2013), and with DRD4 polymorphisms
18 in offspring to predict child externalizing behaviors (Bakermans-Kranenburg & van
19 Ijzendoorn, 2006).

20 Fraley and colleagues took advantage of repeated measurements of maternal
21 sensitivity and of social and academic competence over childhood, together with
22 measures of potential confounders and reported that the strength of association
23 between maternal sensitivity and later social and cognitive functioning did not
24 attenuate over time, and that it could not be accounted for by potential confounding
25 variables nor by transactional processes. (Fraley, Roisman, Booth-LaForce, Owen, &

1 Holland, 2013). The same group showed similar effects up to age 32 for academic
2 functioning although, in the case of social functioning, associations with maternal
3 sensitivity were accounted for by confounders such as early socio-economic factors
4 and child's sex (Raby, Roisman, Fraley, & Simpson, 2014). Van der Voort et al.
5 (2014) addressed the possibility of genetic confounding in a longitudinal study of
6 children adopted in infancy and found that maternal sensitivity during infancy
7 predicted internalizing symptomatology during adolescence. A causal role for
8 maternal sensitivity is further supported by clinical trials of attachment-based
9 interventions that show that rates of insecure or disorganized attachment can be
10 reduced by increasing maternal sensitivity (Juffer, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van
11 Ijzendoorn, 2005; van Ijzendoorn et al., 1995).

12 Methods of assessing maternal sensitivity vary considerably in the extent to
13 which they use home or lab-based observations, whether the conditions are
14 standardized, their coding, or the duration of the observations. It may be that these
15 broad characterizations ignore possible issues of domain specificity whereby aspects
16 of sensitivity that entail different processes may have different developmental
17 consequences (Grusec & Davidov, 2010). In particular, maternal sensitivity to infant
18 bids for reciprocity in playful interactions are likely to promote joint exploration and
19 joint attention (Hobson, Patrick, Crandell, Perez, & Lee, 2004) and hence cognitive
20 development (Bornstein & Tamis-Lemonda, 1997) but does not appear to contribute
21 to attachment security (Murray et al., 2008). In contrast, sensitive and comforting
22 responses to infant distress are associated with attachment security (Leerkes, 2011)
23 but not cognitive development (McElwain & Booth-Laforce, 2006). Moreover, it has
24 been suggested that sensitivity to distress and non-distress may have different
25 antecedents, with the later being significantly associated with socio-demographic

1 factors (e.g. age, education, income, or uninvolved partner) and the former with the
2 caregiver's emotional and cognitive competencies and responses to the infant's
3 negative emotions (Leerkes, 2010; Leerkes, Crockenberg, & Burrous, 2004; Leerkes,
4 Weaver, & O'Brien, 2012).

5

6 **Current study**

7 Previous studies have typically measured parental CD during the child's early years
8 and have therefore failed to consider the possibility that the association between CD
9 and offspring's development might have been confounded by the evocative effect of
10 child's behavior on the parents' communication (Miklowitz & Stackman, 1992). Just
11 as importantly for the present purposes, Wynne (1968) originally conceived CD to be
12 a risk marker for parental mental processes that disrupt early caregiving (Singer &
13 Wynne, 1966b) but this possibility is difficult to test in studies which focus
14 exclusively on verbal communication between parents and verbally-competent
15 children.

16 In this study, we addressed both of these issues by investigating whether CD
17 measured during pregnancy (in primiparous mothers) was a significant predictor of
18 caregiver-infant interaction at 29 weeks. Given the more recent research that has
19 shown that maternal representations during pregnancy that are incoherent, confused,
20 contradictory or bizarre, measured with the WMCI, are associated with later parenting
21 characterised by disengagement and less sensitivity and warmth (Theran,
22 Levendosky, Bogat, & Huth-Bocks, 2005), we predicted that increased CD at 32
23 weeks gestation would be associated with decreased maternal sensitivity during early
24 caregiver-infant dyadic communication and that these effects would not be accounted
25 for plausible confounders. Moreover, as maternal sensitivity in the context of infant

1 distress and non-distress may each have distinct antecedents, and different
2 consequences to the infant's social and cognitive development, we examined the
3 contribution of CD to each.

4

5

6 **METHOD**

7 **Design**

8 The current study draws on data from the Wirral Child Health and Development
9 Study (WCHADS; Sharp et al., 2012), a prospective longitudinal study that aims to
10 identify early social, emotional and biological risks involved in the development of
11 childhood conduct problems.

12 In the WCHADS, first-time mothers were recruited to establish a general
13 population (extensive sample) from which an intensive subsample was drawn. The
14 extensive sample comprised primiparous mothers (≥ 18 years of age and English
15 speaking) who sought antenatal care at 12 weeks gestation between February 2007
16 and October 2008 at the Wirral University Teaching Hospital. The intensive sub-
17 sample was stratified by psychosocial risk (partner psychological abuse) and both
18 samples were then followed in tandem. A detailed flowchart of the sampling and
19 recruitment procedure can be found elsewhere (Sharp et al., 2012). This two stage
20 stratified design enables intensive measurement in the subsample (including the
21 assessment of CD and maternal sensitivity), while collection of other measures across
22 the extensive sample allow weighting back of the findings from the intensive
23 subsample to give general population estimates.

24 At 32 weeks, mothers in the intensive sample provided five-minute speech
25 samples in which they spoke without interruption about their anticipated relationship

1 with their as yet unborn child (FMSS; Leeb et al., 1991), as described in more detail
2 below. This methodology, adapted from a method used to measure EE in patients, has
3 been previously used to measure EE during pregnancy (e.g. Lambregtse-van den Berg
4 et al., 2013; Lucassen et al., 2015). The speech samples were audio-recorded,
5 transcribed by members of the WCHADS team and later coded for CD.

6 At 29 weeks into the post-natal period, mothers completed a 15-min play
7 protocol with their babies in the research base (The NICHD Early Child Care
8 Research Network, 1999). Maternal sensitivity was coded from these interactions.
9 Approval for the procedures was obtained from the local Research Ethics Committee.

10

11 **Recruitment and sample**

12 As described in detail in Sharp et al. (2012), the full cohort of 1233 WCHADS
13 mothers (with live singleton births) participated in several waves of assessment and a
14 stratified random sub-sample of 316 was drawn for additional more intensive
15 assessments. Of the 316 participants, 29 either indicated that they did not wish to do
16 the task, or found they were unable to speak for the 5 minutes. Of the 287 who
17 provided the FMSS in pregnancy 237 attended for the 29 weeks assessment that
18 included the observations of mothers and infants in play. Reasons for non-attendance
19 included that the family no longer wished to participate, illness in the family and other
20 family events. Adjustments for attrition made in the analyses are described in the
21 ‘Statistical Analysis’ section. Sensitivity to distress could be rated on the 180
22 assessments were the child showed distress at some point over the 15 minutes of
23 observations. The design allows estimates of means and coefficients for the whole
24 general population cohort to be derived for all measures including those available

1 only in the intensive sample using methods described in the ‘Statistical Analysis’
2 section.

