# Making sense of voices

<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<ul><li>Prospectively registered</li><li>Protocol</li></ul>		
Completed	[X] Results		
Condition category	Individual participant data		
	No longer recruiting  Overall study status  Completed		

## Plain English summary of protocol

Plain English summary under review

# Contact information

### Type(s)

Scientific

#### Contact name

Dr Craig Steel

#### Contact details

Department of Psychology Whiteknights Campus University of Reading Reading United Kingdom RG6 6AL 0118 378 7550 c.steel@reading.ac.uk

# Type(s)

Public

#### Contact name

Dr Craig Steel

#### Contact details

Department of Psychology Whiteknights Campus University of Reading Reading United Kingdom RG6 6AL

# Additional identifiers

#### Protocol serial number

N/A

# Study information

#### Scientific Title

Making sense of voices: a case series

#### **Study objectives**

The main hypothesis to be tested is whether the Making Sense of Voices intervention will reduce the level of distress associated with the experience of hearing voices.

#### Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

#### Ethics approval(s)

NRES South Central Berkshire B, ref: 15/SC/0013

#### Study design

The study design is a multiple baseline case series design with a randomised duration of waitlist.

#### Primary study design

Interventional

#### Study type(s)

Treatment

#### Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Hearing voices

#### **Interventions**

#### 1. Phase 1: Assessment and construct:

The Maastricht Hearing Voices Interview: This is a clinical interview. For most voice hearers, the interview is part of an intervention as the conversation challenges cognitive avoidance of the topic.

The construct: The construct relates voices to the personal history of the voice hearing individual. Voice hearers acquire insight in the assumed original mechanisms of their voices. The individuals who represent the voices and the problems that the voices represent are identified. Making a construct is comparable with constructing a functional analysis as is done in behavioral therapy.

#### 2. Phase 2: Intervention:

The intervention is aimed at reducing distress, and improving the quality of the relationship between voice hearer and her/his voices. Often voice hearers experience an unequal relationship with their voices, where the voices dominate in a negative way and are responsible for

disturbing daily functioning.

To improve the relationship with the voices 3 types of methods are used:

- 2.1. Homework assignments: to communicate with the voices at a set time during each day.
- 2.2. Role play: to exercise how to communicate with the voices in the session
- 2.3. Talking with the voices: the therapist communicates indirectly or directly with the voices.

The communication with the voices is guided by the assumption that voice hearing is traumatic in origin and that the voices are signals to protect certain vulnerabilities. Many voice hearers experience their voices as attacking self esteem and self-efficacy; by this intervention the communication is bent towards voices as 'allies', from a destructive towards a constructive relationship.

#### Intervention Type

Other

#### Primary outcome(s)

Hallucination Change Scale (HCS). Each participant generates a narrative description of their auditory hallucinations (AH) scored for the 24-hour time period just prior to initiation of the trial, which was scored as a 10. The Hallucination Change Scale (HCS) is scored in subsequent assessments by requesting the patient to generate a new narrative description of AHs. Follow-up severity scores ranged from 0, corresponding to no hallucinations, to a maximum score of 20, corresponding to hallucinations twice as severe as baseline.

### Key secondary outcome(s))

- 1. Voice hearing:
- 1.1. Psychotic Symptoms Rating Scale (PSYRATS (AH)): 11 items completed on the basis of a clinical interview, and enables analysis in relation to voice distress specifically as well as a wider range of voice characteristics
- 1.2. Positive and Negative Symptom Scale (PANNS): A widely used clinical interview assessing a wide range of symptoms associated with a diagnosis of a psychotic disorder
- 1.3. Beliefs about Voices Scale (BAVQ-R). A 35-item self-report measure of the appraisals made in relation to a voice hearing experience
- 1.4. The Voice and You Rating Scale (VAY). A 28-item self-report measure assessing the relationship an individual has with their voices
- 1.5. The DAIMON Scale. A 28-item self-report measure assessing how an individual relates to a voice hearing experience
- 2. Anxiety and Depression:
- 2.1. Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD7). A 7-item self-report anxiety measure
- 2.2. Physical Health Questionnaire (GAD9). A 9-item self-report measure of depression
- 3. Dissociation:
- 3.1. Dissociative Experience Scale (DES). 28-item self-report measure
- 4. Wellbeing
- 4.1. Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWB) 14 item self-report measure
- 4.2. Self Compassion Scale (SCS) a 12 item self-report measure

#### Completion date

31/12/2016

# **Eligibility**

#### Key inclusion criteria

Participants will be eligible if they:

- 1. Report currently distressing voices as determined by a rating of 2 or above on the 'Intensity of Distress' item on the PSYRATS scale
- 2. Has had recorded contact and treatment from mental health services at the point of recruitment
- 3. Aged 18-65
- 4. No significant history of organic, or drug/alcohol factors implicated in the aetiology of psychotic symptoms
- 5. English speaking
- 6. Provides informed patient consent
- 7. Not receiving care from a learning disability service
- 8. Has a fixed abode. Having a fixed abode is operationalised as having a current address (including B&B or open access hostel) and evidence (e.g. from key worker) indicating that the person is more likely than not to have a reliable address throughout the 2 years. Although the exclusion of those with no fixed abode may limit the sample, this is a necessary restriction to avoid inevitable sample attrition from this group

#### Participant type(s)

**Patient** 

#### Healthy volunteers allowed

No

### Age group

Adult

#### Lower age limit

18 years

#### Upper age limit

65 years

#### Sex

All

#### Total final enrolment

15

#### Key exclusion criteria

- 1. Unable to provide informed consent
- 2. Unable to communicate sufficiently in English
- 3. Of no fixed abode

#### Date of first enrolment

01/05/2015

#### Date of final enrolment

# Locations

#### Countries of recruitment

United Kingdom

England

# Study participating centre Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust

Fitzwilliam House
Skimped Hill Lane
Bracknell
United Kingdom
RG12 1BQ

# Sponsor information

### Organisation

Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust

#### **ROR**

https://ror.org/03t542436

# Funder(s)

# Funder type

University/education

#### **Funder Name**

University of Reading

# Alternative Name(s)

UoR

### **Funding Body Type**

Private sector organisation

### **Funding Body Subtype**

Universities (academic only)

# Location

United Kingdom

# **Results and Publications**

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

# IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration

# **Study outputs**

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Results article	results	02/01/2019	26/06/2020	Yes	No
HRA research summary			28/06/2023		No
Participant information sheet	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes