

1 Epistemic Trust, Mistrust and Credulity Questionnaire (ETMCQ) validation
2 in French language: Investigating association with loneliness

3
4 Christian Greiner^{1¶}, Vincent Besch^{1,2¶}, Marissa Bouchard-Boivin^{1,3}, Catherine Le Hénaff¹,
5 Cécilia Von Rohr-De Pree¹, Nader Perroud^{1,4}, Paco Prada^{1,4&}, Martin Debbané^{2&}

6
7 ¹ Department of Psychiatry, Geneva University Hospital, Geneva, Switzerland

8 ² Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science, Geneva University, Geneva, Switzerland

9 ³ Montreal Mental Health University Institute, Montreal, Canada

10 ⁴ Faculty of Medicine, Geneva University, Geneva, Switzerland

11
12 * Corresponding author

13 E-mail: christian.greiner@hug.ch (CG)

14
15 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

16 & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

28 **Abstract**

29 The concept of epistemic trust is gaining traction in the mental health field. It is thought to play
30 a foundational role as a resilience factor against the development and maintenance of
31 psychopathology by facilitating social learnings useful to navigate in the modern world. The
32 primary aim of this study is to validate in French language the Epistemic Trust, Mistrust, and
33 Credulity Questionnaire (ETMCQ). We further investigate associations with key developmental
34 and psychological factors (childhood trauma, mentalizing and attachment), besides possible
35 mediating roles between childhood traumatic experiences and psychopathology and between
36 loneliness and psychopathology. 302 participants were recruited for analysis via the online
37 survey platform Prolific. Along with ETMCQ, measures of CTQ-SF, RFQ-8, ECR-R, UCLA-LS
38 and SCL-90-R were administered. Confirmatory Factor Analysis and General Linear Model of
39 Mediation were conducted. Our study shows that the ETMCQ represents a valid instrument to
40 assess epistemic trust. We find an adequate replication of the original three-factor solution in
41 a francophone population with a 12-item version, exhibiting satisfactory psychometric
42 properties and external validity. We replicate previous findings that demonstrated epistemic
43 trust's attachment style related differences, as well as the mediating effect between childhood
44 traumatic experiences and psychopathology. We also observed that epistemic trust mediates
45 the well-described association between loneliness and psychopathology. We add momentum
46 to the framework that considers epistemic trust as key underlying contributor to the
47 maintenance or alleviation of psychopathology. Future research should investigate the
48 ETMCQ in clinical population, where psychopathological expressions are severe, enduring and
49 connected, and where identifying potential intercessors could help target and improve
50 interventions.

51

52 **Introduction**

53 In the past decade, the field of mental health appears to be increasingly focusing on social-
54 cognitive abilities enabling individuals to form, maintain, lean on, and learn from interpersonal
55 relationships and social networks [1]. The work of Fonagy and colleagues on the relationship
56 between attachment, mentalizing and trust propose to re-examine the links between early
57 adversity and the expression of psychopathology over the lifespan [2–5]. Building on a broad
58 range of disciplines such as evolutionary anthropology [6], philosophy [7,8] and epistemology
59 [9], but also on developmental psychology [10] and attachment research [11,12], Fonagy and
60 colleagues propose an integrative theoretical model in which early adversity in attachment
61 relationships, impaired mentalizing and psychopathology are developmentally interwoven
62 through difficulties in attributing trust to a key sources of social information, that is, to attribute
63 epistemic trust. This misattribution ultimately limits social learning and consequently interferes
64 with adaptation and resilience. They define epistemic trust as “the capacity of the individual to
65 consider knowledge conveyed by others as significant, relevant to the self, and generalizable
66 to other contexts” [13]. They hypothesize that early adversity impacts the development of social
67 communicative abilities, conferring patterns of mistrust and/or credulity, first to attachment
68 figures [14], and then to other significant people in the individual’s social environment,
69 preventing the individual to learn to adaptively navigate and learn from different social contexts
70 [15,16]. The concept of epistemic trust does not just concern an open stance to trust any given
71 information or general trust, but rather a more complex process that depends on the
72 individual’s ability to consider the reliability of the source of information, the information’s
73 relevance to the addresses, and the quality of the information in a calibrated fashion [16].

74 In order to empirically examine the epistemic trust theoretical framework, Campbell et al. [13]
75 operationalize the concept through three possibly linked dimensions embodied within social
76 communication: Epistemic Trust (ET), Epistemic Mistrust (EM) and Epistemic Credulity (EC).
77 ET is characterized by selective and balanced receptivity to social learning opportunities within
78 relationships, and the capacity to maintain confidence in the reliability and value of information
79 from others. EM is defined as perceiving a source of information as untrustworthy, leading to
80 individuals’ tendency to remain impermeable to the influence of others’ communication. EC

81 entails decreased vigilance and discrimination vis-a-vis social signals, making the individual
82 prone to misinformation and exploitation [17]. EM and EC are often sustained by patterns of
83 inefficient mentalizing characterized by all or nothing views on mental states of self and others
84 (psychic equivalence), concrete thinking (teleological mode) or decoupling between emotional
85 needs and emotion expression (pretend mode). Campbell et al. [13] introduced the first self-
86 report scale (15 items) to assess epistemic trust, the Epistemic Trust, Mistrust and Credulity
87 Questionnaire (ETMCQ). Their results offer evidence for a three-factor structure, empirically
88 substantiating the hypothesis of three distinct epistemic stances. The questionnaire yields
89 good reliability and validity indices, and significant associations between both EM and EC and
90 higher levels of childhood adversity, low mentalizing abilities, as well as insecure attachment
91 and expressions of psychopathology. Post-hoc analysis identified that different attachment
92 styles were associated with differences in epistemic stances. Both EM and EC partially
93 mediated the link between early adversity and expression of psychopathology. To our
94 knowledge, two ETMCQ translation and replication studies were conducted to date. Liotti et al.
95 [18] translated and validated the scale into Italian, and Asgarizadeh et al. [19] into Persian.
96 Both provide evidence for the instrument's cross-cultural applicability, by reporting a three-
97 factor structure similar to the model proposed in the original validation with slight differences
98 on item loadings and total item number. Other studies which employ the ETMCQ with
99 convergent psychological variables in large and representative populations or clinical samples
100 convey further evidence supporting key assumptions regarding the relations of dysfunctional
101 epistemic stances with adverse childhood experiences, insecure attachment, poor
102 mentalization and psychopathology [17,20–23,18,24–27].

103 Within this framework, epistemic trust is thought to play a foundational role as a resilience
104 factor against the development and maintenance of psychopathology, through its salutogenic
105 effect in sustaining adaptive social learning. It could accordingly act as a proxy for a general
106 psychopathology factor [4], or as a mediating “psychomarker” predicting outcomes of
107 psychosocial interventions, not limited to psychotherapeutic treatment but to any intervention
108 that depends on trust in others [28]. Currently, the interplay between attachment, childhood

109 traumatic experiences and later outcomes remain difficult to grasp [29,30]. Whilst most clinical
110 researchers and practitioners are familiar with attachment-related differences, the exact
111 mechanisms linking to developmental psychopathology remain enigmatic [31–33]. If
112 attachment-related differences reflect broader differences in establishing trust in
113 communication - as John Bowlby had intuited [35] - rather than exclusively strategies for
114 managing threats, their association with lifespan evolutions could become more intelligible
115 [35–37]. There is strong evidence of an association between childhood trauma and
116 unfavorable later-life consequences [38–40], where epistemic trust appears to significantly
117 mediate the effect between early adversity and mentalizing abilities [17] as well as with
118 psychopathology [13]. Other results are however mixed [41] and require further studies to
119 inform the complex paths between early disruptive experiences and mental health difficulties.
120 Research on well-being, both psychological and social, is gaining traction as a body of scientific
121 literature putting emphasis on “living well” as opposed to the more conventional health-
122 centered view of “getting rid of illness” [42]. It joins a broader movement encompassing
123 recovery and salutogenesis, a path also thread by the mentalization research field [4,43].
124 Loneliness, a concept with a lengthy research record, is consequently reappraised as a key
125 social factor playing against well-being , in a transdiagnostic fashion [44]. Described as
126 “gnawing chronic disease without redeeming features” [45], it emerges as a serious global
127 health concern, as it is a risk factor for a myriad of both physical and mental health conditions,
128 rivaling well-established morbidity risk factors such as physical inactivity, smoking and obesity
129 [46]. Interestingly, loneliness’ chief model of understanding advanced by Cacioppo and
130 colleagues shows thought-provoking similarity with the epistemic trust construct, particularly
131 “epistemic petrification”, an expression seeking to translate how the traumatic valence of early
132 adversity resides in the solitude it entails when facing threat, when early adversity tends to
133 convey the lesson that vigilance and impermeability to others’ influence may be the most
134 adaptive way to navigate a dangerous social world [3]. In a similar vein, but from a cognitive
135 behavioral standpoint, Cacioppo et al. theorize a self-reinforcing loop which would sustain the
136 formation and maintenance of chronic loneliness [47]. They propose that loneliness can