3

4 **Measures and procedure**

5 **CD at 32 weeks of pregnancy**

6 The CD coding system was originally developed for family interactions (Velligan,
7 1985) and captures eight different types of communicational atypicalities that were
8 identified in previous work on CD (Doane & Singer, 1977; Singer & Wynne, 1965a,
9 1965b, 1966b; Wynne et al., 1977; Wynne & Singer, 1963a, 1963b), namely:

10

11 (1) Abandoned, abruptly ceased, uncorrected remarks;

12 (2) Unintelligible remarks;

13 (3) Contradictions, denials and retractions;

14 (4) Ambiguous referents;

15 (5) Extraneous questions and remarks;

16 (6) Tangential, inappropriate responses to questions or remarks;

17 (7) Odd word usage or odd sentence construction; and,

18 (8) Reiterations.

19

20 Table 1 shows definitions and examples for the different codes. CD scores
21 were calculated as the number of instances of CD divided by the number of words
22 spoken to account for verbosity (as recommended by previous researchers; (Hirsch &
23 Leff, 1971; Miklowitz & Stackman, 1992). This coding protocol has been shown to
24 have good reliability and construct validity (Velligan et al., 1990), and has been
25 previously used with clinical (Velligan et al., 1996; Velligan, Funderburg, Giesecke,

1 & Alexander, 1995), and high-risk populations (Velligan et al., 1988). The system has
2 also been previously applied to FMSS (Kymalainen, 2005; Kymalainen, Weisman,
3 Rosales, & Armesto, 2006), and to natural speech samples (Docherty, 1993).

4

5 *****INSERT TABLE 1 HERE *****

6

7 The five minutes speech sample (FMSS) used in this study is an adaptation of
8 the procedure developed for use with parents in which they are asked to talk about
9 how they get along with their child (Magaña et al., 1986). The instructions for the
10 original measure are, “I’d like to hear your thoughts about [patient’s name] in your
11 own words and without my interrupting you with any questions or comments. When I
12 ask you to begin, I’d like you to speak for 5 minutes, telling me what kind of a person
13 [patient’s name] is and how the two of you get along together. After you have begun
14 to speak, I prefer not to answer any questions. Are there any questions you would like
15 to ask me before we begin?” In adapting this for use in pregnancy Lucassen et al.
16 (2015) changed the initial wording to, “I would like you to tell me about your unborn
17 child. What I would like to hear from you is what you expect or hope your child will
18 be like and how you would like to relate to your child.” In view of the emphasis in the
19 original version the speakers’ view of the present rather than the future, we wrote a
20 version that focused on the present and also was appropriate in pregnancy, “I would
21 like to hear your thoughts and feelings about your baby at the moment, in your own
22 words without me interrupting. When I ask you to begin I would like you to speak for
23 5 minutes, tell me what your impressions have been of your baby whilst you’ve been
24 pregnant.”

1 For purposes of training, the first (P.S.) and third authors (K.F.) both coded
2 31% (90) of the speech samples. This training period was preceded by the careful
3 reading of relevant papers in the field of CD (Singer & Wynne, 1966b) and the coding
4 manual that was kindly provided by its author (Velligan, 1985). Both coders were
5 only provided with anonymised transcripts and audio-recordings (the only other
6 information available was the participants id number) hence remaining blind to any
7 background information about the mothers and study hypotheses. Following training,
8 both coders independently scored a subset of 30 speech samples (~10%). Some of the
9 CD codes were very infrequent (e.g. reiteration) but the estimated reliability was good
10 (intraclass correlations for the different items ranged from .77 to .97). After reliability
11 was established, the first author (P.S.) coded the remainder of the speech samples
12 including those used in the training. All coding of CD was conducted independently
13 of the coding of maternal sensitivity and blind to all other measures.

14

15 **Maternal sensitivity at 29 weeks**

16 Maternal sensitivity was assessed with a 15-min standardized laboratory-based
17 protocol (The NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 1999). Mothers were
18 asked to play with their infants seated in a reclining chair or on the floor mat, as they
19 would at home. The protocol started with the following prompt:

20

21 “Play as you might usually do with your baby.”

22

23 During the initial 7 minutes, mothers were instructed to play with their babies
24 using a toy of their choice. After this period, a researcher knocked on the door and
25 instructed the mother to play for an extra 8 minutes with a set of standardized toys

1 provided by the WCHADS team, resulting in a total of 15 minutes of video recorded
2 play. The camera was placed so that full-face view of the infant and the mother could
3 be captured (to enable the team to code eye-to-eye contact between mother and
4 infant).

5 Maternal sensitivity to distress and maternal sensitivity to non-distress were
6 rated using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all characteristic) to 5 (highly
7 characteristic) reflecting mothers' appropriate, supportive, warm responding to infant
8 communications, playful bids or distress.

9 An investigator from NICHD Early Child Care Research Network trained the
10 raters, who then coded sensitivity from the video recordings blind to all other study
11 measures of this report. Each rater (K.A. and L.F.) achieved good inter-rater
12 reliability for maternal sensitivity on a subset of 30 assessments (intraclass
13 correlations ranged from .85 to .91). All ratings of maternal sensitivity were made by
14 different coders than those that rated CD, and blind to all other measures.

15 The video recordings in which distress was observed were also rated for
16 duration of distress (207 in total). The inter-rater reliability for distress duration on a
17 subset of 20 recordings was .92 (intraclass correlations). The duration of distress
18 varied across the sample (129.86 seconds; SD = 115.90), with the child spending an
19 average of 14.7% (SD = 13.6%) of the 15 minutes of the assessment period
20 distressed. The validity of the maternal sensitivity construct was explored by testing
21 the association between sensitivity to distress and non-distress in each quartile of the
22 distribution of the duration of distress (as percentage of the assessment period).
23 Correlations were all sizable and significant across the 4 quartiles (Spearman's
24 correlations varied between .64 and .75) supporting the validity of the sensitivity to

1 distress measure. A more detailed analysis can be found elsewhere (Wright, Hill,
2 Sharp, & Pickles, 2018).

3

4 **Confounders**

5 Maternal age, depression and socio-economic deprivation have been found to be
6 associated with maternal sensitivity (Campbell, Matestic, von Stauffenberg, Mohan,
7 & Kirchner, 2007; Leerkes et al., 2012; Murray, Fiori-Cowley, Hooper, & Cooper,
8 1996) and therefore were included as potential confounders. Although CD has been
9 found to be unrelated to IQ and depression in previous studies (e.g. Doane, West,
10 Goldstein, Rodnick, & Jones, 1981; Velligan et al., 1988), this has not been tested in
11 studies with samples similar to the WCHADS, and so maternal verbal IQ and
12 depressive symptoms were accounted for in analyses with confounds.

13

14 **Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)**

15 Socioeconomic status was determined using the revised IMD (Noble et al., 2004).
16 According to this system, postcode areas in England are ranked from the most
17 deprived (IMD of 1) to the least deprived (IMD of 32,482) based on seven domains of
18 inequality: (1) income deprivation; (2) employment deprivation; (3) health
19 deprivation and disability; (4) education, skill and training deprivation; (5) barriers to
20 housing and services; (6) living environment deprivation; and, (7) crime. All mothers
21 were ranked according to their area postal code and assigned to a quintile based on the
22 UK distribution of deprivation.

23

24 **Verbal IQ**

1 Verbal IQ in mothers was measured with Wechsler Test of Adult Reading (WTAR).
2 The WTAR is a neuropsychological test that takes approximately 10 minutes to
3 complete and that assesses pre-morbid intelligence through the use of 50 irregularly
4 spelled words. During the test, the examiner presents a series of cards with the words
5 prompting the participant for a single pronunciation of the word. The test is stopped
6 when the participant gives 12 consecutive incorrect pronunciations. Each correct
7 pronunciation is given a score of 1 with the maximum raw score of 50. The raw score
8 is then standardized by age and education using published guidelines (Holdnack,
9 2001). WTAR scores are strongly correlated with measures of verbal IQ, verbal
10 comprehension and full scale IQ (Strauss, Sherman, & Spreen, 2006).

11

12 **Maternal Depression in pregnancy and at follow-up**

13 Symptoms of depression were assessed with the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression
14 Scale (EPDS; Cox, 1996). The EPDS includes 10-items that cover different symptoms
15 of depression (e.g. anhedonia, low mood, or thoughts of self-harm) in the last seven
16 days. Questions are answered on a 3-point severity scale and total scores can range
17 from 0 to 30. Scores above a threshold of 12 are likely to indicate clinical depression
18 in the mother (Cox, Holden, & Sagovsky, 1987).

19

20 **Statistical analysis**

21 In order to make inference about the general population from our sample, we applied
22 inverse probability weights that accounted for both the stratified sample and sample
23 attrition associated with maternal age, education, depression score at booking and in
24 pregnancy, smoking and marital status (Dunn, Pickles, Tansella, & Vázquez-
25 Barquero, 1999). We then ran three separate linear regressions with the CD as the

1 predictor variable for the three different maternal sensitivity scores (overall sensitivity
2 and sensitivity in and out of the context of infant distress, with different weights to
3 account for the fact that a substantial proportion of the infants did not become
4 distressed during the observation). These analyses were carried out in a stepwise
5 fashion with estimation of an initial unadjusted model and then with adjustment for
6 confounders (i.e. maternal age, verbal IQ, and IMD quintile). As the sample size was
7 somewhat reduced for analyses including prenatal and postnatal depression (see Table
8 2) they were included as additional confounds in separate analyses. Lastly, we
9 checked for non-linearity in the association of CD and overall maternal sensitivity
10 using a lowess regression smooth (Cleveland, 1979) and a “bent-stick” regression that
11 hypothesized that the association was limited to only part of the range of CD scores
12 (Bacon & Watts, 1971). All analyses were carried out in Stata 13 by the fifth author
13 (AP).

14

15 **Results**

16 **Characteristics of the sample**

17 Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation for the key variables of the study. The
18 mean age of the mothers was 26.96 years (s.d. = 5.96) and the mean IQ score was
19 105.68 (s.d. = 6.43). Regarding the IMD, mothers in the sample ranked on average in
20 the second lowest quintile (2.29, s.d. = 1.3) consistent with the high levels of
21 deprivation in the study catchment area. In Table 2, we also present the means and
22 standard deviations for the depression and maternal sensitivity scores, the different
23 CD codes, duration of speech samples and word count.

24 The means and s.d. for CD in our study are considerably lower than CD scores
25 previously published by Kymalainen and colleagues (2006). However in their study,

1 the authors tested relatives of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia from different
2 ethnic groups (white Americans: mean= 2.89 s.d.= 2.12; Afro-Americans: mean=
3 3.22 s.d.= 2.18; and, Latinos: mean= 1.27 s.d. = 1.35).

4

5

6

*****INSERT TABLE 2 HERE *****

7

8

9 **CD and maternal sensitivity scores**

10 Bivariate correlations between the study variables are provided in the online
11 supplementary materials. Table 3 shows the summary of the regression analysis
12 testing the associations between CD at 32 weeks gestation and the different maternal
13 sensitivity scores at 29 weeks, before and after adjustment for confounders.

14 An initial regression with CD predicting overall maternal sensitivity score
15 showed a highly significant association ($p < 0.001$) suggesting that a 1 SD increase in
16 CD was associated with a 0.385 SD decrease in maternal sensitivity (95% CI [-0.567;
17 -0.203]; $F [1,236] = 17.38$; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.078$). The effect of CD on overall maternal
18 sensitivity score remained significant ($p < 0.005$) after adjustment for confounders
19 (maternal age, verbal IQ and IMD quintile) despite the smaller estimated coefficient
20 of -0.216 (95% CI [-0.365; -.067]). Of note is the significant association between the
21 confounders and overall sensitivity scores (p values ranging from $p < 0.001$ to $p =$
22 0.015), especially maternal age. The inclusion of these confounders led to an overall
23 improvement of the model ($F [4,233] = 19.30$; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.266$).

24 In our second set of analyses, we repeated the same procedure but this time
25 with the maternal sensitivity to non-distress as the outcome variable. The initial

1 model, without confounders, revealed that CD was significant predictor of maternal
2 sensitivity to non-distress (-0.311; 95% CI [-0.547; -0.076]; $p=0.01$). After
3 adjustment for confounders, CD remained a significant predictor of sensitivity to non-
4 distress (-0.185; 95% CI [-0.346; -0.024], $p=0.024$). Again, the confounders were
5 significantly associated with the outcome variable (p values ranging from $p<0.001$ to
6 $p=0.036$) especially maternal age and verbal IQ. The overall model with all the
7 variables proved to be highly significant explaining 24.7% of the observed variance
8 ($F [4,233]=17.65$; $p<0.001$; $R^2=0.247$).

