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Abstract

Schizotypy is a multidimensional personality construct that is characterized by perceptual abnormalities, social withdrawal, mild suspiciousness, and odd thinking patterns. This study examined the relationship between four dimensions of self-reported schizotypy and substance use involving nicotine, alcohol, and cannabis, in undergraduate students. Results showed that higher levels of disorganized schizotypy, or odd thinking and behavior, were associated with greater indices of use of all three substances. Furthermore, higher cognitive-perceptual schizotypy was selectively associated with cannabis use. Results confirm findings of recent research that has discovered associations among schizotypy and substance use, highlighting links between behavioral traits and use of nicotine, alcohol, and cannabis. This study is one of the first to examine a wide range of schizotypy domains, and to show selective effects of the disorganized domain of schizotypy.
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1.0 Introduction

Schizotypy is a multifaceted personality profile of great interest to personality and schizophrenia researchers alike. The schizotypy construct encompasses a set of dimensional traits in behavioral, perceptual, ideational, cognitive, and affective domains that exist along continua in the general population (Raine, Lencz, & Mednick, 1995). Biological relatives of individuals with schizophrenia are more likely to exhibit schizotypal traits than those without a family history of the illness (Kendler, McGuire, Gruenberg, & Walsh, 1995), suggesting that schizotypy is genetically related to schizophrenia. Individuals with schizotypal personality features exhibit social deficits similar to, but less prominent than, those found in schizophrenia (Dickey et al., 2005).

Investigators have long been interested in the high prevalence of substance use in individuals with schizophrenia, given that up to 50% of individuals with schizophrenia have a co-occurring substance use disorder (Dixon, 1999). In light of the relationship between schizophrenia and schizotypy, lines of investigation have more recently turned toward examining associations between schizotypy and substance use. Some research in the general population has shown that greater levels of schizotypy are related to cigarette, alcohol, and cannabis use. Regarding the use of cigarettes, Allan and colleagues (1995) found a positive correlation between self-reported schizotypy and a measure of the number of cigarettes smoked per day. Other studies have revealed similar results (Joseph, Manafi, Iakovaki, & Cooper, 2003; Larrison, Briand, & Sereno, 1999; Wiles et al., 2006). A recent study in this area of research examined the relationship between cigarette use and schizotypy in a sample of healthy adults and relatives of patients with schizophrenia (Esterberg, Jones, Compton, & Walker, 2008). Individuals who
smoked had greater levels of schizotypy; however, the relationship was significant only among
the relatives of patients with schizophrenia.

Schizotypy has also been examined in relation to use of alcohol. Rather than a global
positive relationship between the two, results suggest a more nuanced pattern of associations
between alcohol use and specific domains of schizotypy. Nunn and colleagues (2001), for
example, found that alcohol use in a sample of undergraduate students was related to lower
introvertive anhedonia, or negative schizotypy, and to higher scores on delusional conviction, a
construct similar to positive schizotypy. Larrison et al. (1999) found that increased alcohol use
was associated with lower scores on the Rust Inventory of Schizotypal Cognitions (RISC; Rust,
1998), a measure of positive schizotypy. There have been no other published studies
conducted that have examined the relationship between schizotypy and alcohol use in the general
population.

An emerging body of research suggests an association between schizotypy and cannabis
use (Compton, Goulding, & Walker, 2007). Several studies involving university students have
demonstrated correlations between cannabis use and positive schizotypal symptomatology in
particular (Bailey & Swallow, 2004; Dumas et al., 2002; Mass, Bardong, Kindl, & Dahme, 2001;
Nunn, Rizza, & Peters, 2001; Schiffman, Nakamura, Earleywine, & LaBrie, 2005; Skosnik,
Krishnan, Aydt, Kuhlenshmidt, & O’Donnell, 2006). One study found a significant positive
correlation between schizotypy scores and total self-reported years of cannabis use (Skosnik et
al., 2006), and another showed that in individuals reporting cannabis use, average age of onset of
schizotypal symptoms preceded the age of initiation of cannabis use (Schiffman et al., 2005).
Bailey and Swallow (2004) found a broader set of associations between cannabis use and the
presence of positive, negative, and disorganized schizotypal characteristics among 60
undergraduates. However, some studies have suggested that individuals who use cannabis have lower negative schizotypal symptomatology than those not using the drug (Nunn et al., 2001; Schiffman et al., 2005).