137 increase hypervigilance and cognitive biases towards social threat, leading lonely individuals
138 to anticipate negative social interactions and remember more negative social information. As
139 a result, lonely individuals may exhibit hostile or pessimistic behaviors which elicit exactly the
140 unwanted responses from others that confirm their negative expectations. This loop has short-
141 term self-protective features but over the long-term, overall consequence is that a negative
142 self-image is established, along with a desire to avoid social contact, resulting in chronic
143 feelings of loneliness [48]. Thus, besides being well suited for studying links between
144 attachment, adversity and later psychopathology, the epistemic trust framework appears to
145 lend itself very well to the inquiry of loneliness. Specifically, disentangling the question of
146 causality and reciprocal influences [49,50] in the already firmly established link between
147 loneliness and psychopathology [51] could be further investigated if were to hypothesize that
148 epistemic trust stances play a mediating partition in these complex developmental
149 transactions.

150

151 **Aims and Hypotheses**

152 The first objective of the present study is to validate the ETMCQ in French language to provide
153 a valid tool to francophone clinical and research settings. We expect to confirm a three-factor
154 structure, referring respectively to the degree of trust, mistrust and credulity. Furthermore, we
155 suppose that this three-factor structure will have satisfactory internal consistency and be
156 invariant across time (1-year). We also anticipate that the ETMCQ scores converge with key
157 developmental variables (levels of childhood traumatic experiences, attachment styles) and
158 psychological processes (mentalization abilities), as theoretically proposed and empirically
159 tested in previous studies.

160 Second, we seek to replicate Campbell et al. [13] main findings, expecting to observe that the
161 ETMCQ subscales differ according to distinctive attachment dimensions and styles. We further
162 expect the ETMCQ subscales to significantly mediate the association between childhood
163 traumatic experiences and psychopathology.

164 Third, in line with the theory put forward by Fonagy and Allison [2], we investigate the potential
165 association between epistemic trust and loneliness. We expect to find that the ETMCQ
166 subscales significantly mediates the association between loneliness and the individual
167 expression of psychopathology.

168

169 **Methods**

170 **Participants**

171 In this study, 372 participants were recruited via the online survey platform Prolific
172 (<https://www.prolific.com/>). The inclusion criteria were to be 18 years of age or older, to be
173 fluent in French, and to have never been hospitalized for psychiatric reasons. Participants
174 received a financial compensation of 6.00 CHF for each test session, with a +25% bonus for
175 the 1-year retest. In order to ensure the quality of the data they provided, several additional
176 selection criteria were applied. First, the need for participants to have satisfactorily submitted
177 at least 15 online surveys beforehand to ensure a good level of use of the online platform and
178 reduce data entry errors. Then, nonsensical items were randomly inserted in the survey and
179 response times were monitored in order to check for participants' linguistic skills and attention.
180 70 participants failed these controls and were rejected. The final sample used for analyses
181 included N=302 participants. All participants filled-in socio-demographic data and completed
182 the initial set of 15 items of the ETMCQ and additional validity questionnaires. Recruitment
183 period started April 21st, 2022, and ended January 19th, 2024. The study was approved by the
184 Swiss Ethics Commission in Geneva under Project-id 2021-01100. Participants were
185 submitted a written consent form approved by the Commission. According to its requirements,
186 participants gave written consent on their involvement in the study and the use of their data for
187 analysis and publication.

188

189 **Additional Measures**

190 Childhood Trauma Questionnaire - Short Form (CTQ-SF) [52]: a 28-item self-report instrument
191 validated for clinical and non-clinical populations. The questionnaire evaluates the presence
192 and severity of five types of childhood traumatic experiences: Physical Abuse, Emotional
193 Abuse, Sexual Abuse, Emotional Neglect and Physical Neglect. Individuals are asked on a 5-
194 point Likert scale to indicate how often they suffered specific traumatic childhood experiences.
195 The French validation of the instrument demonstrated that the five types of traumatic childhood
196 experiences are valid and usable with French-speaking populations [53].

197 Reflective Function Questionnaire (RFQ-8) [54]: an 8-item self-report instrument to evaluate
198 mentalization abilities by the degree of certainty and uncertainty with which individuals utilize
199 mental state information to understand their own and other's behaviour. It asks subjects to
200 express their agreement with each item on a 7-point Likert scale. The uncertainty about mental
201 states subscale (RFQ-u) captures poor use of mental state information and a stance
202 characterized by a lack of knowledge about mental states. The certainty about mental states
203 subscale (RFQ-c) captures better use of mental states information and adaptative levels of
204 certainty about mental states. The French validation of the instrument demonstrated
205 satisfactory reliability and construct validity of the two subscales [55].

206 Experience in Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R) [56]: a 36-item questionnaire of
207 adult attachment style. The instrument, rated on a 7-point Likert scale, comprises two
208 subscales measuring two attachment dimensions: anxiety (intense concern for relationships,
209 fear of abandonment) and avoidance (feelings of discomfort in establishing emotional
210 closeness with the partner, difficulty in trusting others). Four attachment styles can be defined
211 according to individuals' anxiety and avoidance scores [57,58]: "Secure" attachment style is
212 associated with low scores on both anxiety and avoidance, "Fearful" is associated with high
213 scores on both anxiety and avoidance, "Preoccupied" with high anxiety and low avoidance,
214 and "Dismissing" with high avoidance and low anxiety. The French validation of the
215 questionnaire has good reliability and validity and is consistent with its theoretical model of
216 attachment dimensions [59,57,60].

217 University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale [UCLA-LS] [61]: a 20-item scale
218 designed to measure one's subjective feeling of loneliness and of social isolation on a 4-point
219 Likert scale. Conceptualized as unidimensional in its structure, the scale items tap both the
220 frequency and intensity of salient aspects and events of the lonely experience (e.g. How often
221 do you feel alone ?). Evaluation of the scale found high internal consistency and good validity
222 [62]. It is the most commonly used self-report loneliness instrument: a meta-analysis looking
223 at 149 studies found that the UCLA scale was used in 27% of the studies, far more than for
224 any other formal scale [62,63]. The French validation of the instrument demonstrated good
225 internal consistency and construct validity [64].

226 Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R) [65]: a 90-item instrument that evaluate a broad
227 range of psychological problems and symptoms of psychopathology. On a 5-point Likert scale,
228 it yields nine scores along primary symptom dimensions (somatization, obsessive-compulsive,
229 interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation,
230 psychoticism) and three scores among global distress indices (global severity index - GSI,
231 hardiness, symptom free). The French validation of the instrument demonstrated satisfactory
232 reliability and validity of the French version of the SCL-90-R [66].