9 In order to draw the comparison with sensitivity to non-distress, we then tested
10 the association between CD and maternal sensitivity in the context of infant distress.
11 In this analysis, the effect estimate, without adjustment for confounders, was not only
12 significant but also substantially larger (-0.514; 95% CI [-0.767; -0.262]; $p<0.01$)
13 than the one reported for the association between CD and maternal sensitivity to non-
14 distress. After adjustment for confounders, CD remained a highly significant predictor
15 ($p<0.001$) despite the smaller estimate coefficient, -0.293 (95% CI [-0.421; -0.164]).
16 Interestingly, in this model maternal age and verbal IQ were not significantly
17 associated with maternal sensitivity in the context of infant distress ($p=0.257$ and $p=$
18 0.243 , respectively); only IMD quintile was ($p=0.006$). Again, the overall model was
19 highly significant ($F [4,176]=11.36$; $p<0.001$; $R^2=0.216$).

20

21

22 *****INSERT TABLE 3 HERE *****

23

24

25 **CD and maternal sensitivity with maternal depression as a confounder**

1 In order to explore the potential confounding effect of maternal depression on the
2 association between CD and the maternal sensitivity scores, we ran another set of
3 analyses additionally adjusting for mothers' scores on the EPDS at 32 weeks of
4 pregnancy and at 29 weeks postnatal.

5 For overall sensitivity, the N fell to 229, but the effect of CD remained
6 significant, $p= 0.023$. For maternal sensitivity to non-distress, the N fell to 229, and
7 the coefficient for CD was no longer significant, $p= 0.094$. Finally, for maternal
8 sensitivity in the context of infant distress, the N fell to 173, but CD remained a
9 highly significant predictor, $p< 0.001$. In none of the three cases did either depression
10 score significantly predict sensitivity.

11

12 **Testing non-linearity in the association between CD and maternal sensitivity**

13 Figure 1 shows the fitted regression model together with a non-linear regression
14 (locally weighted scatterplot smoothing, LOWESS). The LOWESS suggested that the
15 association might be restricted to the upper-end of the distribution of CD scores. A
16 "bent-stick" regression was estimated, which allowed for the lower end of the
17 distribution of CD scores to have no effect. The distribution is shown in Figure 1.
18 This suggests that the point of inflection in the regression, though appearing quite
19 close to the lower end of the range of raw scores, fell at the 48th percentile (close to
20 the middle of the distribution) because of the skew of the distribution. The 95%
21 confidence interval for this break point or threshold spanned from the 37th to the 60th
22 percentile. A formal test of the superiority of this model in our stratified sample was
23 not straightforward.

24

25

1 *****INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE *****

2

3

4 **Discussion**

5 CD in first time pregnant women, assessed as the use of confusing verbal
6 constructions when describing their anticipated infants, predicted lower sensitivity to
7 infant cues approximately 9 months later. This association was stronger in the context
8 of their infant's distress rather than in a non-distress context, and it was greater over
9 the upper range of the CD distribution. These associations were not accounted for by
10 maternal depressive symptoms either during pregnancy or at the time of the
11 sensitivity assessment. The findings could have implications for our understanding
12 intergenerational transmission of developmental vulnerabilities, and for the study of
13 processes that may influence both verbal and non-verbal parenting behaviours.

14 Previous research has suggested that maternal sensitivity in the context of
15 infant's non-distress cues is significantly predicted by socio-demographic risk factors
16 (Leerkes et al., 2012). Our analyses supported this assertion by revealing significant
17 associations between maternal sensitivity to non-distress cues and maternal age,
18 verbal IQ and deprived living conditions. In contrast, maternal sensitivity in the
19 context of infant distress may be more related to the emotional and cognitive
20 competencies of the mother (e.g. negative emotions in response to infant crying or
21 better skills at detecting infant distress; Leerkes, 2010). The results of the present
22 study suggest that CD and, generally speaking, communicational difficulties, are
23 associated with more basic early relational difficulties between mothers and their
24 infants, particularly in emotionally stressful contexts, such as when there is a need to
25 respond to the infant's distress.

1 The findings should be interpreted in the larger context of previous studies
2 that have reported associations between disrupted communication during face-to-face
3 interactions between caregivers and their infants, and caregivers' difficulties in
4 sensitively attuning to their 4-months-old distress cues (Crockett, Holmes, Granger, &
5 Lyons-Ruth, 2013) and initiating and sustaining joint attention bids from the infant
6 (Annie Yoon, Kelso, Lock, & Lyons-Ruth, 2014; Schechter et al., 2010). Also
7 relevant in this context is the robust association observed in previous studies between
8 caregiver's disrupted communication (12 to 18 months) and disorganized attachment
9 styles in children (Madigan et al., 2006). In these studies, disrupted communication
10 was conceptualized as the caregiver's failure to grasp and respond to the intentions
11 conveyed in the infant's communication. It therefore seems likely that disrupted
12 communication and CD reflect broader impairments in the cognitive and emotional
13 processes that are important in attuning to and responding to infant distress (Leerkes
14 & Crockenberg, 2006).

15 A possible interpretation of our results is that both maternal CD and low
16 maternal sensitivity reflect limitations in 'mentalizing' (the ability to think about the
17 mental states of others). For example, it has been argued that mentalizing is important
18 for repairing misunderstandings during conversation (e.g. clarifying deictic references
19 that the listener finds ambiguous or vague) and that both mentalizing and alignment,
20 although dissociable processes, contribute to successful communication (Brennan,
21 Galati, & Kuhlen, 2010). Consistent with this hypothesis, 'maternal mind-
22 mindedness', defined in terms of the caregiver's ability to "read" their infant's
23 thoughts and feelings accurately during play and to comment on their internal
24 states in an attuned way, has been found to be an important predictor of children's
25 socio-cognitive development (Meins et al., 2002; Meins et al., 2003).