Given the relative dearth of literature that has examined the relationship between schizotypy and substance use in large non-psychiatric samples, and the importance of emerging research in this area, this study examined associations between four domains of self-reported schizotypy (cognitive-perceptual, paranoid, negative, and disorganized) and the use of non-prescription substances of abuse (nicotine, alcohol, and cannabis) in a non-psychiatric sample of undergraduate college students at a large, urban university. This study attempted to elucidate how personality factors such as schizotypy potentially drive substance use behaviors, which has important implications for public health theory. Understanding more about the predictors of substance use is vital for the development of prevention and treatment efforts, especially in light of recent research that has shown that interventions targeting personality factors significantly reduce use of substances such as alcohol (Conrod, Castellanos, & Mackie, 2008).

2.0 Method

2.1 Participants

Participants consisted of a non-clinical sample (n=950) of undergraduate college students enrolled in classes at an urban state university in the southeastern United States. Students enrolled in introductory psychology classes from January 2007 to December 2007 were eligible for participation. Only those students between the ages of 18 and 26 years who spent at least 20 minutes completing the survey were included in the analyses, resulting in a final sample size of
n=825. Not all participants completed all measures; therefore, the total number of participants included in the different analyses varied across statistical tests.

2.2 Procedure

Students were invited to participate via a recruitment statement on an experiment management system, which is an online program used to manage the undergraduate research pool at the university. Interested students were required to read an IRB-approved online consent form before proceeding to the questionnaire, which implied their consent to participate. Participants anonymously completed a confidential, web-based survey, and received course credit in return for participation. Automated data entry produced computerized survey data files for data cleaning and data analysis.

2.3 Measures

The Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire (SPQ; Raine, 1991) is a 74-item self-report measure that is modeled on the nine criteria of schizotypal personality disorder as defined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition, Revised. The SPQ total scale score ranges from 0 to 74, given that each positively endorsed item counts one point. A confirmatory factor analysis (Compton, Goulding, McClure-Tone, & Bakeman, 2008) of the nine SPQ subscales with the sample in the current investigation revealed a best-fit model of four factors: cognitive-perceptual (odd beliefs and perceptual abnormalities); paranoid (ideas of reference, suspiciousness, and excessive social anxiety); negative (suspiciousness, excessive social anxiety, and constricted affect); and disorganized (eccentric behavior and odd speech). These four factors were used in all analyses.

Participants were also asked to provide information about their substance use histories with regard to three substances: nicotine (cigarette smoking), alcohol, and cannabis. For each
substance, they were asked: (1) whether or not they had ever used the substance (i.e., lifetime use); (2) if so, their age in years at first use; (3) whether or not they had used the substance in the past 90 days; and (4) if so, the average number of days (range=0–7) per week they had used the substance in the past 90 days. Individuals who reported lifetime use of cigarettes, alcohol, or cannabis were included in subsequent analyses with respect to their age at first use of the substance, whether or not they had used in the past 90 days, and their average daily use of the substance in the past 90 days.

2.4 Data Analysis

The relationships among the four factors of the SPQ and the substance use variables were examined using linear and logistic regression analyses, with age and sex included as covariates as appropriate, based on preliminary correlation analyses and t-tests. The four factors of the SPQ served as predictors of substance use, and each of the substance use variables served as dependent variables; this resulted in a total of twelve regression analyses. To limit the number of statistical analyses performed, the four factors of the SPQ were entered into one step of each regression model. Although the four SPQ subscales were moderately correlated, the large sample size and a subsequent examination of variance inflation factors, tolerance statistics, and confidence interval widths for each of the regression models safeguarded against the effects of potential multicollinearity.

3.0 Results

Table 1 provides sociodemographic characteristics of the sample as well as details regarding schizotypy and substance use. The average age of participants was 20.1 ± 1.7 years, and over three-quarters (637, 77.2%) were female. The large percentage of females was attributed to participants being recruited from an undergraduate introductory psychology course,
in which the majority of students tend to be female. Nearly half of the students (383, 46.4%) self-identified as White/Caucasian, 254 (30.8%) as Black/African American, 84 (10.2%) as Asian American, and 104 (12.6%) as of other races. The mean scores for the total SPQ, cognitive-perceptual, paranoid, negative, and disorganized factors were 22.98 ± 13.61 (range = 0–74), 3.95 ± 3.41 (range=0–16), 9.77 ± 5.60 (range=0–25), 9.94 ± 6.80 (range=0–33), and 5.26 ± 4.07 (range=0–16), respectively.