233

234 **Data analyses**

235 We started the validation process of the French ETMCQ version with the translation of the
236 original English ETMCQ by independent French and English Natives speakers (S1 File.
237 ETMCQ items in French), following a forward-backward-forward procedure [67]. We conducted
238 a Confirmatory Factor Analysis for the proposed three-factor model. The goodness-of-fit
239 indices employed where: Chi-Square; the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index
240 (TLI), the Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR), the Root Square Error of Approximation
241 (RMSEA). To achieve a good fit of data, the values of CFI and TLI should be above .90 for an
242 acceptable fit and above .95 for a good fit, the SRMR and the RMSEA should be under .08 for
243 a, acceptable fit and under .05 for a good fit [68,69]. The internal coherence of the obtained

244 subscales was estimated by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which are deemed
245 acceptable above .7. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) were calculated for the 3 ETMCQ
246 subscales to control for reliability. ICC above 0.74 was considered good, and between 0.60
247 and 0.74 acceptable [70]. Temporal stability was estimated using test-retest correlations after
248 a one-year interval. Test-retest correlations above .7 were considered strong, above .6 good,
249 and above .5 acceptable [71,72]. Construct validity was established by examining Spearman's
250 correlations between the ETMCQ subscales and 4 related constructs used in the original study
251 [13]: childhood traumatic experiences (CTQ-SF), mentalization abilities (RFQ-8), attachment
252 style (ECR-R). Additionally, correlation of the ETMCQ subscales with loneliness (UCLA-LS)
253 and psychopathology (SCL-90-R) were also examined. Nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test
254 for two independent groups evaluated difference in the ETMCQ subscale according to gender.
255 One-way ANOVAs (Welch's) and Dwass-Steel-Crichlow-Fligner pairwise comparisons were
256 conducted to assess differences in ETMCQ subscales between the distinctive attachment
257 styles as itemized by the ECR-R construct ("Secure", "Fearful", "Preoccupied" and
258 "Dismissing") [59], after a median split between of the ECR-R Avoidant and Anxious
259 dimensions was done. A General Linear Model of Mediation evaluated the ETMCQ subscales
260 mediation between childhood traumatic experiences (CTQ-SF total score) and
261 psychopathology (SCL-90-R GSI), once considering first correlation between traumatic
262 childhood experience and psychopathology. Another General Linear Model of Mediation
263 evaluated the ETMCQ subscales mediation between loneliness (UCLA-LS) and
264 psychopathology (SCL-90-R GSI), after considering correlation between loneliness and
265 psychopathology. All p values were adjusted with Bonferroni corrections. All statistical analysis
266 were performed using Jamovi Desktop 2.3.28.

267

268 **Results**

269 **Demographic data**

270 Our sample consists of 161 women (53.3 %) and 141 men (46.7 %). Mean age was 37.1
271 (standard deviation 12.3), with women mean age 37.3 (standard deviation 13.6) and men mean
272 age 36.8 (standard deviation 10.7). Mean SCL-90-R GSI was .71 which is in line to what is
273 found in general population [73–75]. Mean CTQ-SF total score was 42.5 corresponding to
274 previous findings in non-clinical population [53,76].

275

276 **Factor structure, internal consistency and reliability**

277 Table 1 gives the results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The initial 15-item 3-factor
278 model did not provide good fit to the data (CFI .775; TLI .728; SMRR .0903; RMSEA .0984).
279 Following the procedure of Campbell et al. [13], we removed in each ETMCQ subscale the
280 item with the lowest loading (item 1 for EM: “I usually ask people for advice when I have a
281 personal problem.”; item 3 for EM: “I’d prefer to find things out for myself on the internet rather
282 than asking people for information.”; and item 6 for EC: “When I speak to different people, I
283 find myself easily persuaded by what they say even if this is different from what I believed
284 before.”). Goodness of fit was improved although not acceptable (CFI .815; TLI .760; SRMR
285 .0666; RMSEA .0961). Next we correlated the residuals between several items, which gave
286 satisfactory goodness of fit (CFI .954; TLI .935; SRMR .0480; RMSEA .0501). We allowed four
287 Correlated Errors (CE) terms (or disturbances). While taking into account the problem of using
288 CE in CFA framework [77], we based the choice of computing certain CE upon theoretical
289 arguments (i.e. measurement model provided by the authors of the original instrument which
290 includes CE terms with similar item content or wording: items 7&8, 5&12) and statistical ones
291 (i.e. high modification indices and large standardized residuals in Jamovi: items 11&15,
292 13&14). Internal consistency was acceptable, with Cronbach’s alpha for the entire scale at
293 .701, and for each ETMCQ subscale as follows: Trust .710; Mistrust .690; Credulity .742.

294

295 **Table 1. Goodness-of-Fit measures.**

Model	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA
-------	-----	-----	------	-------

3-factor, 15 items	.775	.728	.0903	.0984 (.09 - .10)
3-factor, 12 items	.815	.760	.0666	.0961 (.08 - .11)
3-factor, 12 items, CR	.954	.935	.0480	.0501 (.03 - .07)

296 CRs = Correlated residuals; CFI = Comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR =
 297 Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation.

298
 299 Mean ETMCQ subscale scores were the following: ET $M = 4.81$ ($SD = 1.10$); EM $M = 3.76$ (SD
 300 $= 1.09$); EC $M = 2.54$ ($SD = 1.16$). A nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test for two independent
 301 groups revealed that women and men differed on both ET and EC subscales, with women
 302 showing higher scores on both subscales (ET: women $M = 4.79$, $SD = 1.08$; men $M = 4.45$,
 303 $SD = 1.1$, $p < .01$; EC women $M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.18$; men $M = 2.35$, $SD = .96$, $p < .01$). Shapiro-
 304 Wilk test shown non-parametric distribution for ET ($p < .001$) and EC ($p < 0.01$). EM was close
 305 to a normal distribution ($p = .05$). When examining Spearman correlation coefficients between
 306 the ETMCQ subscales and age, we found a significantly negative correlation between age and
 307 EM ($r = -.253$, $p < .001$) and between age and ET ($r = -.147$, $p < .05$). All items load significantly
 308 ($p < .001$) and substantially (above .3) to their respective factors (Fig 1). EM and EC were
 309 significantly correlated ($r = .339$, $p < .001$), as were ET and EC ($r = .170$, $p < .05$). ET and EM
 310 were not significantly correlated (Fig 1).

311
 312 **Fig 1. CFA with factor loadings (12 items).** Loadings are standardized. Rectangles indicate
 313 measured variables and circles represent latent constructs. Note the item numbering is
 314 retained from the original Campbell study 15-item scale. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

315
 316 All 302 participants were recontacted after a one-year interval, 257 took the retest (85.1% of
 317 the original sample). Between individuals who took the retest and those who did not, there was
 318 no significant differences in age (Mann-Whitney U = 5760.0, $p = .97$), gender ($X^2(1) = 1.69$, p
 319 $= .19$), GSI (Mann-Whitney U = 5261.0, $p = .33$) nor in the ETMCQ scores (ET Mann-Whitney
 320 U = 5079.5, $p = .19$, EM Mann-Whitney U = 5459.0, $p = .55$, EC Mann-Whitney U = 5144.0, p
 321 $= .24$). The test-retest reliability was moderate to good, with Spearman $r_s = .500$ ($p < .001$),

322 .600 ($p < .001$) and .678 for ET, EM and EC, respectively. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients
323 (ICC) estimates and their 95% confident intervals were calculated based on average-rating (k
324 = 257), absolute-agreement, 2-way random-effects mode [78,79]. ICC were acceptable to
325 good: ET = .706 (95% CI (.62-.77)); EM = .733 (95% CI (.58-.82)) and EC = .781 (95% CI (.71-
326 .83)).

327

328 **Construct validity**

329 Significant correlations between the ETMCQ subscales and related developmental,
330 psychological and psychopathology scales are given in Table 2.

331 Regarding childhood traumatic experiences as assessed in the CTQ-SF, EM was positively
332 correlated with Physical Abuse ($r = .194, p = < .05$), Sexual Abuse ($r = .184, p = < .05$),
333 Emotional Abuse ($r = .289, p = < .001$), Physical Negligence ($r = .183, p = < .05$) and Emotional
334 Negligence ($r = .270, p = < .001$); EC was positively correlated with Emotional Abuse ($r = .305,$
335 $p = < .001$); ET was not significantly correlated to any CTQ-SF subscale. EM was positively
336 correlated to CTQ-SF total score ($r = .300, p = < .001$), as was EC ($r = .257, p = < .001$).

