



UWL REPOSITORY
repository.uwl.ac.uk

Building secure attachments for primary school children: a mixed methods study

Ubha, Neerose and Cahill, Sharon (2014) Building secure attachments for primary school children: a mixed methods study. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 30 (3). pp. 272-292. ISSN 0266-7363

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2014.920304>

This is the Accepted Version of the final output.

UWL repository link: <https://repository.uwl.ac.uk/id/eprint/6564/>


Alternative formats: If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact: open.research@uwl.ac.uk

Copyright:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy: If you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact us at open.research@uwl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Rights Retention Statement:



Building Secure Attachments for Primary School Children: A mixed methods study

Journal:	<i>Educational Psychology in Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research
Keywords:	Attachment, Primary School Children, Mixed Methods, Secure base, Childrens Drawings

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





Figure 2: Children's total strengths and difficulties scores pre, post and follow-up to the secure friendships intervention group




The borderline banding scores for each corresponding scale is indicated following each chart. Scores above this figure are abnormal, whilst scores below are normal.

Borderline score: 16-19

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure 3: Children’s individual scores on the BIOS pre, post and follow-up to the secure friendships intervention group



BIOS Score for Self-esteem				
Very high	High	Average	Low	Very Low
4.5 – 5	3.5 – 4.5	2.5 – 3.5	1.5 – 2.5	1 – 1.5

Profiles of Behaviour based on Attachment behaviour characteristics pre and post intervention

Figure 4: Children's individual scores on the Profiles of Behaviour based on Attachment behaviour characteristics pre and post intervention



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 5: Child P pre-intervention Kinetic Family Drawing



view Only

Figure 6: Child P post-intervention Kinetic Family Drawing



View Only

Table 1: Pre and post-intervention themes

Pre-intervention Theme	Description and rule of theme
The need for being noticed	References made to being noticed and acknowledged by others
Difficulties in managing and articulating emotions	References made to anxieties about themselves and/or significant factors in their lives
Post-intervention Theme	Description and rule of theme
Forming a sense of belonging	Refers to feeling a sense of belongingness to others or to a place
Quality of friendships	Refers to friends and friendships, either with peers or adults in school

Introduction

In the U.K there has been recent increased emphasis and growing appreciation by Government that academic standards cannot be raised simply through addressing the quality of teaching alone (e.g. Every Child Matters, DfES, 2003; Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)/Social and Emotional Aspects of Development (SEAD) Strategies, DfES, 2005; National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidelines, 2008). As a result, a significant focus has been upon on the social and emotional well-being of children and young people and a need for early identification and prevention.

The school setting can present as a potential source of emotional well-being and resilience (DfES, 2003). Children spend a significant period of their lives at school, which provides essential opportunities for children to build consistent, trusting, secure relationships with adults, within which they can experience themselves positively, thus increasing their self-esteem and confidence. Secure attachments have been found to facilitate development of coping skills that promote optimum adjustment, which in turn, has been found to be an important protective factor for mental health in later childhood (Prior & Glaser, 2006). The quality of these relationships further influences the child's cognitive and social development, as well as school engagement (Dobbs & Arnold, 2009). Supportive teacher-child relationships have been shown to be more predictive of children's positive outcomes than are macro level factors such as programme policies and the quality of classroom environments (Mortiz-Rudasill & Rimm-Kaufman, 2009). Negative teacher-child relationships have been linked to poor behavioural and academic outcomes for young children (Decker, Dona, & Christenson, 2007; Garner & Waajid, 2008).

Classroom interactions differ between securely and insecurely attached children with their teachers. Relative to their need for emotional support, insecurely attached children tend to seek to their teachers at a higher frequency than their securely attached class peers (Sroufe, 1988; Sroufe et al., 1999), and often attempt to garner attention, whether positive or negative (Belsky & Fearson, 2002). Secure children accept the necessary support from their parents and teachers and seek help when

1
2
3 they need it, openly communicating their distress when tasks demands become
4 overwhelming (Bus & van Ijzendoorn, 1988).

5
6
7 Geddes (2006) highlighted that children bring their difficulties, frustrations, and
8 uncertainties into the school context, with particular expectations of how their teacher
9 will respond. The relationship between them and the teacher holds attachment
10 significance. From an attachment perspective, the child's internal representations of
11 parental sensitivity, availability and responsiveness inform expectations of
12 relationships with peers and adults outside the family. Attachment-based
13 interventions focussing on the quality of the teacher-pupil relationship is a significant
14 yet much neglected factor for positive adaptation to school (Kennedy & Kennedy,
15 2007).

