Early life attachment in term and preterm infants.

Lorena Jiménez-Sánchez[1,2], Lorna Ginnell[2], Sinéad O'Carroll[2], Victoria Ledsham[3], Amy Corrigan[3], David Q. Stoye[3], Gemma Sullivan[3], Jill Hall[3], Ann M. Clemens[4], James P. Boardman[3,4], Sue Fletcher-Watson[2]

[1]Translational Neuroscience PhD programme, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

[2]Salvesen Mindroom Research Centre, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

[3]MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, The Queen's Medical Research Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

[4]Centre for Discovery Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

*** Correspondence:**

Lorena Jiménez Sánchez

Address: Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower, Morningside Place, Edinburgh EH10 5HF, UK.

Email: Lorena.jimenezs@ed.ac.uk

Abbreviated title:

Early life attachment in term and preterm infants.

Number of words: 5,015 (including title page, abstract, in-text references, tables, and figures)

Number of tables: 2.

Number of figures: 3

1 Abstract

Background: Preterm birth is associated with atypical cognitive and socioemotional outcomes in childhood. Secure infant attachment protects against adverse outcomes, but could be modified by alterations in the early caregiving environment inherent to essential neonatal intensive care or co-morbidities of preterm birth. We aimed to test the hypothesis that preterm birth is associated with differences in infant attachment compared with infants born at term, and to investigate clinical, neurodevelopmental and socioeconomic variables that could contribute to variance in infant attachment.

Methods: 68 preterm and 68 term infants with mean (range) gestational age at birth 29.7 (22.1 – 32.9) and 39.6 (36.4 – 42.1) weeks, respectively, completed the Still-Face Paradigm (SFP) at nine months of corrected age. Attachment dimensions and categories were obtained from infant responses to the SFP using a published coding scheme, and an alternative principal component and clustering strategy. Neurodevelopment was assessed using the Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scales, and socioeconomic status was operationalized as neighborhood deprivation.

Results: Preterm and term infants did not differ in attachment dimensions (distress, fretfulness, attentiveness to caregivers, p-values > .07; principal components, p-values > .07), or the distribution of attachment categories (attachment styles, p-value = .79; attachment clusters, p-value > .78). In the whole sample, fretfulness correlated with socioeconomic deprivation (n = 136, r_s = -0.23, p-value < .01), and attentiveness correlated with motor development (n = 120, r_s = .24, p-value < .01).

Conclusions: There were no differences in attachment between preterm and term infants at nine months of age, suggesting that caregiver-infant attachment relationships are resilient to the effects of prematurity on the developing infant. The results highlight links between socioeconomic deprivation and infant attachment, and suggest there is a relationship between infant attentiveness and motor function in infancy.

2 Keywords

Attachment, attention, prematurity, infancy, socioeconomic deprivation, motor development.

3 Abbreviations

AA = Attentive-Avoidant scale

GA = Gestational age at birth

HD = Happy-Distressed scale

ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient

NFF = Not fretful-Fretful scale

NICU = Neonatal Intensive Care Unit

PCA = Principal component analysis

PC1 = First principal component

PC2 = Second principal component

SD = Standard deviation

SIMD = Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation

SFP = Still-Face Paradigm

VABS = Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales

4 Introduction

Preterm birth (birth before 37 weeks of gestation) is associated with atypical neurodevelopmental outcomes in childhood, including attention problems, impaired language development and delayed socioemotional competence (Ene et al., 2019, Dean et al., 2021a, Dean et al., 2021b, Barre et al., 2011). Secure infant attachment can protect against some of these adverse outcomes (Thompson, 2008); however, it could be adversely modified by unavoidable alteration in the caregiving environment inherent to neonatal intensive care required by preterm infants. These alterations include an inevitable degree of separation from parental caregivers, infant stress, and co-exposures of preterm birth that affect the developing brain (Korja et al., 2012, Boardman and Counsell, 2020). Infant attachment could also be impacted by atypical cognitive capacities linked to preterm birth, for example, differences in attention maturation (Ginnell et al., 2021) may influence how long preterm infants engage in social interactions (Burstein et al., 2021). A better understanding of the relationship between prematurity and attachment is essential to support early relationships between preterm infants and their caregivers, which in turn, are important to foster infants' socioemotional resilience and parental wellbeing.

Early interactions between infants and their caregivers build infants' attachment relationships (Ainsworth et al., 1972, Emde, 1980) and shape infants' attachment style (Bowlby, 1982). Securely attached infants use caregivers as a secure base to explore from and return to. Under a threat, insecurely attached infants either avoid their caregiver (avoidant) or fail to respond independently (resistant). Secure, avoidant and resistant attachment styles are adaptative organized strategies, but some infants show contradictory behaviors i.e. attachment disorganization (Main and Solomon, 1990). Secure attachment has been shown to contribute positively to infants' socioemotional development (Thompson, 2008), increased peer competence (Groh et al., 2014) and mental health in later life (Spruit et al., 2020). For preterm infants specifically, secure attachment associated with a better neurological development at 14 months (Brisch et al., 2005) and higher cognitive scores at 24 months of corrected age (López-Maestro et al., 2017). Attachment has also been linked to

demography: secure preterm infants were less likely to come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Wille, 1991).

