The relationship between attachment style and physical and psychological well-being in young adults is mediated by the hardwired defense of depersonalization



Transient Depersonalization: 1-year prevalence 24% in random US rural

Acute Stress



Mental Disorders as Causal Systems: A Network Approach to Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (2015) Richard J. McNally, Donald J. Robinaugh, Gwyneth W. Y. Wu, Li Wang, Marie K. Deserno, and Denny Borsboom



Defense Mechanism



Traumagenics



Briefly what do we know



Fight-flight or Defense Cascade





Increasing dissociation during cascade progression

Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the defense cascade as it progresses along the 6-F course of action. The "uproar" sympathetic arousal reaches a maximum at the fright stage, eventually superseded by the onset of dissociative "shut down" (gray area).

Split-off or dissociated emotion(Power, 2010)



Somatic Symptoms



Anxious Attachment Style

• D

What is reinforcing about attachment anxiety?



CURRENT STUDY

 Does an Affect Phobia Model (McCullough et al, 2003) account for Physical and Psychological wellbeing in a

Measures Used

• ATTACHMENT- The Experiences in Close Relationships- Relationship

Importance of Emotional Maltreatment



Abuse type and Depersonalisation

Symptoms reported in last month

Comparing Young Adults Above the clinical cut-off for Depersonalization

Study II- Repeating the same model but adding Self-Compassion

Method and Participants



Measures



Results: Correlational analysis



Multiple Regression Model 1 Predictors of **Somatic Complaints**

Multiple Regression Model 3 Predictors of **Depression**

Clinical vs non-clinical DP – comparison across measures the clinical cut-off level

Measure	Clinical DP (n = 53, 26.2%)	Non-clinical DP (n = 155, 73.8%)	Sig. (2 – tailed)
Somatic complaints	10.34 (4.74)	6.42 (3.75)	p < .001
Depression	11.10 (4.73)	5.84 (4.32)	p < .001
Self-compassion	14.76 (3.11)	17.96 (4.57)	p < .001
Emotional abuse	10.53 (4.25)	7.61 (3.35)	p < .001
Physical neglect	7.19 (2.35)	6.21 (1.86)	p < .01
Emotional neglect	10.38 (3.63)	8.5 (3.92)	p < .01
Physical abuse	6.3 (2.5)	5.57 (1.37)	p < .05
Attachment anxiety	2.72 (1.76)	2.04 (1.32)	p < .05

Predictors of clinical levels of depersonalisation

Variables	β	S.E.	Wald	р	OR	95% CI.for OR		
						Lower	Upper	
Drugs	38	.42	.81	.368	.69	.30	1.56	
Sleep	.97	.51	3.60	.058	2.65	.97	7.23	
SC	20	.05	15.10	<.001	.82	.74	.91	
ECRAnx	.06	.12	.25	.620	1.06	.84	1.33	
EA	.17	.05	12.23	<.001	1.18	1.07	1.30	
1								

Note OR = Odds Ratio: SC = Self-compassion : ECRApy = Attachment Anyiety: EA =

en normang jegeran n. – Ist helester som sentere som senter og på hele sætter er helester engiger et bet som hover in herbesterer Som som som et nå

REGRESSION

Mediation analysis: Self-compassion as mediator of attachment anxiety and





Implications of this Study

Study III: A tale of one thousand, one hundred and sixty-five therapists and their self-care
What are our research questions



Unreliable Caregiver (McCluskey, 2015)



Five styles of Care-seeking behaviours in supervisee therapists (McCluskey, 2005)

Personal Correspondence with Dr. Una McCluskey (Dublin, Ireland -09/21/19)



Which therapist wrote this poem?



Fear of rejection if true self and feelings are expressed

I am The BEST carer.... (McCluskey, 2015)

What did the research tell us?



Personal Factors Model of secondary traumatic stress and burnout

Attachment style

Attachment anxiety indirectly influences burnout through somatisation, attitudes around emotional expression (belief that people with reject you if display emotions), as well as through dissociation, specifically the tendency to become very absorbed in an activity. Attachment avoidance indirectly influences burnout only through somatisation and attitudes around emotional expression. This model explains 37% of the variance F(12 1143) =

	Attachment anxiety				Attachment avoidance			
	Product of Coefficients		Bootstrap 95% BC ¹ CI		Product of Coefficients		Bootstrap 95% BC1 CI	
Indirect effects	Point Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper	Point Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper
TOTAL	5.52	0.73	4.15	7.05	3.32	0.77	1.85	4.93
AEE 'Control'	0.02	0.14	-0.25	0.32	0.06	0.39	-0.72	0.80
AEE 'Social rejection'	1.86	0.62	0.69	3.14	1.19	0.40	0.45	2.01
AEE 'Weakness'	0.25	0.19	-0.08	0.69	0.49	0.35	-0.20	1.17
AEE 'Non-expression'	0.21	0.17	-0.07	0.60	0.92	0.69	-0.48	2.27
Dissociation absorption	0.77	0.34	0.17	1.48	0.13	0.11	-0.02	0.41
Dissociation amnesia	0.16	0.19	-0.20	0.55	-0.01	0.04	-0.18	0.03
Dissociation depersonalisation / derealisation	-0.42	0.27	-0.99	0.08	-0.12	0.09	-0.37	0.01
Somatisation	2.68	0.45	1.85	3.63	0.66	0.26	0.17	1.21

Overall model

R² = 0.37, F(12,1143) = 55.17, p < 0.001

What we need to do? McCluskey (2015) recommends:

Thank you!



• Key Recommended readings