1 Our findings therefore broaden the possible range of interpretations of the
2 associations between parental CD and poor social and emotional outcomes in children
3 (e.g. Wichstrøm, Anderson, Holte, & Wynne, 1996; Wichstrøm et al., 1996) and
4 psychopathology in adults (de Sousa, Varese, Sellwood, & Bentall, 2014), outlined
5 earlier. If parental CD is a stable trait, it is possible that the associations we have
6 observed reflect an intergenerational process in which prenatal CD is linked to low
7 maternal sensitivity in infancy, which is a key developmental influence on later
8 adjustment. If this is the case, there are implications not only for the timing of the
9 effects of CD, but also the mechanisms. Associations between CD and child mental
10 health outcomes are typically interpreted as effects of verbal communication on the
11 verbal child. However our findings offer the alternative possibility that CD is a
12 marker for non-verbal communication patterns during infancy, and also possibly
13 during childhood, which also influence development. Further research is required to
14 address questions raised by this possibility. For example, to what extent is CD
15 regarding an anticipated infant in pregnancy a ‘trait-like’ reflection of a tendency to
16 speak in this way about people in general, or does CD vary depending on the person
17 the speaker is referring to?

18 Important strengths of this study included that both the predictor and outcome
19 measures were based on observation, and coded by independent raters, blind to all
20 other measurement, and that potential confounding effects of maternal depression
21 were accounted for. Assessment of CD during pregnancy eliminated the possibility of
22 evocative effects of infant behaviour on the parent, a weakness previously identified
23 in the CD literature (Miklowitz & Stackman, 1992). A limitation of the study is that
24 we were not able to rule out some plausible confounds such as previous trauma or
25 current stressors experienced by the mothers. While the case was made earlier that

1 elevated expressed emotion, and coherence of attachment representations, are
2 different constructs, the extent of their overlap with CD is unknown, and controlling
3 for them may have altered the association between CD and maternal sensitivity. Five-
4 minute speech samples are not an everyday conversation; they reflect soliloquies
5 rather than dialogues and it could be argued that CD scores were confounded by the
6 constraints of the experimental condition (e.g. anxiety and self-consciousness).
7 Furthermore, the version of the FMSS used in this study is an adaptation from the
8 original, which refers to the relationship between a parent and a living child, which
9 may limit the generalizability of the findings.

10 Thus far, research on CD has been largely carried out by researchers interested
11 in environmental and developmental influences on later psychopathology, especially
12 schizophrenia (Bentall et al., 2014; Bentall & Fernyhough, 2008; Bentall, 2003; de
13 Sousa et al., 2014). The present findings suggest that CD may be a useful concept in
14 understanding the impact of maternal characteristics on early child development.
15 Future studies should examine maternal characteristics associated with CD and its
16 associations with other a wider range of developmental processes in children.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 References

2 Annie Yoon, S., Kelso, G. A., Lock, A., & Lyons-Ruth, K. (2014). Mother–infant
3 joint attention and sharing: Relations to disorganized attachment and maternal
4 disrupted communication. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and
5 Theory on Human Development*, 1–14.

6 <http://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2014.964170>

7

8 Bacon, D. W., & Watts, D. G. (1971). Estimating the transition between two
9 intersecting straight lines. *Biometrika*, 58, 525–534.

10 <http://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/58.3.525>

11

12 Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2006). Gene-environment
13 interaction of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) and observed maternal
14 insensitivity predicting externalizing behavior in preschoolers. *Developmental
15 Psychobiology*, 48, 406–409. <http://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20152>

16

17 Bentall, R. P. (2003). *Madness explained: Psychosis and human nature*. London:
18 Allen Lane.

19

20 Bentall, R. P., de Sousa, P., Varese, F., Wickham, S., Sitko, K., Haarmans, M., &
21 Read, J. (2014). From adversity to psychosis: Pathways and mechanisms from
22 specific adversities to specific symptoms. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric
23 Epidemiology*, 49(7), 1011–1022. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0914-0>

24

25 Bentall, R. P., & Fernyhough, C. (2008). Social predictors of psychotic experiences:

- 1 Specificity and psychological mechanisms. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 34(6), 1012–
2 1020. <http://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbn103>
3
- 4 Bornstein, M. H., & Tamis-Lemonda, C. S. (1997). Maternal responsiveness and
5 infant mental abilities: Specific predictive relations. *Infant Behavior and*
6 *Development*, 20(3), 283–296. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(97\)90001-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(97)90001-1)
7
- 8 Brennan, S. E., Galati, A., & Kuhlen, A. K. (2010). Two minds, one dialog:
9 Coordinating speaking and understanding. *Psychology of Learning and*
10 *Motivation* (Vol. 53), 301–344. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421\(10\)53008-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(10)53008-1)
11
- 12 Campbell, S. B., Matestic, P., von Stauffenberg, C., Mohan, R., & Kirchner, T.
13 (2007). Trajectories of maternal depressive symptoms, maternal sensitivity, and
14 children’s functioning at school entry. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(5), 1202–
15 1215. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.5.1202>
16
- 17 Cleveland, W. S. (1979). Robust Locally Weighted regression and smoothing
18 scatterplots. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74, 829–836.
19 <http://doi.org/10.2307/2286407>
20
- 21 Cox, J. (1996). Validation of the Edinburgh postnatal depression scale (EPDS) in non-
22 postnatal women. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 39(3), 185–189.
23 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0327\(96\)00008-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0327(96)00008-0)
24
- 25 Cox, J. L., Holden, J. M., & Sagovsky, R. (1987). Detection of postnatal depression:

1 Development of the 10-item Edinburgh postnatal depression scale. *British*
2 *Journal of Psychiatry*, 150(June), 782–786. <http://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.150.6.782>

3

4 Crockett, E. E., Holmes, B. M., Granger, D. A., & Lyons-Ruth, K. (2013). Maternal
5 disrupted communication during face-to-face interaction at 4 months: Relation to
6 maternal and infant cortisol among at-risk families. *Infancy*, 18, 1111–1134.
7 <http://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12015>

8

9 Dayton, C. J., Levendosky, A. A., Davidson, W. S., & Bogat, G. A. (2010). The child
10 as held in the mind of the mother: The influence of prenatal maternal
11 representations on parenting behaviors. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 31(2),
12 220–241. <http://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.20253>

13

14 de Sousa, P., Varese, F., Sellwood, W., & Bentall, R. P. (2014). Parental
15 communication and psychosis: A meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 40(4),
16 756-768. <http://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbt088>

17

18 Doane, J. A., Jones, J., Fisher, L., Ritzler, B., Singer, M., & Wynne, L. (1982).
19 Parental communication deviance as a predictor of competence in children at risk
20 for adult psychiatric disorder. *Family Process*, 21(2), 211–223.

21

22 Doane, J. A., & Singer, M. (1977). *Communication deviance scoring manual for use*
23 *with consensus rorschach*. University of Rochester: Rochester, NY, USA:
24 Unpublished manuscript.