Research has examined whether infant attachment is disrupted by preterm birth, but the findings are inconsistent. Some studies found no difference in attachment styles between preterm (gestational age at birth (GA) < 37 weeks) and term infants (Rode et al., 1981, Frodi and Thompson, 1985, Goldberg et al., 1986, Plunkett et al., 1986, Easterbrooks, 1989, Butcher et al., 1993, Brisch et al., 2005). Other studies reported that moderate-to-late preterm infants (GA 32 – 36 weeks) were more frequently assigned an avoidant attachment style (Fuertes et al., 2022), preterm infants of GA < 32 weeks were more commonly assigned a disorganized attachment style (Wolke et al., 2014), and very preterm infants (GA < 26 weeks) were more frequently assigned a resistant attachment style (López-Maestro et al., 2017, Sierra-García et al., 2018). All the aforementioned studies followed similar methodologies and assessed attachment from 12 months of age, but studies demonstrating differences in attachment were more recent, and included larger cohorts of preterm infants with a lower mean GA. Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) practices and outcomes have substantially evolved since the 1990s, resulting in much higher survival rates of extremely preterm infants and better developmental outcomes (Bell et al., 2022). Therefore, there is a need to explore the relationship between prematurity and attachment in a contemporary cohort of recipients of modern intensive care. Contradictory findings may also be explained by the caregiver's gradual adaptations to the characteristics of the preterm infant during the first year of life, establishing a more harmonious interactional style suited to the infant (Frodi and Thompson, 1985). Thus, if preterm infants do present differences in attachment, these could be more apparent early in infancy.

Attachment in early development has traditionally been studied using the Strange Situation Procedure (Ainsworth et al., 1972), where toddlers are observed playing while caregivers and strangers enter and leave one room. The Strange Situation assumes infants' motor competence and fear of strangers, characteristics that may not be completely developed in those younger than 12 months (Schaffer, 1966), especially in clinical populations. The Still-Face Paradigm (SFP) offers an opportunity to study younger populations, while infants progress in terms of locomotor ability and intentionality (Zeanah et al., 1989) and become less indiscriminately friendly and more wary of strangers (Schaffer, 1966). From seven-to-eight months of age, these developments

go hand-in-hand with the formation of attachment to a primary caregiver (Abbott, 2016). Current approaches for categorizing attachment styles from the SFP use predefined thresholds based on raw scores that capture the infants' attentiveness to the caregiver and mood (Williams and Turner, 2020, Abbott, 2016). This approach may not be appropriate for preterm infants who may have atypical attention profiles. Data-driven approaches can partially address this limitation by categorizing attachment based on the behavioral heterogeneity of the population. Moreover, infant attachment patterns may be more continuously rather than categorically distributed, so broad approaches that explore both attachment dimensions and attachment categories are recommended (Fraley and Spieker, 2003).

Our primary aim was to test the hypothesis that preterm birth is associated with differences in infant attachment using two methods to analyze infant behaviors coded from the SFP: an existing SFP categorization system and a sample-specific data-driven approach. A secondary aim was to investigate clinical, neurodevelopmental and socioeconomic variables that could contribute to variance in infant attachment across the study sample.

5 Methods

5.1 Participants

Participants were part of a longitudinal cohort study designed to investigate the effect of preterm birth on brain development and neurocognitive outcomes (Boardman et al., 2020). Preterm and term infants were born between October 2016 to March 2021 at the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, UK. Preterm infants transferred to the hospital *ex utero* for intensive care, and infants with congenital anomalies or major destructive parenchymal brain injury (grade 4 intraventricular hemorrhage, post-hemorrhagic ventricular dilatation and cystic periventricular leukomalacia) were excluded. Informed written parental consent was obtained. Ethical approval was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service (16/SS/0154), South East Scotland Research Ethics Committee, and NHS Lothian Research and Development (2016/0255).

Caregivers were invited to attend follow-up appointments with their infants at nine months of age. Corrected age was used for the preterm group. Participants attended the Child Development lab, part of the Salvesen Mindroom Research Centre and the University of Edinburgh, at the Royal Edinburgh Hospital. The visit comprised an assessment battery including questionnaires and behavioral procedures (for protocol, see Boardman et al., 2020).

Demographic data were collected through questionnaires and review of medical records. Collected information included sex, GA, birth weight (grams), total number of days spent in the NICU, age at testing (months), ponderal index at nine months of age and the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2016 (SIMD) rank, generated from postcode information collected via parental questionnaire. SIMD rank (Scottish Government, 2016) is a multidimensional score generated by the Scottish government ranking localities' deprivation according to local income, employment, health, education, geographic access to services, crime and housing.

5.2 Measures and materials

5.2.1 The Still-Face paradigm

After video consent was obtained, infants were secured in a high chair. Caregivers seated facing the infant approximately 50 cm away. Two Panasonic HC-W580 video cameras were set up behind the caregiver and the infant to record the infant and caregiver's faces and hands. All researchers seated out of view, and verbally cued caregivers. The procedure included five two-minute episodes (Haley and Stansbury, 2003); modified from the original protocol by (Tronick et al., 1978): baseline, still-face, reunion, still-face, and reunion. During the baseline episode, caregivers were instructed to interact naturally with the infant, without using toys. During still-face episodes, caregivers were instructed to express a neutral facial expression, remaining still and looking slightly above the infant's head, avoiding eye contact and interaction with their infant. During reunion

episodes, caregivers were instructed to interact normally with the infant again, without toys. Caregivers were always given the option to terminate the paradigm if their infant exhibited severe distress.