In preliminary analyses, relationships between several demographic characteristics and the substance use variables were examined. Student’s \( t \)-tests indicated that participants who reported lifetime use of cigarettes, alcohol, or cannabis, as well as use of alcohol or cannabis during the past 90 days, were more likely to be older than non-users. Pearson product moment correlations showed that age was also positively correlated with age at first use of alcohol and cannabis, as well as with average number of days per week that alcohol was used during the past 90 days. \( t \)-test results indicated that substance use differed between the sexes as well. Specifically, males were more likely than females to have used cannabis in the past 90 days, and to have used cannabis more frequently during the past 90 days. Given these findings, age and sex were entered as covariates in the regression models predicting substance use.

Preliminary analyses also examined the correlations and relationships within the four schizotypy domains and within among the substance use variables (Tables 2 and 3). As expected, these results showed moderate to large correlations among the four schizotypy domains as well as the twelve variables of substance use, with most relationships being statistically significant. However, as previously mentioned, the large sample size assisted in controlling for multicollinearity, although additional drug use was not controlled for during analyses of the effects on each individual drug to avoid removal of statistical effects.
A logistic regression revealed that a model containing all four factors of the SPQ significantly predicted lifetime use of cigarettes (Table 4). However, only the disorganized factor of the SPQ was a significant independent predictor, such that higher levels of disorganized schizotypy were predictive of ever having smoked. A separate logistic regression showed that a model containing all four factors also significantly predicted use of cigarettes in the past 90 days; the disorganized factor was a significant predictor. Again, higher scores on the disorganized factor significantly predicted cigarette use during the past 90 days. A linear regression revealed that a model containing the four SPQ factors did not significantly predict age at first use of cigarettes (Table 4). Finally, a separate linear regression showed that a model containing the four SPQ factors significantly predicted average daily use of cigarettes over the past 90 days, explaining 2% of the variance above and beyond age and sex. Within the model, only the disorganized factor was a significant individual predictor. Again, higher scores on the disorganized factor predicted greater average daily use of cigarettes.

A logistic regression revealed that a model including all four schizotypy domains did not significantly predict lifetime use of alcohol (Table 5); however, within the model, the disorganized schizotypy factor was a significant individual predictor. A separate logistic regression showed a model including all four factors also did not significantly predict use of alcohol in the past 90 days. However, the disorganized factor was individually predictive of alcohol use during the past 90 days. A linear regression revealed that a model with all four schizotypy factors did not significantly predict age at first use of alcohol, explaining only 1% of the variance (Table 5). Finally, a separate linear regression showed that a model including the four schizotypy domains significantly predicted average daily use of alcohol over the past 90 days.
days, explaining 4% of the variance. The disorganized factor was again a significant individual predictor, with greater disorganization predicting greater average daily use of alcohol.

Lastly, a logistic regression revealed that a model containing all four factors of the SPQ significantly predicted lifetime use of cannabis (Table 6). The disorganized factor of the SPQ was a significant individual predictor, such that higher levels of disorganized schizotypy were predictive of ever having used cannabis. A separate logistic regression showed that a model containing all four factors also significantly predicted cannabis use in the past 90 days; the disorganized factor was again a significant individual predictor. Similar to the effects seen regarding use of cigarettes and alcohol, higher scores on the disorganized factor significantly predicted cannabis use during the past 90 days. A linear regression revealed that a model containing the four SPQ factors did not significantly predict age at first use of cannabis (Table 6), explaining only 2% of the variance, and there were no significant individual predictors. Finally, a separate linear regression showed that a model containing the four SPQ factors significantly predicted average daily use of cannabis over the past 90 days, explaining 3% of the variance. Both the cognitive-perceptual and disorganized factors were significant individual predictors. Higher scores on both factors predicted greater average daily use of cannabis.

4.0 Discussion

This study provided descriptive information regarding various domains of schizotypy and substance use behaviors in a sample of undergraduate university students. Results showed that the overall level of schizotypy in this sample was comparable to that found in other normative samples that have included individuals of all ages, with studies reporting an average total SPQ score of around 24 (Hall & Habbits, 1996; Raine, 1991). Furthermore, results on rates of substance use in this sample showed rates of use that were similar to those reported by the most
recent National Survey on Drug Use and Health for individuals ages 12 and older (SAMHSA, 2008). However, use of cannabis in the past 90 days was slightly higher, at 22.4% of the sample, compared to 14.4% reporting use in the past month on the national health survey.