16
17
18 Bowlby's (1969, 1973, 1980, 1988) work considered the formation of attachment,
19 separation and loss, and focussed on the process of attachment of children to their
20 caregivers. His theory of attachment has provided one framework for understanding
21 how children view themselves in relation to the social world.

22
23
24 Bowlby (1980) described attachment behaviour as a child's proximity seeking to the
25 attachment figure in the face of threat, with children developing adaptive patterns
26 which may function to elicit caring, support and nourishment from a primary
27 caregiver, typically their mother. In Bowlby's terms, a person who has experienced a
28 secure attachment is likely to possess a representational model of attachment
29 figure(s) as being available, responsive, and helpful. The person has a
30 complementary model of himself as '*... a potentially lovable and valuable person*'
31 (Bowlby, 1980, p.242) and is likely to '*approach the world with confidence and, when*
32 '*faced with potentially alarming situations, is likely to tackle them effectively or to seek*
33 '*help in doing so*' (Bowlby, 1973, p.208). Infants whose needs have not been
34 adequately met in this respect see the world as '*comfortless and unpredictable and*
35 '*they respond either by shrinking from it or doing battle with it*' (Bowlby, 1973, p.208).

36
37
38 Mary Ainsworth's famous observations of infants and mothers (Ainsworth , Salter, &
39 Bell, 1970; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) found that children demonstrate
40 a range of behaviours to achieve attachment defined as 'attachment behaviour'.
41 This concurred with Bowlby's belief in the proximity seeking of the infant when
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 activated by internal conditions such as hunger, cold or pain and by external
4 conditions which are frightening, causing the infant to seek contact with an
5 attachment figure.
6
7

8
9 Ainsworth observed how infants from 2 months onwards and increasingly through
10 their first year, actively sought interaction. Ainsworth and Wittig (1969) 'Strange
11 Situation' procedure measured the nature of the attachment bond between infant and
12 attachment-figure. Different patterns of response to the mother at reunion were
13 noted and four different attachment patterns identified:
14
15

- 16 • Secure
- 17 • Insecure-avoidant
- 18 • Insecure-resistant/ambivalent
- 19 • Insecure-disorganised/disorientated
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

27 The notion of an internal working model that controls the attachment behavioural
28 systems and can be changed over time with alternative experiences, allows for a
29 strong argument for the development of interventions which assist children in
30 establishing more positive internal representations of themselves in relationship to
31 others (Egeland, 2004).
32
33
34

35
36 The principal goal of this research was to explore the impact of an intervention,
37 which focused upon building the attachment between primary-aged pupils with
38 insecure attachment styles and an adult figure in school – the 'secure base' (Bowlby,
39 1988). There is accumulating evidence for the effectiveness of school-based
40 preventive intervention programmes for a wide variety of childhood or adolescent
41 problems, including aggressive or externalizing behaviours (Graham-Bermann,
42 Lynch, Banyard, DeVoe & Halabu, 2007; Shaw, Dishion, Supplee, Gardner &
43 Arnolds, 2006) and depressive symptoms (Horowitz & Garber, 2006).
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 The 'Nurture group' is one intervention strategy based in schools, introduced in 1969
51 by Marjorie Boxall, an Educational Psychologist. Boxall understood the children's
52 difficulties as the outcome of impoverished early nurturing, thus being unable to
53 make trusting relationships with adults or to respond appropriately to other children.
54 Nurture groups usually consist of 10-12 children, a class teacher and an assistant.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The children assessed and monitored using the Boxall profile. Nurture groups have
4 proven to be successful over the years in supporting pupil's social and emotional
5 difficulties in schools (e.g., Cooper & Tiknaz, 2005; Cooper & Whitbread, 2007; Seth-
6 Smith, Levi, Pratt, Fonagy & Jaffey, 2010).
7
8
9

10 Waters' (2004b) 'Therapeutic Story Writing' intervention was designed to support
11 pupils with emotional, behavioural and social difficulties at Key Stage 2. Using the
12 medium of story writing, children's emotional issues are addressed, where the child
13 explores and projects their own feelings onto different characters, scenes and plots,
14 of which they are the creators. Water's (2004a) evaluation of the therapeutic story
15 writing on a group of key stage 2 children found that they developed co-operative
16 and trusting relationships with peers, support listening and speaking skills and foster
17 interactive relationships between the teacher and group. Furthermore, Waters
18 (2004b) stressed the importance of the teacher in providing an emotionally secure
19 learning environment in which the child can feel safe enough to engage with their
20 inner story.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Rationale for current study**

33
34 The limited literature on the implementation of attachment-based interventions in the
35 school context justified the need for the current research. It was hoped that by
36 bridging the theory-into-practice gap, this research would address how attachment
37 theories can inform educational consultations and intervention practices for children.
38 This would support recent whole-school approaches and initiatives that have been
39 implemented in schools and contribute to government initiatives.
40
41
42
43
44

45 This research was based within a mainstream school within the Local Educational
46 Authority in which the researcher worked as an Educational Psychologist. Within
47 their professional role, the researcher continuously met children and young people in
48 schools who appeared to be displaying behaviours reflecting insecure attachments.
49 The researcher consulted with staff who were often stressed and distraught as to the
50 root of their pupil's difficulties. The researcher wanted to address these difficulties
51 with an approach that would support both staff and enhance outcomes for the
52 children.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This research developed an intervention called the 'Secure Friendships Group'
4 focussing on building pupil's attachment relationships in the school context. The
5 group intervention involved primary aged pupils who displayed insecure attachment
6 styles.
7
8
9

10 **AIMS**

- 11 1. To demonstrate that children's insecure attachment behaviours can change
12 positively
13
- 14 2. To demonstrate that school interventions can work/have a significant impact on
15 withdrawn and passive children (not just referring to CAMHS)
16
- 17 3. To demonstrate how staff can benefit from knowledge of attachment theory
18 (through teacher training, supervision, INSETS)
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Method**

26 **Design of evaluation**

27
28 The evaluation of this intervention study utilised a mixed methodology, with teachers
29 rating the children's behaviours on standardised measures pre and post intervention
30 complimented by semi-structured interviews with the children post intervention. This
31 was a QUAL (qualitative)-quant (quantitative) design with the qualitative data taking
32 precedence over the quantitative (Cresswell and Plano Clark, 2011). The researcher
33 adopted a critical realist position in order to use a 'triangulation' strategy allowing a
34 greater range of methods for data collection and from different sources. In this way it
35 was hoped that the findings would be enriched thus further enhancing the rigour,
36 breadth and richness of the research.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Participants**

47 All participants attended a mixed mainstream primary school (School 'M') in an outer
48 London borough. There were 264 students on role at the time with 1% of the
49 children having a statement of Special Educational Need and a further 11% on
50 School Action or School Action plus. School M had a diverse population that
51 included about a third of the students drawn from Black African backgrounds. The
52 remaining two thirds were from white British, Turkish, Greek, Indian and Black
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Caribbean backgrounds. A sample of 6 children from school years 2 – 4 (aged
4 between 7 - 9 years) was derived using criterion sampling as the children needed to
5 have met agreed criteria for attachment behaviour difficulties.
6
7

8 Inclusion Criteria for the Children: 9

- 10 ● Living with a primary caregiver (maternal mother)
- 11
- 12 ● English speaking
- 13
- 14 ● No medical difficulties
- 15
- 16 ● No specific learning difficulties
17

18 These children were selected on the basis that they were on the SEN Code of
19 Practice School Action or School Action Plus. In particular, passive and withdrawn
20 children who reflected characteristics of attachment difficulties were identified.
21

22 These children were not receiving any additional support for their identified
23 difficulties. This ensured that as far as possible any other support or interventions
24 could not be attributed for any progress seen in the children post intervention. The
25 final sample consisted of five children (1 white British, 2 black African and 2 black
26 Caribbean) three of whom were boys. There was no control group in this
27 research. All children were assigned pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Ethics** 35

36 Protection was ensured for all of the children during the research in that the methods
37 and measures being used aimed to be non-pressuring, child-friendly, and were
38 designed to avoid stress and distress. If stress and distress was experienced by the
39 children, they were free to withdraw without stating a reason. This was
40 communicated to the children by providing visual picture cards illustrating this
41 choice. No child withdrew during the research.
42
43
44
45
46

47 All parents / carers and children gave informed consent. The welfare of participants
48 was paramount throughout the research. The children were debriefed after data
49 collection, during which the researcher explained how the research aimed to build
50 the child's confidence, ability to make and keep friendships in school. Opportunities
51 for children to ask the researcher questions were given at the end of the interviews.
52
53
54
55