5.2.2 Data coding

Williams and Turner's coding scheme (Williams and Turner, 2020) was selected to study attachment from the SFP at nine months of age. Williams and Turner's coding scheme includes the Happy-Distressed (HD), Not fretful-Fretful (NFF) and Attentive-Avoidant (AA) Global Rating Scales (GRS) from Murray et al. (1996) to analyze infant behaviors during the reunion episode (Abbott, 2016, Williams and Turner, 2020). The coding scheme was applied as per the coding manual. To study attachment dimensions, raw scores of each scale were calculated as the percentage of time the infants engaged in each scale's set of behaviors during the reunion episode, offering continuous information of the HD, AA and NFF scales. To study attachment categories, attachment styles were obtained according to the published algorithm. Only the first reunion episode was coded in this study because a stronger stress response was expected during the second reunion episode (Provenzi et al., 2016). This provided a better equivalent to the reunion episode of the three-episode SFP used in other studies (Abbott, 2016, Williams and Turner, 2020).

Video coding was conducted using EUDICO Linguistic Annotator software (Wittenburg et al., 2006).

Participants were excluded based on the following criteria (see Appendix S1 for further details):

- SFP procedural violations: cases where others than the caregiver-infant dyad initiated the violation (e.g., researchers not concealed from view of the infant and caregiver, or siblings present in room) were excluded.

- Coded reunion time: coded reunion time refers to the duration of the codable time during the reunion episode (i.e. when the infant's face was visible enough to code, Williams and Turner, 2020). The available coded reunion time should be long enough to represent the infant's response to the SFP. The shortest

duration of the SFP episodes at nine months of age was 30 seconds in previous studies (Mesman et al., 2009), so cases with a lower coded reunion time were excluded.

5.2.3 Assessment of development

Infants' behavioral development was assessed by the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales Third Edition Comprehensive Interview Form Report (Sparrow et al., 2016, Dean et al., 2021b). Caregivers were interviewed by trained examiners to complete the communication, social, daily living skills and motor skills domains for all infants during the follow-up appointment at nine months of age. For each subdomain, the sum of v-scale scores were extracted and used for subsequent analyses.

5.3 Data analyses

Data analyses and plots were generated using R (version 3.2.3, (R Core Team, 2020). R packages used in this study are listed in Appendix S2.

5.3.1 Principal component analysis and clustering strategy

A data-driven approach was carried out to generate sample-specific data-driven attachment dimensions and categories for two reasons. First, Williams and Turner's algorithm imposes numeric cut-offs to assign attachment styles, but behavioral differences may be subtle around those numeric cut-offs. Second, it has been debated whether attachment styles are naturally occurring groups across different populations (Fraley and Spieker, 2003). Cluster analysis can identify new behavioral groups, maximizing similarities within each group and minimizing similarities between groups (Henry et al., 2005).

A principal component analysis (PCA) was performed to generate attachment dimensions for clustering. The selected variables included the total raw scores of Williams and Turner's coding scheme (Williams and Turner, 2020). Since disorganized attachment goes along with an increase of distress across the reunion episode, HD

raw scores for the first and second half of the reunion episode were also included. Thus, the PCA input variables were total HD, first-half HD, second-half HD, total NFF and total AA raw scores.

Agglomerative hierarchical clustering was carried out on all principal components (Coppola et al., 2016). To create more compact and even sized clusters (Szmrecsanyi, 2012), the Ward's criterion was used as linkage method and the minimized squared Euclidean distance as the distancing metric. The number of clusters with the highest relative loss of inertia was chosen. This approach involved no a priori assumption about the number of clusters to consider in the analysis, providing the maximum flexibility in determining the appropriate number of groups.

5.3.2 Statistical analyses

Distributions of attachment categories in the term and preterm groups were compared using the chi-square test. For chi-square tests, effect sizes were calculated with Cramér's V (Cramér, 2016). To analyze attachment dimensions, Shapiro-Wilk tests and F-tests were used to assess data normality and homogeneity of variances, respectively. Attachment dimensions between preterm and term infants were compared using t-tests or Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon tests for normally or non-normally distributed data, respectively. For t-tests, effect sizes were calculated with Cohen's d. For Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon tests, effect sizes were calculated with r (rank-biserial correlation, Rosenthal et al., 1994). Correlations between attachment dimensions and demographic factors or behavioral development were investigated using Pearson or Spearman's rank correlation coefficient for normally or non-normally distributed data, respectively. Since correlations were exploratory, Pearson or Spearman's rank p-values were not corrected (Armstrong, 2014) .

A post-hoc power analysis for data-driven attachment data in the given sample size was conducted. For attachment clusters (χ^2), the behavioral sample provides 90% power to detect a medium effect size (.3) at an alpha-level of .05. For attachment principal components (t-test), the behavioral sample provides 90% power to detect a medium effect size (.5) at an alpha-level of .05.

Unless otherwise specified, results are presented as mean (standard deviation, SD) for parametric data and median (range) for non-parametric data, with significance threshold set at p-value < .05.