337 With regard to mentalizing abilities operationalized through the RFQ-8, EM was negatively
338 correlated with the certitude subscale ($r = -.324, p < .001$) and positively with the incertitude
339 subscale ($r = .280, p < .001$); EC was negatively correlated with the certitude subscale ($r = -$
340 $.496, p < .001$) and positively with the incertitude subscale ($r = .248, p < .001$). ET was not
341 significantly correlated to RFQ subscales.

342 Concerning attachment dimensions as reflected in the ECR-R scale, ET was negatively
343 correlated with the avoidance dimension ($r = -.342, p < .001$); EM was positively correlated
344 with the avoidance ($r = .259, p < .001$) and anxious dimension ($r = .328, p < .001$); EC was
345 positively correlated with the anxious dimension ($r = .430, p < .001$).

346 With respect of psychopathology as itemized in the SCL-90-R instrument, EM was positively
347 correlated with the GSI ($r = .396, p < .001$); EC was positively correlated with the GSI ($r = .462,$
348 $p < .001$); ET was not significantly correlated with psychopathology. Note that when looking to

349 the primary symptom dimensions, particularly strong and significant were the correlation
 350 between EM and paranoid ideation ($r = .454, p < .10^{-16}$), as well as EC and interpersonal
 351 sensitivity ($r = .464, p < .10^{-16}$), whereas ET was not significantly correlated with any of them.
 352 Regarding loneliness as operationalized in the UCLA-LS, loneliness score was negatively
 353 correlated with ET ($r = -.207, p < .01$); positively correlated with EM ($r = .397, p < .001$); and
 354 positively correlated with EC ($r = .231, p < .01$)

355

356 **Table 2. Spearman correlations between the ETMCQ subscales and convergent scales.**

	ET	EM	EC
Childhood traumas (CTQ-SF)			
Physical abuse	-.019	.194*	.136
Sexual abuse	.007	.184*	.144
Emotional abuse	.001	.289***	.305***
Physical neglect	-.093	.183*	.152
Emotional neglect	-.123	.270***	.153
Total score	-.067	.300***	.257***
Mentalization (RFQ-8)			
RFQ certitude	-.126	-.324***	-.496***
RFQ incertitude	.161	.280***	.248***
Attachment (ECR-R)			
Avoidant dimension	-.342***	.259***	.104
Anxious dimension	-.001	.328***	.430***
Loneliness (UCLA-LS)			
UCLA-LS sum	-.207**	.397***	.231**
Psychopathology (SCL-90-R)			
Global Severity Index	.118	.396***	.462***

357 P values adjusted for Bonferroni correction * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

358

359 ETMCQ and attachment

360 We assessed differences in the ETMCQ subscales between the distinctive attachment styles
 361 (“Secure”, “Fearful”, “Preoccupied” and “Dismissing”) [59]. A median split between of the ECR-
 362 R Avoidant and Anxious dimensions was done (median Avoidant = 74; median Anxious = 23),
 363 resulting in 101 participants being coded as having “Secure” attachment style (low avoidance

364 and low anxiety), 103 “Fearful” (high avoidance, high anxiety), 51 “Preoccupied” (low
365 avoidance, high anxiety), and 46 “Dismissing” (high avoidance, low anxiety). One-way
366 ANOVAs (Welch’s) were conducted. ET subscale was found to differ significantly between the
367 different attachment styles (ET $F = 8.65, p < .001$). Dwass-Steel-Crichlow-Fligner pairwise
368 comparisons found that the “Secure” and “Preoccupied” styles scored significantly higher than
369 the “Dismissing” and “Fearful” style ($ps < .01$). There were no significant differences between
370 “Secure” and “Preoccupied” styles neither between “Dismissing” and “Fearful” style. EM
371 subscale was also found to differ significantly between the different attachment styles (EM $F =$
372 $12.19, p < .001$). Pairwise comparisons showed significant difference between higher score for
373 “Fearful” on both “Secure” ($p < .001$) and “Dismissive” styles ($p < .05$). Other comparisons did
374 not significantly differ. Finally, EC subscale was found to differ significantly between the
375 different attachment styles (EC $F = 13.71, p < .001$). Pairwise comparisons showed significant
376 differences between higher score for “Fearful” and “Preoccupied” styles comparing to “Secure”
377 and “Dismissive” ones ($ps < .01$). Other comparisons weren’t significantly different (Fig 2).

378

379 **Fig 2. Comparison between to attachment styles according to the ETMCQ subscales. D:**
380 “Dismissive”. F: “Fearful”. P: “Preoccupied”. S: “Secure”.

381

382 **ETMCQ and childhood traumatic experiences**

383 A generalized linear model of mediation was constructed between CTQ-SF total score, the
384 ETMCQ subscales and SCL-90-R GSI (Fig 3). We found that the total effect of CTQ-SF total
385 score on GSI was significant (standardized effect sizes $\beta = .278, p < .001$). The direct effect of
386 CTQ-SF total score on the GSI was significant ($\beta = .133, p < .001$), but smaller than the total
387 effect, indicating partial mediation effects. As shown on the path diagram model of mediation
388 (Fig 3), only EM and EC appear to mediate the relation between childhood traumatic
389 experiences and psychopathology (EM standardized mediation effect between CTQ-SF total
390 score and GSI : $\beta = .066, p < .001$; EC standardized mediation effect between CTQ-SF total

391 score and GSI : $\beta = .090, p < .001$). ET had no significant mediating impact. It is to note that
392 the when examining CTQ-SF subscales, Emotional abuse and Emotional negligence had the
393 greatest direct effect on psychopathology (respectively $\beta = .140, p < .005$ and $\beta = .121, p <$
394 $.001$), with EM and EC still keeping significant mediating effects.

395

396 **Fig 3. Path diagram model of mediation by the ETMCQ subscales on the relation**
397 **between childhood traumatic experiences and psychopathology.** β = standardized effect
398 sizes * $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

399

400 **ETMCQ and loneliness**

401 A second generalized linear model of mediation was constructed between loneliness, the
402 ETMCQ subscales and psychopathology (Fig 4). We found that the total effect of UCLA-LS
403 sum on the SCL-90-R GSI was significant (standardized effect sizes $\beta = .440, p < .001$). The
404 direct effect of UCLA-LS sum on the SCL-90-R GSI was significant ($\beta = .337, p < .001$), but
405 smaller than the total effect, indicating partial mediation effects. Path diagram model of
406 mediation by EM and EC on the relation between loneliness and psychopathology were
407 significant and positive, and indicated a potential role of these factors as mediators of the
408 relationship between loneliness and psychopathology (EM standardized mediation effect
409 between UCLA-LS sum and SCL90-R GSI: $\beta = .064, p < .01$; EC standardized mediation effect
410 between UCLA-LS sum and SCL90-R GSI: $\beta = .076, p < .001$). ET displayed a negative
411 significant mediation effect (ET standardized mediation effect between UCLA-LS sum and
412 SCL90-R GSI : $\beta = -.036, p < .01$) which indicate a likely suppressor effect, a situation in which
413 the magnitude of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent
414 variable becomes larger when a mediating variable is introduced [80]. Thus, ET suppresses
415 the relationship between loneliness and psychopathology when present and augments it when
416 absent. Moderation tests were additionally conducted, indicating a significant effect for ET (Z

417 = 2.096, $p < .05$), while EM and EC did not moderate the association between loneliness and
418 psychopathology.

419

420 **Fig 4. Path diagram model of mediation by the ETMCQ subscales on the relation**
421 **between loneliness and psychopathology.** β = standardized effect sizes ** $p < .001$.

422

423 Discussion

424 Consistent with previous findings [19,13,18], the results of our study show that the ETMCQ
425 represents a valid self-report instrument to assess epistemic trust. We find an adequate
426 replication of the original three-factor solution in a francophone non-clinical population, with
427 satisfactory psychometric properties and external validity. We further replicate on an
428 independent sample Campbell et al. [13] findings on epistemic trust differences related to
429 attachment, as well as the ETMCQ subscales mediating effect between childhood trauma
430 experiences and psychopathology. We finally observe that ETMCQ subscales mediate the
431 well-described association between loneliness and psychopathology.