25

- 1 Doane, J. A., West, K. L., Goldstein, M. J., Rodnick, E. H., & Jones, J. (1981).
2 Parental communication deviance and affective style: Predictors of subsequent
3 schizophrenia spectrum disorders in vulnerable adolescents. *Arch Gen*
4 *Psychiatry*, 38(6), 679–685.
- 5
6 Docherty, N. (1993). Communication deviance, attention and schizotypy in parents of
7 schizophrenic patients. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 181(12), 750–
8 756. [http://doi.org/Doi 10.1097/00005053-199312000-00007](http://doi.org/Doi%2010.1097/00005053-199312000-00007)
- 9
10 Dunn, G., Pickles, A., Tansella, M., & Vázquez-Barquero, J. L. (1999). Two-phase
11 epidemiological surveys in psychiatric research: Editorial. *British Journal of*
12 *Psychiatry*, 174(Feb.), 95–100. <http://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.174.2.95>
- 13
14 Fraley, R. C., Roisman, G. I., Booth-LaForce, C., Owen, M. T., & Holland, A. S.
15 (2013). Interpersonal and genetic origins of adult attachment styles: A
16 longitudinal study from infancy to early adulthood. *Journal of Personality and*
17 *Social Psychology*, 104, 817–38. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031435>
- 18
19 Goldstein, M. J. (1987). The UCLA high-risk study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 13(3),
20 505–514.
- 21
22 Grusec, J. E., & Davidov, M. (2010). Integrating different perspectives on
23 socialization theory and research: A domain-specific approach. *Child*
24 *Development*, 81, 687–709. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01426.x>
- 25

- 1 Hirsch, S. R., & Leff, J. P. (1971). Parental abnormalities of verbal communication in
2 the transmission of schizophrenia. *Psychol Med*, *1*(2), 118–127. Retrieved from
3 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/5148763>
4
- 5 Hobson, R. P., Patrick, M. P. H., Crandell, L. E., Perez, R. M. G., & Lee, A. (2004).
6 Maternal sensitivity and infant triadic communication. *Journal of Child*
7 *Psychology and Psychiatry*, *45*(3), 470–480.
8
- 9 Holdnack, H. A. (2001). *Wechsler test of adult reading: WTAR*. San Antonio: The
10 Psychological Corporation.
11
- 12 Joosen, K. J., Mesman, J., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H.
13 (2012). Maternal sensitivity to infants in various settings predicts harsh
14 discipline in toddlerhood. *Attachment & Human Development*, *14*(2), 101-117.
15 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2012.661217>
16
- 17 Juffer, F., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2005). The
18 importance of parenting in the development of disorganized attachment:
19 Evidence from a preventive intervention study in adoptive families. *Journal of*
20 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *46*, 263–274.
21 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00353.x>
22
- 23 Kymalainen, J. A. (2005). *Expressed emotion and communication deviance in anglo-*
24 *american, latino-american and african-american families with schizophrenia*.
25 University of Massachusetts, Boston.

1

2 Kymalainen, J. A., Weisman, A. G., Rosales, G. A., & Armesto, J. C. (2006).

3 Ethnicity, expressed emotion, and communication deviance in family members
4 of patients with schizophrenia. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *194*,
5 391–396. <http://doi.org/10.1097/01.nmd.0000221171.42027.5a>

6

7 [Korja, R., Ahlqvist-Björkroth, S., Savonlahti, E., Stolt, S., Haataja, L., Lapinleimu,](#)
8 [H., ... Lehtonen, L. \(2010\). Relations between maternal attachment](#)
9 [representations and the quality of mother-infant interaction in preterm and full-](#)
10 [term infants. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *33*\(3\), 330–336.](#)
11 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2010.03.010>

12

13 Lambregtse-van den Berg, M. P., Lucassen, N., Kuipers-Nap, M. F., Dingemans, P.
14 M. A. J., Jaddoe, V. W. V, Hofman, A., ... Tiemeier, H. (2013). Assessing
15 expressed emotion during pregnancy. *Psychiatry Research*, *205*(3), 285–288.
16 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2012.08.037>

17

18 Leeb, B., Hahlweg, K., Goldstein, M. J., Feinstein, E., Mueller, U., Dose, M., &
19 Magana-Amato, A. (1991). Cross-national reliability, concurrent validity, and
20 stability of a brief method for assessing expressed emotion. *Psychiatry Research*,
21 *39*, 25–31. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781\(91\)90005-A](http://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(91)90005-A)

22

23 Leerkes, E. M. (2010). Predictors of Maternal Sensitivity to Infant Distress.
24 *Parenting*, *10*(3), 219-239. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15295190903290840>

25

- 1 Leerkes, E. M. (2011). Maternal sensitivity during distressing tasks: A unique
2 predictor of attachment security. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *34*, 443–446.
3 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2011.04.006>
4
- 5 Leerkes, E. M., & Crockenberg, S. C. (2006). Antecedents of mothers' emotional and
6 cognitive responses to infant distress: The role of family, mother, and infant
7 characteristics. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *27*(4), 405–428.
8
- 9 Leerkes, E. M., Crockenberg, S. C., & Burrous, E. (2004). Identifying components of
10 maternal sensitivity to infant distress: The role of maternal emotional
11 competencies. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, *4*(1), 1–23.
12
- 13 Leerkes, E. M., Weaver, J. M., & O'Brien, M. (2012). Differentiating maternal
14 sensitivity to infant distress and non-distress. *Parenting*, *12*(2-3), 175-184.
15 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2012.683353>
16
- 17 Lucassen, N., Tiemeier, H., Luijk, M. P. C. M., Linting, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg,
18 M. J., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., ... Lambregtse-Van den Berg, M. P. (2015).
19 Expressed emotion during pregnancy predicts observed sensitivity of mothers
20 and fathers in early childhood. *Parenting*, *15*(3), 158–165.
21 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2015.1053316>
22
- 23 Madigan, S., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Moran, G.,
24 Pederson, D. R., & Benoit, D. (2006). Unresolved states of mind, anomalous
25 parental behavior, and disorganized attachment: A review and meta-analysis of a

1 transmission gap. *Attachment & Human Development*, 8, 89–111.

2 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616730600774458>

3

4 Magaña, A. B., Goldstein, M. J., Karno, M., Miklowitz, D. J., Jenkins, J., & Falloon,

5 I. R. (1986). A brief method for assessing expressed emotion in relatives of

6 psychiatric patients. *Psychiatry Res*, 17(3), 203–212. Retrieved from

7 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3704028>

8

9 McElwain, N. L., & Booth-Laforce, C. (2006). Maternal sensitivity to infant distress

10 and nondistress as predictors of infant-mother attachment security. *Journal of*

11 *Family Psychology : JFP : Journal of the Division of Family Psychology of the*

12 *American Psychological Association (Division 43)*, 20, 247–255.