5.3.3 Reliability analyses

LJ-S coded all videos, and LG coded 12 % of all available videos for reliability analyses (Figure 1). The main coder was blind to group (preterm vs term infants). Both researchers independently rated all of the infant behaviors on the HD, NFF, AA scales following Williams and Turner's coding manual (Williams and Turner, 2020). Two types of inter-rater reliability scores were calculated. For attachment dimensions (raw scores on the HD, NFF and AA scales), the intraclass correlation coefficient was calculated. Following Williams and Turner's coding scheme, two coders would need to agree on the absolute values of the HD, NFF, and AA raw scores to assign the same attachment style to a subject. Thus, a two-way random-effects agreement intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was calculated for each scale. For attachment categories (attachment styles), the percentage of agreement (tolerance = 0) and Cohen's Kappa were calculated.

ICC was .92 for the HD raw scores, .86 for the NFF raw scores and .81 for the AA raw scores. The percentage of agreement was 76.50 % and Cohen's kappa was .65 for attachment styles.

5.4 Data availability.

All data supporting the findings of the study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

6 Results

6.1 Baseline characteristics

One hundred and fifty five caregiver-infant dyads completed the in-person follow-up appointments at nine months, of which 145 provided codable videos and were assessed against inclusion and exclusion criteria. Seven participants were excluded due to violations initiated by others than the caregiver-infant dyad and two

participants were excluded based on their low coded reunion time, so 136 participants were included in the study (Figure 1).

Demographic characteristics of the preterm (n= 68) and term (n = 68) groups are displayed in Table 1. Mean (SD) GA for the preterm group was 29.74 (2.09) weeks, mean birthweight was 1355 (372) g and mean days in NICU were 50.97 (27.70). There were no differences in the sex distribution and ethnicity between the preterm and the term group. The preterm group had a mean SIMD rank of 4232 (1884), significantly lower when compared to the term group, which indicates higher deprivation in the preterm group (4818 (1774), W = 2780, p-value = .04).

6.2 Attachment continuous behaviours in the Still-Face Paradigm in preterm vs term infants

Raw scores of the HD, NFF and AA scales were compared between preterm and term infants. Raw scores per group are reported in Table 2. There were no significant differences in the HD raw scores (W = 2482, p-value = .46, r = .06), NFF raw scores (W = 1950, p-value = .07, r = .16) or AA raw scores (t = 1.05, p-value = .30, Cohen's d = .18) of preterm compared to term infants.

6.3 Attachment styles in preterm vs term infants

Distributions of attachment styles per group are reported in Table 2. There were no differences in the distribution of attachment styles between preterm and term infants (x^2 = 1.69, p-value = .79, Cramér's V = .18).

6.4 Attachment principal components in preterm vs term infants

To compare data-driven attachment dimensions between preterm and term infants, two principal components were retained which explained 87.25 % of the total variance. The main contributors of the first principal component (PC1) were the HD and NFF raw scores whereas the main contributor of the second principal component (PC2) was the AA raw score (Table S1).

Attachment principal component coordinates per group are reported in Table 2. There were no significant differences in the PC1 coordinates (W = 2450, p-value = .55, r = .05) or the PC2 coordinates (t = 1.83, p-value = .07, Cohen's d = .31) of preterm compared to term infants.

6.5 Attachment clusters in preterm vs term infants

Hierarchical clustering suggested three clusters as the best fit to the data (Table S2). Infants in cluster I showed higher distress (lower HD scores), especially in the second half of the reunion episode, higher fretfulness (lower NFF scores) and lower attentiveness to the caregiver (lower AA scores). Infants in cluster II were neutral during the reunion episode (medium and similar HD raw scores across the episode), showed lower fretfulness (high NFF scores) and lower attentiveness. Infants in cluster III showed lower distress during the reunion episode (higher HD raw scores across the episode), lower fretfulness and higher attentiveness to the caregiver (higher AA raw scores). To explore the correspondence between attachment styles and clusters, the frequencies of attachment styles within clusters were investigated (Table S3). There was a strong significant association between attachment styles and clusters (x^2 = 121.89, p-value < .001, Cramér's V = .67, Figure 2).

Distributions of attachment clusters per group are reported in Table 2. There were no differences in the distribution of attachment clusters between preterm and term infants (x^2 = 2.55, p-value = .28, Cramér's V = .14).

6.6 Correlations between attachment dimensions and demographic characteristics at birth

Correlations between attachment dimensions and potentially confounding factors were explored. These factors included GA as a proxy measure for individual differences in prematurity, and SIMD rank since it significantly differed between preterm and term infants (Table 1).

Lower SIMD rank correlated with higher NFF raw scores (n = 136, Spearman's rho = -0.23, p-value < .01; Figure 3, Table S4); i.e. infants from more deprived areas spent shorter time displaying fretful behaviors during the reunion episode in the SFP. There were no other significant correlations (Figure 3, Table S4).