Results from the current analyses indicate that the disorganized factor of the SPQ had a significant and widespread association with substance use in this sample, such that higher disorganized schizotypy predicted greater likelihood of using substances and younger age at onset of substance use. Results also showed that the cognitive-perceptual factor had selective associations with substance use in this sample, such that it was significantly related to the use of cannabis. There was no evidence that the paranoid and negative factors had any relationship with use of any of the substances. However, with respect to the differential impact of various domains on particular substances, these findings should be interpreted with caution given the moderate correlations between use of nicotine, alcohol, and cannabis.

Regarding nicotine, past research has shown that individuals who smoke cigarettes report higher levels of schizotypy than do individuals who do not smoke (Allan et al., 1995; Joseph et al., 2003; Larrison et al., 1999; Wiles et al., 2006). The current study examined four domains of schizotypy rather than a total composite score including all domains, and results showed that individuals with higher disorganized schizotypy were more likely to report lifetime use of cigarettes, to have used cigarettes during the past 90 days, and to have used cigarettes more frequently during the past 90 days. Esterberg et al. (2008) also found that individuals who smoked cigarettes had higher scores on the disorganized factor of the SPQ; however, this relationship was only significant in relatives of patients with schizophrenia and not in non-psychiatric adult controls. Although the current study did not collect information on participants’ family history of mental illness, it is the first to reveal a relationship between a
specific domain of schizotypy, namely disorganized schizotypy, and cigarette smoking in a non-psychiatric sample.

Levels of disorganized schizotypy in this undergraduate sample also predicted lifetime use of alcohol, use of alcohol in the past 90 days, and greater average daily use of alcohol during the past 90 days. Past research has found alcohol use to relate to lower scores on measures of negative schizotypy (Nunn et al., 2001), delusional conviction, and positive schizotypy (Larrison et al., 1999). This is likely related to the social nature of alcohol use, especially in undergraduate populations. Those higher in positive and negative schizotypy may be less likely to participate in social situations that involve alcohol use, due to the unusual thoughts, anhedonia, and social withdrawal that these individuals typically experience. Contrary to these past studies, positive (i.e., cognitive-perceptual) and negative forms of schizotypy were not related to use of alcohol in the present sample. However, the current study is the first to suggest a potential relationship between greater disorganized schizotypy and alcohol use in a non-psychiatric sample of young adults.

Finally, regarding cannabis use, the cognitive-perceptual and the disorganized factors were significantly related to use of this substance. Most past research has revealed significant relationships between positive schizotypy and cannabis use (Compton et al., 2007; Schiffman et al., 2005; Skosnik et al., 2006). Mass et al. (2001) found, in a sample of university students, higher levels of schizotypy as measured by the SPQ in individuals who used cannabis. The findings of the current study replicate the association between positive schizotypy and cannabis use that has been found in previous research, though the cognitive-perceptual domain was only significantly associated with one of four measures of cannabis use, namely the average number of days used per week during the past 90 days. Furthermore, the findings herein are similar to
the results of Bailey and Swallow (2004), who discovered a positive association between disorganized schizotypy and cannabis use in a small sample of undergraduates.

In general, the fairly consistent association between the disorganized dimension of the SPQ and substance use was somewhat unexpected. Items in the odd or eccentric behavior subscale of the disorganized domain include: “Other people see me as slightly eccentric (odd),” and “People sometimes comment on my unusual mannerisms and habits.” Items in the odd speech subscale of the disorganized domain include: “People sometimes find it hard to understand what I am saying.” There are several potential explanations for this relationship between disorganized schizotypy and substance use. First, it could be that participants who engage in more frequent substance use are more likely to experience more frequent intoxication, which can manifest as behaviors that approximate disorganized schizotypy. For example, participants who are frequently intoxicated may understandably receive feedback from others describing them as odd or difficult to understand. Therefore, participants may be rating the effects of substance use rather than actual schizotypy.

Second, those participants who have high levels of schizotypy may be more likely to engage in substance use given as a function of their odd or eccentric behavior. Such behavior may lead these individuals to appear strange to others, and it is hypothesized that these characteristics might lead to greater social anxiety. This social anxiety may influence individuals high in disorganized schizotypy to engage in substance use to alleviate the stress experienced in social situations. Finally, the link between disorganized schizotypy and substance use could potentially be explained by a relationship between the underlying neurobiology of subtle disorganization and the neurobiology of addictive behaviors.
Several methodological limitations, inherent to the study design, should be considered. First, inferences about causality should be avoided given the cross-sectional nature of the study. Second, the original factor structure of the SPQ included some overlap between the three subscales; the factor structure used in the current study (i.e., four factors) also had some overlap, such that the suspiciousness and excessive social anxiety subscales were included in both the paranoid and the negative factors (Compton et al., 2008). Third, the measure of schizotypy was based on self-report rather than researchers’ ratings, and it is possible that some aspects of schizotypy may not be fully recognized by those who have such traits. Fourth, the study design utilized a web-based survey, which has inherent limitations that should be acknowledged; for example, lack of computer expertise could contribute to response errors.