13 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.2.247>

14

15 Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Wainwright, R., Clark-Carter, D., Gupta, M. Das, Fradley,

16 E., & Tuckey, M. (2003). Pathways to understanding mind: Construct validity

17 and predictive validity of maternal mind-mindedness. *Child Development*, 74(4),

18 1194–1211.

19

20 Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Wainwright, R., Das Gupta, M., Fradley, E., & Tuckey,

21 M. (2002). Maternal mind-mindedness and attachment security as predictors of

22 theory of mind understanding. *Child Development*, 73(6), 1715–1726.

23

24 Miklowitz, D. J., & Stackman, D. (1992). Communication deviance in families of

25 schizophrenic and other psychiatric patients: Current state of the construct. *Prog*

- 1 *Exp Pers Psychopathol Res*, 15, 1–46. Retrieved from
2 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1343105>
3
- 4 Murray, L., Fiori-Cowley, A., Hooper, R., & Cooper, P. (1996). The impact of
5 postnatal depression and associated adversity on early mother-infant interactions
6 and later infant outcome. *Child Development*, 67(5), 2512–2526.
7 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01871.x>
8
- 9 Murray, L., Hentges, F., Hill, J., Karpf, J., Mistry, B., Kreutz, M., ... Green, R.
10 (2008). The effect of cleft lip and palate, and the timing of lip repair on mother-
11 infant interactions and infant development. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
12 *Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 49, 115–123. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01833.x)
13 [7610.2007.01833.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01833.x)
14
- 15 Noble, M., Wright, G., Dibben, C., Smith, G., McLennan, D., Anttila, C., ... Lloyd,
16 M. (2004). *The English Indices of Deprivation 2004 (revised). Report to the*
17 *Office of the Deputy Prime Minister*. London: Neighbourhood Renewal Unit.
18
- 19 Nuechterlein, K. H., Goldstein, M. J., Ventura, J., Dawson, M. E., & Doane, J. A.
20 (1989). Patient-environment relationships in schizophrenia. Information
21 processing, communication deviance, autonomic arousal, and stressful life
22 events. *Br J Psychiatry Suppl*, (5), 84–89. Retrieved from
23 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2605027>
24
- 25 Pickles, A., Hill, J., Breen, G., Quinn, J., Abbott, K., Jones, H., & Sharp, H. (2013).

1 Evidence for interplay between genes and parenting on infant temperament in the
2 first year of life: monoamine oxidase A polymorphism moderates effects of
3 maternal sensitivity on infant anger proneness. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
4 *Psychiatry*, 54(12), 1308–1317. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12081>

5

6 Raby, K. L., Roisman, G. I., Fraley, R. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2014). The enduring
7 predictive significance of early maternal sensitivity: Social and academic
8 competence through age 32 years. *Child Development*, 86(3), 695-708.
9 <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12325>

10

11 Roisko, R., Wahlberg, K. E., Miettunen, J., & Tienari, P. (2014). Association of
12 parental communication deviance with offspring's psychiatric and thought
13 disorders. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Psychiatry*, 29(1),
14 20-31. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2013.05.002>

15

16 [Schechter, D. S., Coates, S. W., Kaminer, T., Coots, T., Zeanah, C. H., Davies, M., ...](#)
17 [Myers, M. M. \(2008\). Distorted maternal mental representations and atypical](#)
18 [behavior in a clinical sample of violence-exposed mothers and their toddlers.](#)
19 [Journal of Trauma and Dissociation](#), 9(2), 123–147.
20 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15299730802045666>

21

22 Schechter, D. S., Willheim, E., Hinojosa, C., Scholfield-Kleinman, K., Turner, J. B.,
23 McCaw, J., ... Myers, M. M. (2010). Subjective and objective measures of
24 parent-child relationship dysfunction, child separation distress, and joint
25 attention. *Psychiatry*, 73, 130–144. <http://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2010.73.2.130>

1

2 Sharp, H., Pickles, A., Meaney, M., Marshall, K., Tibu, F., & Hill, J. (2012).

3 Frequency of infant stroking reported by mothers moderates the effect of

4 prenatal depression on infant behavioural and physiological outcomes. *PLoS*5 *ONE*, 7. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0045446>

6

7 Singer, M., & Wynne, L. (1965a). Thought disorder and family relations of

8 schizophrenics: III. Methodology using projective techniques. *Arch Gen*9 *Psychiatry*, 12, 187–200. Retrieved from10 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14237629>

11

12 Singer, M., & Wynne, L. (1965b). Thought disorder and family relations of

13 schizophrenics: IV. Results and Implications. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 12, 201–212.14 Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14237630>

15

16 Singer, M., & Wynne, L. (1966a). Communication styles in parents of normals,

17 neurotics, and schizophrenics. Some findings using a new Rorschach scoring

18 manual. *Psychiatr Res Rep Am Psychiatr Assoc*, 20, 25–38. Retrieved from19 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/5907506>

20

21 Singer, M., & Wynne, L. (1966b). Principles for scoring communication defects and

22 deviances in parents of schizophrenics: Rorschach and TAT scoring manuals.

23 *Psychiatry*, 29(3), 260–288. Retrieved from24 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/5969538>

25

- 1 Strauss, E., Sherman, E. M., & Spreen, O. (2006). *A compendium of*
2 *neuropsychological tests: Administration, norms, and commentary*. New York:
3 Oxford University Press.
- 4
- 5 The NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1999). Child care and mother-child
6 interaction in the first 3 years of life. NICHD Early Child Care Research
7 Network. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1399–413. Retrieved from
8 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10563730>
- 9
- 10 [Theran, S. A., Levendosky, A. A., Bogat, G. A., & Huth-Bocks, A. C. \(2005\).](#)
11 [Stability and change in mothers' internal representations of their infants over](#)
12 [time. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7\(3\), 253–268.](#)
13 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616730500245609>
- 14
- 15 van der Voort, A., Linting, M., Juffer, F., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J.,
16 Schoenmaker, C., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2014). The development of
17 adolescents' internalizing behavior: Longitudinal effects of maternal sensitivity
18 and child inhibition. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 528–40.
19 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9976-7>
- 20
- 21 van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Juffer, F., & Duyvesteyn, M. G. C. (1995). Breaking the
22 intergenerational cycle of insecure attachment: A review of the effects of
23 attachment-based interventions on maternal sensitivity and infant security.
24 *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 36(2), 225-
25 248. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1995.tb01822.x>

1

2 Velligan, D. I. (1985). *Communication deviance coding manual for coding family*
3 *confrontations*. Unpublished manuscript: Los Angeles: University of California.