432 Our analyses confirm a three-factor structure for a 12-item scale, referring respectively to the
433 degree of trust (ET), mistrust (EM) and credulity (EC) in epistemic trust stances. To note that
434 the three removed items present the lowest loadings in their respective subscales in the
435 ETMCQ original and validation studies (item 1 for ET in Liotti et al. [19] and Asgarizadeh et al.
436 [20], item 3 for EM in all three studies, item 6 for EC in Campbell et al. [13] and Liotti et al.
437 [19]). We find significant associations among the three epistemic trust stances, with a slightly
438 different correlation pattern than in the original Campbell et al. study [13]. We find gender
439 differences between epistemic trust stances, with women showing higher scores on both ET
440 and EC subscales. This result partially echoes Campbell et al. [13] (who found also higher
441 women EM score, but only in their Study 2), Benzi et al. [18] and Riedl et al. [27] (higher score
442 only for ET), Asgarizadeh et al. [20] (higher score for EC and EM), but not Liotti et al. [19] who
443 found no differences between gender. We observe that age has an impact on epistemic trust

444 stances, with ET and EM being negatively linked with age. This latter finding partially mirrors
445 Campbell et al. [13] who find that ET (in their Study 1) and EC (in their Study 2) were negatively
446 correlated with age. Liotti et al. [19] observed that only EM was negatively associated with age,
447 and Asgarizadeh et al. [20] only ET. Internal consistency for the whole instrument and for the
448 three subscales is acceptable, confirming findings from Campbell et al. [13] and Liotti et al.
449 [19], but not Asgarizadeh et al. [20] who found low internal consistency for ET and EM. Test-
450 retest reliability and interclass correlation coefficients of the subscales is acceptable to good,
451 suggesting coherent and relatively stable individual attributes, reflecting possibly the mostly
452 trait-driven nature of the ETMCQ measurement.

453 Concerning external validity, EM and EC subscales are significantly correlated with childhood
454 traumatic experiences, insecure attachment, poor mentalizing, loneliness and
455 psychopathology, adding weight to the hypothesis that they are both dysfunctional epistemic
456 trust stances regarding social communication [13,81,82]. Furthermore, the fact that the three
457 epistemic trust stances constitute independent factors was also supported by their distinctive
458 correlation pattern with the precited variables. Interestingly, ET was not associated with
459 reduced levels of symptoms nor most of the precited variables, except to avoidant attachment
460 and loneliness. It adds weight to similar findings [23,18,26] that lead Li et al. [83] to formulate
461 the hypothesis that higher level of the specific ET dimension is not correlated with better
462 psychological functioning nor buffers against the impact of childhood adversity. Overall, we
463 find mostly similar psychometric features with the original and the replicating ETMCQ
464 validation studies, with possible differences in the number of items retained mainly due to
465 linguistic and cultural factors that need further investigation.

466 On attachment issues, we find that the ETMCQ subscales differ according to distinctive
467 attachment dimensions (avoidant and anxious). Our findings replicate those of Campbell et al.
468 [13] and Asgarizadeh et al. [20] but not Liotti et al. [19], showing that EM is more strongly
469 correlated to the avoidance dimension and EC to the anxiety dimension. In line with the novel
470 way to see attachment as more adaptative than thought before, avoidance can be thought as
471 adjustment to conditions promoting self-sufficiency, whereas anxiety may best aid in

472 unpredictable environments [84]. Thus, avoidance may prompt EM and closing of the
473 epistemic channel, whereas anxiety helps keep the channel open at the expense of self-
474 agency [13,19]. We also replicate largely Campbell et al. [13] findings concerning attachment
475 styles (“Secure”, “Fearful”, “Preoccupied”, “Dismissive”) and the ETMCQ subscales. “Secure”
476 and “Preoccupied” styles scored higher than the other styles regarding ET, “Fearful” style
477 higher regarding EM, and “Fearful” and “Preoccupied” higher regarding EC. Thus, “Dismissive”
478 attachment style seems to protect against high level of EM and EC, but also show the lowest
479 level of ET, hindering probably the possibility to learn from experience if a minimal level of the
480 ET default mode is not attained [83]. “Fearful” attachment styles scores both high on EM and
481 EC and low on ET, displaying the likely worst pattern of epistemic trust stances, eventually
482 leading to the so-called “epistemic petrification” were all social-communicative channels are
483 freezed [13,3]. “Preoccupied” attachment styles scores high on EM, EC and ET, thus having
484 perhaps more likelihood to emerge from” epistemic petrification”.

485 Regarding childhood trauma experiences, we also replicate Campbell et al. [13] by observing
486 that epistemic trust significantly mediates the association between childhood traumatic
487 experiences and psychopathology. Specifically, we find that EM and EC partially mediate this
488 link while ET was not a mediator, as observed by the authors of the original study. One possible
489 interpretation could be that non-clinical sample are more protected against high levels of
490 childhood traumatization, and thus further studies require looking into clinical populations to
491 see if ET still lacks mediation effects. Preliminary studies report that ET is increased in clinical
492 population, and it has been discussed that these findings may best be understood as indicating
493 a help-seeking state rather than a trait [86]. When examining isolated childhood traumatic
494 experiences, emotional abuse and emotional negligence had the greatest direct effect on
495 psychopathology. Combined with our finding that EM and EC are mostly correlated to
496 emotional abuse and negligence, they add evidence to the hypothesis that it is the emotional
497 dimensions of child traumatization that has the most enduring impact on later life development,
498 conceivably through its duration and enduring social-communicative disruptions [85,84,86].
499 Overall, our finding suggests that childhood traumatic experience, through adaptive

500 attachment strategies (avoidance and anxiety dimensions), can produce dysfunctional
501 epistemic stances (EM and EC) that participate to psychopathology vulnerability, possibly by
502 hindering fundamental psychological abilities like mentalizing [17].

503 We further observe that the ETMCQ subscales significantly mediate the association between
504 loneliness and psychopathology. Specifically, EM and EC are partial mediators, while ET has
505 a suppressor effect, meaning that it has the potential to hinder paths between loneliness and
506 psychopathology when present. These observations are corroborated by the fact that EM and
507 EC did not moderate the association between loneliness and psychopathology, emphasizing
508 thus the hypothesis that EM and EC have a primary mediating effect. The fact that ET shows
509 this suppressor effect and is at the same negatively correlated to loneliness in our convergent
510 validity testing specifies the shape of its peculiar participation in the epistemic stances frame.
511 Thus, when ET is lacking, the person is presumably not able to open again to the social world
512 - she/he is possibly protected against symptoms (no correlation between ET and
513 psychopathology) but at the price of loneliness, stagnation, and the so-called “epistemic
514 petrification”. Our results are in line with previous findings that showed that the development
515 of epistemic trust capacities in childhood and adolescence is likely to be diminished in social
516 contexts of loneliness, especially when there is social isolation from peers [87]. The
517 phenomenon of “epistemic petrification” that occurs when epistemic channels are closed oblige
518 to address the issues of enduring mistrust, suspicion and hopes that are always dashed that
519 can submerge the thinking of individuals who experiences loneliness. Consequently, simply
520 increasing individuals’ amount of social contact may be insufficient for improving outcomes.
521 The development and dissemination of evidence-based interventions and primary prevention
522 for loneliness is still in its infancy compared with recommendations for specific mental health
523 disorders [88]. But what is known is that interventions that addressed maladaptive social
524 cognition had a larger effect size compared to interventions that addressed social support,
525 social skills, and opportunities for social contacts [89]. These results are consistent with both
526 the Cacioppo et al. [47] model of loneliness as a self-reinforcing and regulatory loop, as with
527 loneliness as an “epistemic petrification” precursor and marker. Some mental capacities are

528 required in order for a person to see the value and engage in social relationships and in
529 collective actions (so-called “we intentions”) [90,91]. In the social neuroscience field,
530 underlying cognitive and biological processes have been found that could account for this
531 bidirectional relation. These processes are possibly reduced for people undergoing prolonged
532 loneliness, due to changes in biological features which can trigger fear-based responses to
533 typically non-threatening situations, thus leading to loss of trust in relationships and further
534 isolation [47,92,93]. Overall, this highlights the complex interaction between social support and
535 mental health, individuals and communities, where social support could be a means to positive
536 mental health, as well as the outcome of mental health improvement that can led to the
537 capacity to engage further in social relationships [87].

538 Our study should be considered with its limitations in mind. First, our sample is community-
539 based, and results and applications have to been experimented in clinical populations. Second,
540 our study was operated through an online-survey. Although this method is becoming more
541 widespread in the psychology research field, it may lead to the exclusion of part of the
542 population, causing some limitations regarding the generalizability of our study. Third, our
543 findings focused only on self-report measures and may introduce response biases potentially
544 increasing the strength of reported associations. Future studies could assess the association
545 between the ETMCQ and experimental designs which test laboratory social learning. Fourth,
546 our study used a cross-sectional design and thus the direction of effect for the two mediation
547 models cannot be formally establish. Accordingly, although the direction of effect in our first
548 mediation model (epistemic trust mediating childhood traumatic experiences and
549 psychopathology) is based on the assumption that childhood experience refers to the past
550 while epistemic trust stances are current experiences, we cannot rule out alternative
551 explanations such as selective recall of adverse events in individuals with current difficulties.
552 In our second model (epistemic trust mediating loneliness and psychopathology), even if there
553 is ample evidence from longitudinal studies that loneliness is a risk factor for multiple mental
554 health outcomes [51], psychopathology produces also the experience of loneliness in itself.
555 Therefore, as already mentioned by Campbell et al. [13], future longitudinal studies should

556 test these directions and investigate the long-term effects of epistemic trust on mental health
557 symptoms and psychological constructs.

558

559 **Conclusions**

560 In line with the findings of Campbell et al. [13], Liotti et al. [19] and Asgarizadeh et al. [20], the
561 results of our study show that the ETMCQ represents a valid and promising instrument to
562 assess epistemic trust. We replicated Campbell et al. [13] main findings - which is valuable in
563 itself considering the enduring replication crisis affecting psychology field [96] - concerning the
564 ETMCQ subscales attachment style differences and mediating effect between childhood
565 traumatic experiences and psychopathology. We lastly find that the ETMCQ subscales have a
566 substantial mediating effect between loneliness and psychopathology. Thereby, we add
567 momentum to the framework that considers epistemic trust as an underlying contributor to the
568 maintenance or alleviation of psychopathology, through its freezing and in fine self-alienating
569 effect on human development. Our study calls in favor of pursuing and enhancing research on
570 the interceding role of epistemic trust in human difficulties. Future research should investigate
571 epistemic trust in clinical population, where psychopathological expressions are severe,
572 enduring and connected, and where identifying potential intercessors could help target and
573 improve interventions [97].

574

575 **References**

- 576 1. Choi-Kain LW, Masland SR, Finch EF. Corrective Experiences to Enhance Trust: Clinical
577 Wisdom From Good (Enough) Psychiatric Management. *Journal of Personality*
578 *Disorders*. 2023 Oct;37(5):559–79.
- 579 2. Fonagy P, Allison E. The role of mentalizing and epistemic trust in the therapeutic
580 relationship. *Psychotherapy*. 2014;51(3):372–80.

- 581 3. Fonagy P, Luyten P, Allison E. Epistemic Petrification and the Restoration of Epistemic
582 Trust: A New Conceptualization of Borderline Personality Disorder and Its Psychosocial
583 Treatment. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2015 Oct;29(5):575–609.
- 584 4. Fonagy P, Luyten P, Allison E, Campbell C. What we have changed our minds about:
585 Part 2. Borderline personality disorder, epistemic trust and the developmental
586 significance of social communication. *bord personal disord emot dysregul*. 2017
587 Dec;4(1):9.
- 588 5. Schröder-Pfeifer P, Talia A, Volkert J, Taubner S. Developing an assessment of
589 epistemic trust: a research protocol. *Research in Psychotherapy*.
- 590 6. Tomasello M, Carpenter M, Call J, Behne T, Moll H. Understanding and sharing
591 intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and brain sciences*.
592 2005;28(5):675–91.
- 593 7. Fricker M. Evolving concepts of epistemic injustice. In: *The Routledge handbook of*
594 *epistemic injustice*. Routledge; 2017. p. 53–60.
- 595 8. Sperber D, Clément F, Heintz C, Mascaro O, Mercier H, Origgi G, et al. Epistemic
596 vigilance. *Mind & language*. 2010;25(4):359–93.
- 597 9. Origgi G. Epistemic Injustice and Epistemic Trust. *Social Epistemology*. 2012
598 Apr;26(2):221–35.
- 599 10. Csibra G, Gergely G. Natural pedagogy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2009
600 Apr;13(4):148–53.
- 601 11. Ellis BJ, Boyce WT, Belsky J, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, van Ijzendoorn MH.
602 Differential susceptibility to the environment: An evolutionary–neurodevelopmental
603 theory. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2011 Feb;23(1):7–28.

- 604 12. Fearon P, Shmueli-Goetz Y, Viding E, Fonagy P, Plomin R. Genetic and environmental
605 influences on adolescent attachment. *Child Psychology Psychiatry*. 2014
606 Sep;55(9):1033–41.
- 607 13. Campbell C, Tanzer M, Saunders R, Booker T, Allison E, Li E, et al. Development and
608 validation of a self-report measure of epistemic trust. Doering S, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2021
609 Apr 16;16(4):e0250264.
- 610 14. Corriveau K, Harris PL. Choosing your informant: weighing familiarity and recent
611 accuracy. *Developmental Science*. 2009 May;12(3):426–37.
- 612 15. Campbell C, Allison E. Mentalizing the modern world. *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*.
613 2022;36(3):206–17.
- 614 16. Fonagy P, Allison E. Beyond Mentalizing: Epistemic Trust and the Transmission of
615 Culture. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 2023 Oct 2;92(4):599–640.
- 616 17. Luyten P, Campbell C, Fonagy P. Borderline personality disorder, complex trauma, and
617 problems with self and identity: A social-communicative approach. *Journal of Personality*.
618 2020 Feb;88(1):88–105.
- 619 18. Benzi IMA, Carone N, Parolin L, Martin-Gagnon G, Ensink K, Fontana A. Different
620 epistemic stances for different traumatic experiences: implications for mentalization.
621 *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*. 2023;26(3).
- 622 19. Liotti M, Milesi A, Spitoni GF, Tanzilli A, Speranza AM, Parolin L, et al. Unpacking trust:
623 The Italian validation of the Epistemic Trust, Mistrust, and Credulity Questionnaire
624 (ETMCQ). Doering S, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2023 Jan 26;18(1):e0280328.
- 625 20. Asgarizadeh A, Ghanbari S. Iranian adaptation of the Epistemic Trust, Mistrust, and
626 Credulity Questionnaire (ETMCQ): Validity, reliability, discriminant ability, and sex
627 invariance. *Brain and Behavior*. 2024 Mar;14(3):e3455.