6.7 Cross-sectional associations between attachment dimensions and behavioral development at nine months of age

Since attachment behaviors could be confounded by infant behavioral development, correlations between attachment dimensions and infants' behavioral development were explored. There was a positive correlation between motor development scores and AA raw scores (n = 120, Spearman's rho = .22, p-value = .02) and PC2 coordinates (n = 120, Spearman's rho = .24, p-value < .01; Figure 3, Table S4). In other words, infants with higher motor development scores spent longer time looking at the caregiver's face during the reunion episode in the SFP. There were no other significant correlations (Figure 3, Table S4).

7 Discussion

This study found no differences in attachment dimensions (raw scores and principal components) or in the distribution of attachment categories (attachment styles and clusters) between preterm and term infants (Table 2). GA did not correlate with any attachment dimension (Figure 3). SIMD negatively correlated with infant fretfulness (Figure 3). Motor development positively correlated with infant attentiveness to the caregiver (Figure 3).

Our results agree with other studies reporting that preterm infants are comparable in their attachment classifications to term infants from 12 months of age (Rode et al., 1981, Frodi and Thompson, 1985, Goldberg et al., 1986, Plunkett et al., 1986, Easterbrooks, 1989, Butcher et al., 1993, Brisch et al., 2005). Most studies using the Strange Situation Procedure show that approximately two thirds of preterm infants are assigned a secure attachment style from 12 months of age (Korja et al., 2012). We found a low prevalence of secure attachment style in this study using the SFP (Table 2), in line with Williams and Turner who reported similar findings in a cohort of term infants at seven months of age (Williams and Turner, 2020). Infants need to be highly attentive to the caregiver to be classified as secure, so low infant attentiveness (i.e., low AA raw scores) may account for the low prevalence of secure attachment in this study.

Our results differ from the reported higher frequencies of avoidant (Fuertes et al., 2022) and disorganized attachment style (Wolke et al., 2014), and disorganized attachment scores (Zengin Akkus et al., 2021) in preterm infants compared to term infants from 12 months of age. Since we explored attachment at nine months, our data could suggest that any impact of prematurity on attachment takes longer to manifest. Moreover, prematurity could be more likely to impact attachment when it is associated with family socioeconomic disadvantage (Fuertes et al., 2022, Wille, 1991), and the compounding effects of socioeconomic deprivation on infant attachment could also be more evident later in infancy. Additionally, more insecure resistant attachment (López-Maestro et al., 2017, Sierra-García et al., 2018) and anxious attachment scores (Zengin Akkus et al., 2021) have been found in preterm infants of GA < 32 weeks at 18 months of age, whereas only one infant was assigned a resistant attachment style in this study.

In this sample, two identified factors could have impacted infants' attachment. First, socioeconomic deprivation correlated with infants' fretfulness during the reunion episode of the SFP, suggesting infants' strategies to re-engage with caregivers after separation may vary across socioeconomic backgrounds. Second, infants' motor development correlated with infant's attentiveness to the caregiver during the reunion episode of the SFP. This is consistent with previous observations suggesting that infants' social looking behavior changes as they transition from crawling to walking: crawlers watched others communicate more, but infants would bid for social interactions more when they began to walk (Zeanah et al., 1989, Schaffer, 1966, Clearfield et al., 2008). Changes in social attention and motor skills may co-develop: motor development may motivate infants to more actively engage in social interactions, or the infant's interest in social interactions may encourage motor development (Campos et al., 2000).

7.1 Limitations, strengths and future directions

This study relied on coding behavior from video and did not include maternal measures, for instance maternal sensitivity, which has been shown to predict attachment organization only in term infants (Wolke et al., 2014). However, this work was strengthened by use of a data-driven approach to avoid predefined attention

thresholds in a cohort of preterm infants, who may present with different levels of attention maturation. Despite the inherent challenges of coding infant behavior (e.g., tracking the infant's gaze is difficult in distressed infants who cry and close their eyes for a long time), we reached good reliability between coders. We included GA to account for individual differences in prematurity and explored links between attachment and possible confounders, including demographic factors that differed between the preterm and term group and behavioral development. Caregiving practices and infant social networks can differ substantially across cultures (Schmidt et al., 2021), so future studies could explore whether these findings are generalizable to other populations.

7.2 Conclusion

In summary, the data do not reveal differences in attachment between preterm and term infants at nine months, suggesting that caregiver-infant attachment relationships are resilient to the effects of prematurity on the developing infant. The results highlight putative links between socioeconomic deprivation and infant attachment, and suggest infant attentiveness associates with motor development. The relationships between socioeconomic status and behavioral development on infant attachment in term and preterm infants warrant further study.

8 Key points and relevance

- The adverse impact of preterm birth on socioemotional outcomes might be mitigated by secure infant attachment relationships, but these could be affected by early exposure to extrauterine life.
- We used an existing categorization system and a data-driven approach on infant behaviors coded from the Still-Face Paradigm to test whether preterm birth leads to differences in infant attachment, and identified variables that may explain variance in attachment.
- The data do not reveal differences in attachment between preterm and term infants at nine months of age, suggesting that caregiver-infant attachment relationships are resilient to the effects of prematurity on the developing infant.
- Our results highlight links between socioeconomic deprivation and infant attachment, and suggest infant attentiveness may associate with motor development.