Other limitations concern the generalizability of the current findings to the general population. Given that the sample was comprised of Younger individuals, such as the of undergraduate university students in this sample, it could be that younger individuals could display greater variability than older adults in their substance use behaviors. For example, college students may be more likely to engage in heavier or binge-type drinking behaviors. This greater variability in substance use behaviors has implications for detecting relationships with other variables such as personality; therefore, these findings may not generalize to other individuals who are not college students. Finally, given limited availability of comprehensive, self-administered substance use measures, the current study utilized single-item measures of substance use behavior, thus limiting our ability to conduct reliability and validity assessments.

Despite these limitations, this study is the first to examine multiple domains of schizotypy in relation to the use of several different substances using a reliable and valid measure of the multidimensional schizotypy construct. Furthermore, this study enrolled a large
sample, a characteristic that previous research has often lacked. This not only allowed for a robust investigation of different aspects of schizotypy, but also an examination of the associations between these constructs and the use of three different substances. Future research should attempt to include standardized measures of substance use to allow for comparisons across studies, and to ensure the reliable measurement of substance use behaviors.

Other future directions for research in this area include longitudinally assessing both schizotypy and substance use to inform causal models that address the potential reciprocal effects of subclinical psychiatric symptoms on substance use in healthy individuals, as well as how these two variables temporally relate to one another. It will be especially important to tease apart various substances to determine the differential impact of domains of schizotypy on different substances. Furthermore, given the relationship between schizotypy and schizophrenia and the high prevalence of substance use in individuals with schizophrenia, future research should attempt to examine the impact of family history of schizophrenia on the relationship between schizotypy and substance use. Finally, given that this study highlighted important links between personality variables and substance use, future research should focus on the importance of personality factors in the prevention and treatment of substance use.


Table 1. Sociodemographic, schizotypy, and substance use characteristics of sample (n = 825)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifetime use of cigarettes</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.1 ± 1.7</td>
<td>18 – 25.9</td>
<td>Use of cigarettes in past 90 days (of those who have used)</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female)</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Age at first use of cigarettes</td>
<td>15.6 ± 2.7</td>
<td>6 – 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Caucasian)</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Average days/week used cigarettes in past 90 days</td>
<td>0.9 ± 2.2</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (African American)</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Other)</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Use of alcohol in past 90 days (of those who have used)</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Total</td>
<td>22.9 ± 13.6</td>
<td>0 – 74</td>
<td>Age at first use of alcohol</td>
<td>15.9 ± 2.5</td>
<td>2 – 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Cognitive-perceptual</td>
<td>3.9 ± 3.4</td>
<td>0 – 16</td>
<td>Average days/week used alcohol in past 90 days</td>
<td>1.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Paranoid</td>
<td>9.8 ± 5.6</td>
<td>0 – 25</td>
<td>Lifetime use of cannabis</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Negative</td>
<td>9.9 ± 6.8</td>
<td>0 – 33</td>
<td>Use of cannabis in past 90 days (of those who have used)</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Disorganized</td>
<td>5.3 ± 4.1</td>
<td>0 – 16</td>
<td>Age at first use of cannabis</td>
<td>16.3 ± 2.5</td>
<td>8 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average days/week used cannabis in past 90 days</td>
<td>0.7 ± 1.7</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Intercorrelations among schizotypy domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schizotypy Domain</th>
<th>SPQ Cognitive-perceptual</th>
<th>SPQ Paranoid</th>
<th>SPQ Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Cognitive-perceptual</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Paranoid</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ Negative</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation significant at $p < 0.001$
Table 3. Intercorrelations and chi-square values for relationships among substance use variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Use Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of cigarettes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Used alcohol in past 90 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>120.63</strong></td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td><strong>103.43</strong></td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td><strong>247.89</strong></td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td><strong>108.43</strong></td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first use of cigarettes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average days per week used alcohol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used cigarettes in past 90 days</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lifetime use of cannabis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td><strong>39.35</strong></td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td><strong>84.33</strong></td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td><strong>140.68</strong></td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td><strong>111.31</strong></td>
<td>0.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average days per week used cigarettes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Age at first use of cannabis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Used cannabis in past 90 days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>120.63</strong></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td><strong>39.35</strong></td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>110.27**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td><strong>40.49</strong></td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first use of alcohol</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Average days per week used cannabis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Used alcohol in past 90 days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td><strong>84.33</strong></td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td><strong>136.92</strong></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td><strong>104.21</strong></td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average days per week used alcohol</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lifetime use of cannabis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Used cannabis in past 90 days</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Used cannabis in past 90 days</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>108.43</strong></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td><strong>111.31</strong></td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td><strong>40.49</strong></td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td><strong>104.21</strong></td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime use of alcohol</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Average days per week used cannabis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p < 0.05
** Significant at p < 0.01
Bolded values represent chi-square values
Table 4. Results of linear and logistic regression analyses pertaining to four schizotypy domains and nicotine use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPQ Domain</th>
<th>Lifetime use</th>
<th>Used in past 90 days</th>
<th>Age at first use</th>
<th>used in past 90 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n used = 394</td>
<td>n used = 216</td>
<td>Mean, 15.63 ± 2.66 years</td>
<td>Mean, 0.99 ± 2.18 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χ² = 19.26*</td>
<td>χ² = 21.51*</td>
<td>R² = 0.02</td>
<td>R² = 0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-Perceptual</td>
<td>1.03 0.98 – 1.09</td>
<td>1.03 0.97 – 1.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>1.02 0.96 – 1.07</td>
<td>1.03 0.97 – 1.09</td>
<td>0.05 0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0.96 0.92 – 1.00</td>
<td>0.97 0.92 – 1.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>1.08* 1.03 – 1.14</td>
<td>1.09* 1.03 – 1.15</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at \( p < 0.01 \)