- 628 21. Bincoletto AF, Zanini L, Spitoni GF, Lingiardi V. Negative and positive ageism in an
629 Italian sample: how ageist beliefs relate to epistemic trust, psychological distress, and
630 well-being. *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*.
631 2023;26(2).
- 632 22. Brauner F, Fonagy P, Campbell C, Griem J, Storck T, Nolte T. "Trust me, do not trust
633 anyone": how epistemic mistrust and credulity are associated with conspiracy mentality.
634 *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*. 2023;26(3).
- 635 23. Hauschild S, Kasper LA, Berning A, Taubner S. The relationship between epistemic
636 stance, mentalizing, paranoid distress and conspiracy mentality: an empirical
637 investigation. *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*.
638 2023;26(3).
- 639 24. Kampling H, Kruse J, Lampe A, Nolte T, Hettich N, Brähler E, et al. Epistemic trust and
640 personality functioning mediate the association between adverse childhood experiences
641 and posttraumatic stress disorder and complex posttraumatic stress disorder in
642 adulthood. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022 Aug 10;13:919191.
- 643 25. Nimbi FM, Baiocco R, Giovanardi G, Tanzilli A, Lingiardi V. Who Is Afraid of Monkeypox?
644 Analysis of Psychosocial Factors Associated with the First Reactions of Fear of
645 Monkeypox in the Italian Population. *Behavioral Sciences*. 2023 Mar 7;13(3):235.
- 646 26. Parolin L, Milesi A, Comelli G, Locati F. The interplay of mentalization and epistemic
647 trust: a protective mechanism against emotional dysregulation in adolescent internalizing
648 symptoms. *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*.
649 2023;26(3).
- 650 27. Riedl D, Rothmund MS, Grote V, Fischer MJ, Kampling H, Kruse J, et al. Mentalizing and
651 epistemic trust as critical success factors in psychosomatic rehabilitation: results of a

- 652 single center longitudinal observational study. *Front Psychiatry*. 2023 May
653 12;14:1150422.
- 654 28. Tanzilli A, Cibelli A, Liotti M, Fiorentino F, Williams R, Lingiardi V. Personality, Defenses,
655 Mentalization, and Epistemic Trust Related to Pandemic Containment Strategies and the
656 COVID-19 Vaccine: A Sequential Mediation Model. *IJERPH*. 2022 Nov 1;19(21):14290.
- 657 29. Knapen S, van Diemen R, Hutsebaut J, Fonagy P. Defining the Concept and Clinical
658 Features of Epistemic Trust.
- 659 30. Bakkum L, Verhage ML, Schuengel C, Duschinsky R, Cornelisz I, van Klaveren C, et al.
660 Exploring the meaning of unresolved loss and trauma in more than 1,000 Adult
661 Attachment Interviews. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2023 May;35(2):587–603.
- 662 31. Groh AM, Fearon RMP, van IJzendoorn MH, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Roisman GI.
663 Attachment in the Early Life Course: Meta-Analytic Evidence for Its Role in
664 Socioemotional Development. *Child Dev Perspectives*. 2017 Mar;11(1):70–6.
- 665 32. Granqvist P, Sroufe LA, Dozier M, Hesse E, Steele M, van IJzendoorn M, et al.
666 Disorganized attachment in infancy: a review of the phenomenon and its implications for
667 clinicians and policy-makers. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2017 Nov 2;19(6):534–
668 58.
- 669 33. Granqvist P. Attachment, culture, and gene-culture co-evolution: expanding the
670 evolutionary toolbox of attachment theory. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2021 Jan
671 2;23(1):90–113.
- 672 34. Schuengel C, Verhage ML, Duschinsky R. Prospecting the attachment research field: a
673 move to the level of engagement. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2021 Jul
674 4;23(4):375–95.

- 675 35. Thérapies basées sur la mentalisation et théorie de l'attachement. In: L'attachement en
676 psychothérapie de l'adulte: Théorie et pratique clinique. Dunod; 2023.
- 677 36. Reches T. Exploring the relationships between attachment, epistemic trust, and
678 expectations of helping relationships in adolescents. 2017;
- 679 37. Talia A, Miller-Bottome M, Katznelson H, Pedersen SH, Steele H, Schröder P, et al.
680 Mentalizing in the presence of another: Measuring reflective functioning and attachment
681 in the therapy process. *Psychotherapy Research*. 2019 Sep 3;29(5):652–65.
- 682 38. van Dijk AL, Geenen DR, Swildens DW, Knapen S. The relationship between adult
683 attachment styles and epistemic trust measured by the Questionnaire Epistemic Trust: a
684 cross-sectional study.
- 685 39. Copeland WE, Shanahan L, Hinesley J, Chan RF, Aberg KA, Fairbank JA, et al.
686 Association of Childhood Trauma Exposure With Adult Psychiatric Disorders and
687 Functional Outcomes. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018 Nov 9;1(7):e184493.
- 688 40. Heim C, Nemeroff CB. The role of childhood trauma in the neurobiology of mood and
689 anxiety disorders: preclinical and clinical studies. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2001
690 Jun;49(12):1023–39.
- 691 41. McKay MT. A revised and extended systematic review and meta-analysis of the
692 relationship between childhood adversity and adult psychiatric disorder. *Journal of*
693 *Psychiatric Research*. 2022;
- 694 42. Driehuis SR. The Relationship between Childhood Trauma and Epistemic Trust: a cross-
695 sectional.
- 696 43. Ryff CD. Psychological Well-Being Revisited: Advances in the Science and Practice of
697 Eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2014;83(1):10–28.

- 698 44. Mittelmark MB, Bauer GF, Vaandrager L, Pelikan JM, Sagy S, Eriksson M, et al. The
699 handbook of salutogenesis. 2022;
- 700 45. Hickin N, Käll A, Shafran R, Sutcliffe S, Manzotti G, Langan D. The effectiveness of
701 psychological interventions for loneliness: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
702 Clinical Psychology Review. 2021 Aug;88:102066.
- 703 46. Weiss R. Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation. MIT press; 1975.
- 704 47. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and Social
705 Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality: A Meta-Analytic Review. 2015;
- 706 48. Cacioppo JT, Hawkley LC. Perceived social isolation and cognition. Trends in Cognitive
707 Sciences. 2009 Oct;13(10):447–54.
- 708 49. Cacioppo JT, Cacioppo S, Adler AB, Lester PB, McGurk D, Thomas JL, et al. The
709 Cultural Context of Loneliness: Risk Factors in Active Duty Soldiers. Journal of Social
710 and Clinical Psychology. 2016 Dec 1;35(10):865–82.
- 711 50. Beutel ME, Klein EM, Brähler E, Reiner I, Jünger C, Michal M, et al. Loneliness in the
712 general population: prevalence, determinants and relations to mental health. BMC
713 Psychiatry. 2017 Dec;17(1):97.
- 714 51. Cacioppo JT, Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley LC, Thisted RA. Loneliness as a specific
715 risk factor for depressive symptoms: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses.
716 Psychology and Aging. 2006 Mar;21(1):140–51.
- 717 52. Wang J, Mann F, Lloyd-Evans B, Ma R, Johnson S. Associations between loneliness and
718 perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systematic review.
719 BMC Psychiatry. 2018 Dec;18(1):156.

- 720 53. Bernstein DP, Stein JA, Newcomb MD, Walker E, Pogge D, Ahluvalia T, et al.
721 Development and validation of a brief screening version of the Childhood Trauma
722 Questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2003 Feb;27(2):169–90.
- 723 54. Paquette D, Laporte L, Bigras M, Zoccolillo M. Validation de la version française du CTQ
724 et prévalence de l'histoire de maltraitance 1. *smq*. 2004 Aug 18;29(1):201–20.
- 725 55. Fonagy P, Luyten P, Moulton-Perkins A, Lee YW, Warren F, Howard S, et al.
726 Development and Validation of a Self-Report Measure of Mentalizing: The Reflective
727 Functioning Questionnaire. Laws K, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2016 Jul 8;11(7):e0158678.
- 728 56. Badoud D, Luyten P, Fonseca-Pedrero E, Eliez S, Fonagy P, Debbané M. The French
729 Version of the Reflective Functioning Questionnaire: Validity Data for Adolescents and
730 Adults and Its Association with Non-Suicidal Self-Injury. Tran US, editor. *PLoS ONE*.
731 2015 Dec 29;10(12):e0145892.
- 732 57. Fraley RC, Waller NG, Brennan KA. An item response theory analysis of self-report
733 measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000
734 Feb;78(2):350–65.
- 735 58. Chaperon É, Dandeneau S. Le Questionnaire sur les structures relationnelles :
736 adaptation et validation de la version française du Experiences in Close Relationships–
737 Relationship Structures Questionnaire. *European Review of Applied Psychology*. 2017
738 Jul;67(4):213–21.
- 739 59. Sibley CG, Fischer R, Liu JH. Reliability and Validity of the Revised Experiences in Close
740 Relationships (ECR-R) Self-Report Measure of Adult Romantic Attachment. *Pers Soc*
741 *Psychol Bull*. 2005 Nov;31(11):1524–36.
- 742 60. Bartholomew K, Horowitz LM. Attachment Styles Among Young Adults: A Test of a Four-
743 Category Model.

- 744 61. Favez N, Tissot H, Ghisletta P, Golay P, Cairo Notari S. Validation of the French Version
745 of the Experiences in Close Relationships– Revised (ECR-R) Adult Romantic Attachment
746 Questionnaire. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*. 2016 Jun;75(3):113–21.
- 747 62. Russell DW. UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, Validity, and Factor
748 Structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1996 Feb;66(1):20–40.
- 749 63. Cramer KM, Barry JE. Conceptualizations and measures of loneliness: a comparison of
750 subscales. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 1999 Sep;27(3):491–502.
- 751 64. Pinquart M, Sorensen S. Influences on Loneliness in Older Adults: A Meta-Analysis.
- 752 65. de Grâce GR, Joshi P, Pelletier R. L'Échelle de solitude de l'Université Laval (ÉSUL):
753 validation canadienne-française du UCLA Loneliness Scale. *Canadian Journal of*
754 *Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*. 1993
755 Jan;25(1):12–27.
- 756 66. Derogatis LR, Savitz KL. The SCL-90-R, Brief Symptom Inventory, and Matching Clinical
757 Rating Scales. In: *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes*
758 *assessment*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers;
759 1999. p. 679–724.
- 760 67. Pariente P, Lepine JP, Boulenger JP, Zarifian E, Lemperiere T, Lellouch J. The Symptom
761 Check-List 90R (SCL-90R) in a French general psychiatric 708 outpatient sample: is
762 there a factor structure? *Psychiatry and Psychobiology*. 2020/04/28 ed. 1989;4(3):151–7.
- 763 68. Beaton D, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz MB. Recommendations for the Cross-
764 Cultural Adaptation of the DASH & QuickDASH Outcome Measures.
- 765 69. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
766 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*
767 *Multidisciplinary Journal*. 1999 Jan;6(1):1–55.

- 768 70. Yu CY. Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable models with binary
769 and continuous outcomes. University of California, Los Angeles; 2002.
- 770 71. Callegari C, Bertù L, Lucano M, Ielmini M, Braggio E, Vender S. Reliability and validity of
771 the Italian version of the 14-item Resilience Scale. *PRBM*. 2016 Oct;Volume 9:277–84.
- 772 72. Campbell KA, Rohlman DS, Storzbach D, Binder LM, Anger WK, Kovera CA, et al. Test-
773 Retest Reliability of Psychological and Neurobehavioral Tests Self-Administered by
774 Computer. *Assessment*. 1999 Mar;6(1):21–32.
- 775 73. Bruton A, Conway JH, Holgate ST. Reliability: what is it, and how is it measured?
776 *Physiotherapy*. 2000;86(2):94–9.
- 777 74. Holi M, Samallahti P, Aalberg V. A Finnish validation study of the SCL-90. *Acta*
778 *Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 1998;97(1):42–6.
- 779 75. Sereda Y, Dembitskyi S. Validity assessment of the symptom checklist SCL-90-R and
780 shortened versions for the general population in Ukraine. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2016
781 Dec;16(1):300.
- 782 76. Vallejo MA, Mañanes G, Isabel Comeche M, Díaz MI. Comparison between
783 administration via Internet and paper-and-pencil administration of two clinical
784 instruments: SCL-90-R and GHQ-28. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental*
785 *Psychiatry*. 2008 Sep;39(3):201–8.
- 786 77. Scher CD, Stein MB, Asmundson GJG, McCreary DR, Forde DR. The childhood trauma
787 questionnaire in a community sample: Psychometric properties and normative data.
788 *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2001 Oct;14(4):843–57.
- 789 78. Brown TA. *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford publications; 2015.

- 790 79. Berchtold A. Test–retest: Agreement or reliability? *Methodological Innovations*. 2016 Jan
791 1;9:205979911667287.
- 792 80. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients
793 for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*. 2016 Jun;15(2):155–63.
- 794 81. MacKinnon DP, Krull JL, Lockwood CM. Equivalence of the mediation, confounding and
795 suppression effect. *Prevention science*. 2000;1:173–81.
- 796 82. Cicchetti D. Socioemotional, Personality, and Biological Development: Illustrations from a
797 Multilevel Developmental Psychopathology Perspective on Child Maltreatment. *Annu*
798 *Rev Psychol*. 2016 Jan 4;67(1):187–211.
- 799 83. Rutter M. Developmental psychopathology: A paradigm shift or just a relabeling? *Dev*
800 *Psychopathol*. 2013 Nov;25(4pt2):1201–13.
- 801 84. Li E, Campbell C, Midgley N, Luyten P. Epistemic trust: a comprehensive review of
802 empirical insights and implications for developmental psychopathology. *Research in*
803 *Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process, and Outcome*. 2023;26(3).
- 804 85. Luyten P, Campbell C, Fonagy P. Rethinking the relationship between attachment and
805 personality disorder. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2021 Feb;37:109–13.
- 806 86. Taubner S. Insights and challenges in assessing epistemic trust [Panel Discussion]. 54th
807 International Annual Meeting of the Society for Psychotherapy Research. In Dublin;
808 2023.
- 809 87. Ensink K, Bégin M, Normandin L, Godbout N, Fonagy P. Mentalization and dissociation
810 in the context of trauma: Implications for child psychopathology. *Journal of Trauma &*
811 *Dissociation*. 2017 Jan;18(1):11–30.

- 812 88. Thompson AE, Kaplan CA. Childhood Emotional Abuse. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1996
813 Feb;168(2):143–8.
- 814 89. Bauer A, Stevens M, Purtscheller D, Knapp M, Fonagy P, Evans-Lacko S, et al.
815 Mobilising social support to improve mental health for children and adolescents: A
816 systematic review using principles of realist synthesis. Kumari V, editor. *PLoS ONE*.
817 2021 May 20;16(5):e0251750.
- 818 90. Mann F, Bone JK, Lloyd-Evans B, Frerichs J, Pinfold V, Ma R, et al. A life less lonely: the
819 state of the art in interventions to reduce loneliness in people with mental health
820 problems. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2017 Jun;52(6):627–38.
- 821 91. Hickin N, Käll A, Shafran R, Sutcliffe S, Manzotti G, Langan D. The effectiveness of
822 psychological interventions for loneliness: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
823 *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2021 Aug;88:102066.
- 824 92. Gallotti M, Frith CD. Social cognition in the we-mode. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2013
825 Apr;17(4):160–5.
- 826 93. Gallotti M. Collective Attitudes and the Anthropocentric View. *Journal of Social Ontology*.
827 2016 Mar 23;2(1):149–57.
- 828 94. Cole SW, Capitanio JP, Chun K, Arevalo JMG, Ma J, Cacioppo JT. Myeloid
829 differentiation architecture of leukocyte transcriptome dynamics in perceived social
830 isolation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2015 Dec 8;112(49):15142–7.
- 831 95. Tomasello M. How children come to understand false beliefs: A shared intentionality
832 account. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2018 Aug 21;115(34):8491–8.
- 833 96. Wiggins BJ, Christopherson CD. The replication crisis in psychology: An overview for
834 theoretical and philosophical psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical*
835 *Psychology*. 2019;39(4):202.

836 97. Ormel J, Hollon SD, Kessler RC, Cuijpers P, Monroe SM. More treatment but no less
837 depression: The treatment-prevalence paradox. *Clinical psychology review*.
838 2022;91:102111.

839

840 **Supporting information**

841 **S1 File. ETMCQ items in French.**

842 **S2 File. Study dataset 1.** ETMCQ french_for CFA

843 **S3 File. Study dataset 2.** ETMCQ french_for convergence




Fig 2. Comparison between attachment styles according to the E




Fig 1. CFA with factor loadings (12 items)




Fig 3. Path diagram model of mediation by the ETMCQ subscales




Fig 4. Path diagram model of mediation by the ETMCQ subscales