9 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

10 Funding

This research was funded, in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant No. 108890/Z/15/Z]. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

LJ-S is supported by the University of Edinburgh Wellcome Trust Translational Neuroscience 4-year PhD programme (Grant No. 108890/Z/15/Z). This work was supported by Theirworld (http://www.theirworld.org) and was carried out in the MRC Centre for Reproductive Health [MRC G1002033]. The funding sources had no role in the study design, execution, analysis, interpretation of the data, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

11 Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the families who participated in this research.

12 References

Abbott, K. (2016). *Attachment during the first year of life: Validity and longitudinal associations to 14 months, of attachment classification at 7 months*: The University of Liverpool (United Kingdom).

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Bell, S. M. & Stayton, D. J. (1972). Individual differences in the development of some attachment behaviors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development,* 18**,** 123-143.

Armstrong, R. A. (2014). When to use the B onferroni correction. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics,* 34**,** 502-508.

Barre, N., Morgan, A., Doyle, L. W. & Anderson, P. J. (2011). Language abilities in children who were very preterm and/or very low birth weight: a meta-analysis. *The Journal of pediatrics,* 158**,** 766-774. e761.

Bell, E. F., Hintz, S. R., Hansen, N. I., Bann, C. M., Wyckoff, M. H., Demauro, S. B., Walsh, M. C., Vohr, B. R., Stoll, B. J. & Carlo, W. A. (2022). Mortality, In-Hospital Morbidity, Care Practices, and 2-Year Outcomes For Extremely Preterm Infants In The US, 2013-2018. *JAMA,* 327**,** 248-263.

BOARDMAN, J. P. & COUNSELL, S. J. (2020). Invited review: factors associated with atypical brain development in preterm infants: insights from magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuropathology and applied neurobiology,* 46**,** 413-421.

Boardman, J. P., Hall, J., Thrippleton, M. J., Reynolds, R. M., Bogaert, D., Davidson, D. J., Schwarze, J., Drake, A. J., Chandran, S., Bastin, M. E. & Fletcher-Watson, S. (2020). Impact of preterm birth on brain development and long-term outcome: protocol for a cohort study in Scotland. *BMJ Open,* 10**,** E035854.

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: retrospect and prospect. *American journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 52**,** 664.

Brisch, K. H., Bechinger, D., Betzler, S., Heinemann, H., Kachele, H., Pohlandt, F., Schmucker, G. & Buchheim, A. (2005). Attachment quality in very low-birthweight premature infants in relation to maternal attachment representations and neurological development. *Parenting: Science and Practice,* 5**,** 311-331.

Burstein, O., Zevin, Z. & Geva, R. (2021). Preterm Birth and the Development of Visual Attention During the First 2 Years of Life: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA network open,* 4**,** e213687-e213687.

Butcher, P., Kalverboer, A. F., Minderaa, R. B. & Doormaal, E. V. (1993). Rigidity, sensitivity and quality of attachment: the role of maternal rigidity in the early socio-emotional development of premature infants. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica,* 375**,** 1-38.

Campos, J. J., Anderson, D. I., Barbu-Roth, M. A., Hubbard, E. M., Hertenstein, M. J. & Witherington, D. (2000). Travel broadens the mind. *Infancy,* 1**,** 149-219.

Clearfield, M. W., Osborne, C. N. & Mullen, M. (2008). Learning by looking: Infants' social looking behavior across the transition from crawling to walking. *Journal of experimental child psychology,* 100**,** 297-307.

Coppola, G., Aureli, T., Grazia, A. & Ponzetti, S. (2016). Reunion patterns in the Still-Face Paradigm as predicted by maternal sensitivity and dyadic coordination. *Infancy,* 21**,** 453-477.

Cramér, H. (2016). *Mathematical Methods of Statistics (PMS-9), Volume 9*: Princeton university press.

Dean, B., Ginnell, L., Boardman, J. P. & Fletcher-Watson, S. (2021a). Social cognition following preterm birth: a systematic review. *Neuroscience & biobehavioral reviews,* 124**,** 151-167.

Dean, B., Ginnell, L., Ledsham, V., Tsanas, A., Telford, E., Sparrow, S., Fletcher-Watson, S. & Boardman, J. P. (2021b). Eye-tracking for longitudinal assessment of social cognition in children born preterm. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* 62**,** 470-480.

Easterbrooks, M. A. (1989). Quality of attachment to mother and to father: Effects of perinatal risk status. *Child development***,** 825-830.

Emde, R. N. (1980). Emotional availability: A reciprocal reward system for infants and parents with implications for prevention of psychosocial disorders. *Parent-infant relationships,* 24**,** 125-129.

Ene, D., Der, G., Fletcher-Watson, S., O'carroll, S., Mackenzie, G., Higgins, M. & Boardman, J. P. (2019). Associations of socioeconomic deprivation and preterm birth with speech, language, and communication concerns among children aged 27 to 30 months. *JAMA network open,* 2**,** e1911027-e1911027.

Fraley, R. C. & Spieker, S. J. (2003). Are infant attachment patterns continuously or categorically distributed? A taxometric analysis of strange situation behavior. *Developmental Psychology,* 39**,** 387.

Frodi, A. & Thompson, R. (1985). Infants' affective responses in the strange situation: Effects of prematurity and of quality of attachment. *Child development,* 56**,** 1280-1290.

Fuertes, M., L. Gonçalves, J., Barbosa, M., Almeida, R., Lopes-Dos-Santos, P. & Beeghly, M. (2022). A self-comfort oriented pattern of regulatory behavior and avoidant attachment are more likely among infants born moderate-to-late preterm. *Infancy,* 27**,** 159-180.

Ginnell, L., Boardman, J. P., Reynolds, R. M. & Fletcher-Watson, S. (2021). Attention profiles following preterm birth: A review of methods and findings from infancy to adulthood. *Infant and Child Development,* 30**,** e2255.

Goldberg, S., Perrotta, M., Minde, K. & Corter, C. (1986). Maternal behavior and attachment in low-birth-weight twins and singletons. *Child development,* 57**,** 34-46.

Groh, A. M., Fearon, R. P., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Steele, R. D. & Roisman, G. I. (2014). The significance of attachment security for children's social competence with peers: A meta-analytic study. *Attachment & human development,* 16**,** 103-136.

Haley, D. W. & Stansbury, K. (2003). Infant stress and parent responsiveness: Regulation of physiology and behavior during still-face and reunion. *Child development,* 74**,** 1534-1546.

Henry, D. B., Tolan, P. H. & Gorman-Smith, D. (2005). Cluster analysis in family psychology research. *Journal of Family Psychology,* 19**,** 121.

Korja, R., Latva, R. & Lehtonen, L. (2012). The effects of preterm birth on mother–infant interaction and attachment during the infant's first two years. *Acta obstetricia et gynecologica Scandinavica,* 91**,** 164-173.

López-Maestro, M., Sierra-Garcia, P., Diaz-Gonzalez, C., Torres-Valdivieso, M. J., Lora-Pablos, D., Ares-Segura, S. & Pallás-Alonso, C. R. (2017). Quality of attachment in infants less than 1500 g or less than 32 weeks. Related factors. *Early Human Development,* 104**,** 1-6.

Main, M. & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research, and intervention,* 1**,** 121-160.

Mesman, J., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2009). The many faces of the Still-Face Paradigm: A review and meta-analysis. *Developmental Review,* 29**,** 120-162.

Murray, L., Fiori-Cowley, A., Hooper, R. & Cooper, P. (1996). The impact of postnatal depression and associated adversity on early mother-infant interactions and later infant outcome. *Child development,* 67**,** 2512-2526.

Plunkett, J. W., Meisels, S. J., Stiefel, G. S., Pasick, P. L. & Roloff, D. W. (1986). Patterns of attachment among preterm infants of varying biological risk. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry,* 25**,** 794-800.

Provenzi, L., Giusti, L. & Montirosso, R. (2016). Do infants exhibit significant cortisol reactivity to the Face-to-Face Still-Face paradigm? A narrative review and meta-analysis. *Developmental Review,* 42**,** 34-55.

R Core Team (2020). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Rode, S. S., Chang, P.-N., Fisch, R. O. & Sroufe, L. A. (1981). Attachment patterns of infants separated at birth. *Developmental Psychology,* 17**,** 188.

Rosenthal, R., Cooper, H. & Hedges, L. (1994). Parametric measures of effect size. *The handbook of research synthesis,* 621**,** 231-244.

Schaffer, H. (1966). The onset of fear of strangers and the incongruity hypothesis. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* 7**,** 95-106.

Schmidt, W. J., Keller, H. & Rosabal Coto, M. (2021). Development in context: What we need to know to assess children's attachment relationships. *Developmental Psychology,* 57**,** 2206.

Scottish Government (2016). Scottish index of multiple deprivation.

Sierra-García, P., López-Maestro, M., Torres-Valdivieso, M. J., Díaz-González, C., Carrasco, M., Ares-Segura, S., De Blas, G. D. & Pallás-Alonso, C. (2018). Developmental outcomes, attachment and parenting: Study of a sample of Spanish premature children. *The Spanish journal of psychology,* 21**,** E20.

Sparrow, S., Cicchetti, D. & Saulnier, C. (2016). Vineland adaptive behavior scales–third edition (Vineland-3). *Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service*.

Spruit, A., Goos, L., Weenink, N., Rodenburg, R., Niemeyer, H., Stams, G. J. & Colonnesi, C. (2020). The relation between attachment and depression in children and adolescents: A multilevel meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review,* 23**,** 54-69.

Szmrecsanyi, B. (2012). *Grammatical variation in British English dialects: A study in corpus-based dialectometry*. Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, R. A. (2008). Early attachment and later development: Familiar questions, new answers. In J. CASSIDY & P. R. SHAVER (Eds.) *Handbook of attachment.* Guilford.

Tronick, E., Als, H., Adamson, L., Wise, S. & Brazelton, T. B. (1978). The infant's response to entrapment between contradictory messages in face-to-face interaction. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry,* 17**,** 1-13.

Wille, D. E. (1991). Relation of preterm birth with quality of infant—mother attachment at one year. *Infant Behavior and Development,* 14**,** 227-240.

Williams, L. R. & Turner, P. R. (2020). Infant carrying as a tool to promote secure attachments in young mothers: Comparing intervention and control infants during the still-face paradigm. *Infant Behavior and Development,* 58**,** 101413.

Wittenburg, P., Brugman, H., Russel, A., Klassmann, A. & Sloetjes, H. (2006). ELAN: A professional framework for multimodality research. *5th international conference on language resources and evaluation (LREC 2006).* (pp. 1556-1559).

Wolke, D., Eryigit-Madzwamuse, S. & Gutbrod, T. (2014). Very preterm/very low birthweight infants' attachment: infant and maternal characteristics. *Archives of Disease in Childhood-Fetal and Neonatal Edition,* 99**,** F70-F75.

Zeanah, C. H., Anders, T. F., Seifer, R. & Stern, D. N. (1989). Implications of research on infant development for psychodynamic theory and practice. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry,* 28**,** 657-668.

Zengin Akkus, P., Bahtiyar Saygan, B., Ilter Bahadur, E., Ozdemir, G., Celik, H. & Ozmert, E. (2021). Longitudinal changes in attachment patterns of preterm infants born in a non-Western country. *Infant Mental Health Journal,* 42**,** 517-528.

13 Tables

Table 1 . Demographic characteristics by group.

	Still-face sample (n = 136)			
	Preterm (n = 68)	Term (n = 68)	Mean comparison	
			Test	p-value
Gestational age at birth / weeks, median (range)	30^{+0} (22^{+1}-32^{+6})	39^{+5} (36^{+3}-42^{+1})	W = 4624	< .001
Birthweight / grams, mean (SD)	1355 (372)	3521 (465)	t = 30.01	< .001
Days in NICU, mean (SD)	60.97 (27.20)	–	–	–
Age at testing / months, median (range)[a]	9.07 (7.97 – 21.77)	9.07 (7.97 – 10.00)	W = 2204	.64
Ponderal Index at testing, median (range)[b]	2.89 (2.64 – 6.09)	2.90 (2.55 – 3.22)	W = 2521	.22
Sex M:F	43:25	38:30	x^2 = .49	.49
Ethnicity (%)[b]				
• Mixed	2.94	1.47	x^2 = 2.31	.68
• Pakistani	1.47	-		
• White	89.71	91.18		
• White and Asian	2.94	2.94		
• White and Black African	-	1.47		
SIMD ranking, median (range)	4513 (137 – 6929)	5269 (727 – 6937)	W = 2780	.04

SD = Standard Deviation; SIMD = Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2016; [a]corrected age for preterm group; [b]missing data: ponderal index at testing data was not available for 1.46 % (n = 2) of the Still-Face sample (n = 1 preterm and n = 1 term infants), ethnicity data was not available for 2.94 % (n = 4) of the Still-Face sample (n = 1 preterm and n = 3 term infants), thus, ethnicity percentages do not add up to 100 %.

Table 2. Attachment dimensions and categories in preterm and term infants.

			Still-face sample (n = 136)		Comparison		
			Preterm (n = 68)	Term (n = 68)	Test	p-value	Effect size estimate
Existing categorization	Attachment continuous behaviors	HD raw score, median (range)	.54 (.3 – .88)	.56 (0 – .95)	W = 2482	.46	r = .06
		NFF raw score, median (range)	1 (.49 – 1)	1 (.23 – 1)	W = 1950	.07	r = .16
		AA raw score, mean (SD)	.29 (.18)	.32 (.19)	t = 1.05	.30	Cohen's d = .18
		Secure, n (%)	17 (25)	21 (30.88)			
		Avoidant, n (%)	32 (47.06)	30 (44.12)			
		Resistant, n (%)	1 (1.47)	0 (0)	x^2 = 1.69	.79	Cramér's V = .11
		Disorganized, n (%)	15 (22.06)	15 (22.06)			
		Unscorable, n (%)	3 (4.41)	2 (2.94)			
Principal component analysis and clustering	Attachment principal component coordinates	PC1, median (range)	.06 (-4.09 – 2.54)	.33 (-5.40 – 3.48)	W = 2450	.55	r = .05
		PC2, mean (SD)	- .15 (0.91)	.15 (0.95)	t = 1.83	.07	Cohen's d = .31
		I, n (%)	6 (8.82)	12 (17.65)			
		II, n (%)	36 (52.94)	30 (44.12)	x^2 = 2.55	.28	Cramér's V = .14
		III, n (%)	26 (38.24)	26 (38.23)			

AA = Attentive-Avoidant scale; HD = Happy-Distressed scale; NFF = Not fretful-Fretful scale; PC1 = first principal component; PC2 = second principal component; SD = standard deviation.

14 Figures

Figure 1. Study sample inclusion and exclusion flowchart.



Figure 2. Factor map of attachment styles within attachment clusters.



Contributions of the first (PC1) and second (PC2) principal components to the total variance are shown in brackets on the X and Y axes. Each point represents one infant (n = 136), color and shape indicate the assigned attachment style and prematurity of the infant, respectively. Shaded areas denote attachment clusters. See Table 2 and Table S3 for further details.

Figure 3. Heatmap showing correlations between attachment dimensions and demographic factors or behavioral development.



Participants with missing data were excluded to perform a complete-case analysis (n = 136 for gestational age and SIMD data, n = 120 for VABS social, communication and motor subdomain, n = 119 for VABS daily living skills). Color indicates Spearman's rho for each condition. PC1 = first principal component; PC2 = second principal component; VABS = Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (sum of v-scale scores per subdomain). See Table S4 for further details.