4

5 Velligan, D. I., Christensen, A., Goldstein, M. J., & Margolin, G. (1988). Parental
6 communication deviance: Its relationship to parent, child and family system
7 variables. *Psychiatry Res*, 26(3), 313–325.

8

9 Velligan, D. I., Funderburg, L. G., Giesecke, S. L., & Alexander, A. L. (1995).
10 Longitudinal analysis of communication deviance in the families of
11 schizophrenic patients. *Psychiatry-Interpersonal and Biological Processes*,
12 58(1), 6–19.

13

14 Velligan, D. I., Goldstein, M. J., Nuechterlein, K. H., Miklowitz, D. J., & Ranlett, G.
15 (1990). Can communication deviance be measured in a family problem solving
16 interaction? *Family Process*, 29(2), 213–226.

17

18 Velligan, D. I., Miller, A. L., Eckert, S. L., Funderburg, L. G., True, J. E., Mahurin,
19 R. K., ... Hazelton, B. C. (1996). The relationship between parental
20 communication deviance and relapse in schizophrenic patients in the 1-year
21 period after hospital discharge: A pilot study. *Journal of Nervous and Mental*
22 *Disease*, 184(8), 490–496.

23

24 Verhage, M. L., Schuengel, C., Madigan, S., Pasco Fearon, R. M., Oosterman, M.,
25 Cassibba, R., ... van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2016). Narrowing the transmission gap:

1 A synthesis of three decades of research on intergenerational transmission of
2 attachment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(4), 337–366.
3 <http://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000038>

4

5 Vreeswijk, C. M. J. M., Maas, A. J. B. M., & van Bakel, H. J. A. (2012). Parental
6 representations: A systematic review of the working model of the child
7 interview. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 33(3), 314–328.
8 <http://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.20337>

9

10 Wahlberg, K. E., Wynne, L., Hakko, H., Läksy, K., Moring, J., Miettunen, J., &
11 Tienari, P. (2004). Interaction of genetic risk and adoptive parent communication
12 deviance: longitudinal prediction of adoptee psychiatric disorders. *Psychol Med*,
13 34(8), 1531–1541. [http://doi.org/Doi 10.1017/S003291704002661](http://doi.org/Doi%2010.1017/S003291704002661)

14

15 Wahlberg, K. E., Wynne, L., Oja, H., Keskitalo, P., Anais-Tanner, H., Koistinen, P.,
16 ... Tienari, P. (2000). Thought disorder index of Finnish adoptees and
17 communication deviance of their adoptive parents. *Psychol Med*, 30(1), 127–
18 136.

19

20 Wahlberg, K. E., Wynne, L., Oja, H., Keskitalo, P., Pykalainen, L., Lahti, I., ...
21 Tienari, P. (1997). Gene-environment interaction in vulnerability to
22 schizophrenia: Findings from the Finnish adoptive family study of
23 schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*, 154(3), 355–362. Retrieved from
24 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9054783>

25

- 1 Wichstrøm, L., Anderson, A. M., Holte, A., Husby, R., & Wynne, L. C. (1996).
2 Confirmatory and disconfirmatory family communication as predictor of
3 offspring socio-emotional functioning. A 10 to 14 year follow-up of children at
4 risk. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *93*, 49–56. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1996.tb10618.x)
5 [0447.1996.tb10618.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1996.tb10618.x)
6
- 7 Wichstrøm, L., Anderson, A. M., Holte, A., & Wynne, L. C. (1996). Disqualifying
8 family communication and childhood social competence as predictors of
9 offspring's mental health and hospitalization. A 10- to 14-year longitudinal study
10 of children at risk of psychopathology. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental*
11 *Disease*, *184*, 581–588. <http://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-199610000-00001>
12
- 13 Wichstrøm, L., Holte, A., Husby, R., & Wynne, L. C. (1994). Disqualifying family
14 communication as a predictor of changes in offspring competence: A 3-year
15 longitudinal study of sons of psychiatric patients. *Journal of Family Psychology*.
16 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.8.1.104>
17
- 18 Wichstrøm, L., Holte, A., Husby, R., & Wynne, L. C. (1993). Competence in children
19 at risk for psychopathology predicted from confirmatory and disconfirmatory
20 family communication. *Family Process*, *32*, 203–220.
21
- 22 Wichstrøm, L., Holte, A., & Wynne, L. C. (1993). Disqualifying family
23 communication and anxiety in offspring at risk for psychopathology. *Acta*
24 *Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *88*, 74–79.
25

- 1 Wright, N., Hill, J., Sharp, H., & Pickles, A. (2018). Maternal sensitivity to distress,
2 attachment and the development of callous-unemotional traits in young children.
3 *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12867>
4
- 5 Wynne, L. (1968). Methodologic and conceptual issues in the study of schizophrenics
6 and their families. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 6(suppl. 1), 185–199.
7
- 8 Wynne, L. (1981). Current concepts about schizophrenics and family relationships.
9 *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 169(2), 82–89. <http://doi.org/Doi>
10 10.1097/00005053-198102000-00003
11
- 12 Wynne, L. (1984). The epigenesis of relational systems: a model for understanding
13 family development. *Family Process*, 23(3), 297–318. Retrieved from
14 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6479297>
15
- 16 Wynne, L. (1988). An epigenetic model of family processes. In C. J. Falicov (Ed.),
17 *Family transitions: Continuity and change over the life cycle* (pp. 81–106). New
18 York: Guilford Press.
19
- 20 Wynne, L. C., Singer, M., Bartko, J., & Toohey, M. (1977). Schizophrenics and their
21 families: Research on parental communication. In J. M. Tanner (Ed.),
22 *Developments in psychiatric research* (pp. 254–286). London: England: Hodder
23 & Stoughton.
24
- 25 Wynne, L., Cole, R. E., & Perkins, P. (1987). University of Rochester child and

1 family study: Risk research in progress. *Schizophr Bull*, 13(3), 463–476.

2 Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3477019>

3

4 Wynne, L., & Singer, M. (1963a). Thought disorder and family relations of

5 schizophrenics: I. A research strategy. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 9, 191–198.

6 Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14002138>

7

8 Wynne, L., & Singer, M. (1963b). Thought disorder and family relations of

9 schizophrenics: II. A classification of forms thinking. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 9,

10 199–206. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14002139>

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21