1 SPQ domains entered into one step of the regression model
Table 5. Results of linear and logistic regression analyses pertaining to four schizotypy domains and alcohol use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPQ Domain</th>
<th>Lifetime use</th>
<th>Used in past 90 days</th>
<th>Age at first use</th>
<th>used in past 90 days</th>
<th>Average days/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n used = 669</td>
<td>n used = 533</td>
<td>Mean, 15.93 ± 2.49 years</td>
<td>Mean, 1.17 ± 1.45 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-Perceptual</td>
<td>χ² = 9.22</td>
<td>χ² = 7.59</td>
<td>R² = 0.01</td>
<td>R² = 0.04*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>1.04 0.96 – 1.12</td>
<td>1.01 0.96 – 1.08</td>
<td>-0.03 -0.62</td>
<td>0.06 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0.98 0.92 – 1.06</td>
<td>1.00 0.95 – 1.06</td>
<td>-0.09 -1.10</td>
<td>-0.09 -1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>0.98 0.93 – 1.04</td>
<td>0.98 0.94 – 1.02</td>
<td>0.14 1.76</td>
<td>0.04 0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 SPQ domains entered into one step of the regression model

* Significant at p < 0.05
Table 6. Results of linear and logistic regression analyses pertaining to four schizotypy domains and cannabis use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPQ Domain</th>
<th>Lifetime use</th>
<th>Used in past 90 days</th>
<th>Age at first use</th>
<th>Average days/week</th>
<th>Average days/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n used = 347</td>
<td>n used = 185</td>
<td>Mean, 16.28 ± 2.07 years</td>
<td>Mean, 0.65 ± 1.70 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-Perceptual</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 12.01^* )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 18.29^{**} )</td>
<td>( R^2 = 0.02 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = 0.03^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>OR 1.03 CI 0.98 – 1.09</td>
<td>OR 1.06 CI 0.99 – 1.12</td>
<td>β -0.04 t -0.51</td>
<td>β 0.10 t 2.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>OR 1.00 CI 0.95 – 1.06</td>
<td>OR 1.01 CI 0.96 – 1.08</td>
<td>β 0.05 t 0.50</td>
<td>β 0.02 t 0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>OR 0.99 CI 0.95 – 1.03</td>
<td>OR 0.97 CI 0.93 – 1.02</td>
<td>β 0.01 t 0.10</td>
<td>β -0.06 t -0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) SPQ domains entered into one step of the regression model

\(^*\) Significant at \( p < 0.05 \)

\(^{**}\) Significant at \( p < 0.01 \)