56 **The Intervention** 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The Secure Friendships group intervention ran weekly for approximately one and a
4 half hours and took place over 10 weeks. The group was led by the researcher and a
5 highly skilled learning support assistant (LSA), who was also a trained Learning
6 Mentor. The LSA was extremely familiar with the school, staff and children
7 (employed in the school for past 8 years) and was the 'Key attachment figure' in the
8 school setting. During the Secure Friendships sessions, the researcher's main role
9 was in supporting, facilitating and supervising the LSA. An adaptation of Waters
10 (2004) therapeutic story telling was used during the intervention sessions. Books
11 were purposefully selected in relation to their emotional content and events. By
12 telling a story from the selected books, the children were given opportunities to use
13 the metaphors in the stories to help them to deal with emotions and anxieties that
14 they may not have been able to face or talk about directly.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Figure 1 Structure and sequence of each session.
26
27

28
29
30 INSERT FIGURE 1

31 Measures

32
33 The following scales and measures were used pre and post intervention.
34

35
36 **The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman, 1997)** is a brief
37 behavioural screening questionnaire for 3-16 year old pupils focusing on 25
38 psychological attributes, 20 positive and 5 negative. These 25 items require the
39 adult to mark one of the three boxes which reflect the child best, selecting from 'not
40 true', 'somewhat true' or 'certainly true'. These are then scored using the scoring
41 scale. The 25 items are divided between 5 scales:
42
43
44
45

- 46 ● Emotional symptoms (5 items)
- 47 ● Conduct problems (5 items)
- 48 ● Hyperactivity (5 items)
- 49 ● Peer relationships problems (5 items)
- 50 ● Prosocial behaviour (5 items)
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3 The first four scale items scores are added together to generate a total difficulties
4 score. The fifth scale generates a positive score.
5
6

7 **The Boxall Profile (Bennathan and Boxall, 1998)** provides a framework for the
8 structured observation of children in the classroom. It involves the teacher scoring
9 two checklists, the first of which reveals how the pupil progressed through the early
10 learning processes and therefore how successfully they have organised their
11 experiences and internalised controls. The second checklist identifies behaviours
12 that inhibit or interfere with satisfactory involvement in school and suggests the
13 origins of this behaviour.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 **The Behavioural Indicators of Self-Esteem (BIOS) (Burnett, 1998)** is an
23 instrument designed to provide teachers and SENCOs in school with a means of
24 observing and recording the frequency of behaviours indicative of poor / good self-
25 esteem. It consists of 13 statements relating to a child's behaviour rated over several
26 weeks. The teacher is required to select one of five options (ranging from 'never' to
27 'always') which they consider best describe an individual child's behaviour.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **The Profile of Behaviour Based on Attachment Behaviour Characteristics**
34 **(PBABC)** (Geddes, 2009). The child's attachment behaviour is rated by the level of
35 concern about the characteristic (separation behaviour), ranging from 1 (very little
36 concern) to 5 (high level of concern). The total scores of attachment behaviour
37 difficulties range from 10 to 50. It is not a standardised tool but was developed in
38 order to help those professionals working with children to focus on aspects of
39 behaviour that have attachment significance and in turn inform understanding of
40 what could be inhibiting a child's engagement.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) (Burns & Kaufman, 1970)**. The rationale for using
48 drawings in this research was its typical perception as fun and non-threatening and it
49 does not require literacy or verbal skills (DiCarlo, Gibbons, Kaminsky, Wright &
50 Stiles, 2000). Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985) were the first to suggest those
51 children's drawings might be a rich way of capturing attachment representation, one
52 of the reasons being that the nonverbal nature of drawing may free the child to
53 express emotions and attitudes that are otherwise difficult to assess. KFD was used
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to gain a projective assessment of their attachment relationships. When
4 administering the KFD, the researcher asked the child to 'draw everyone in the family
5 doing something'. The child was provided with a plain piece of A4 paper and a
6 pencil. KFD can be useful for discussions about activities and relationships with the
7 family and open the opportunity for generating and refining hypotheses (Beaver,
8 2003).

13 **Semi-structured Interviews**

14
15
16
17 There are concerns about the ethical aspects of interviewing children (Brownlow &
18 O'Dell, 2002), which may be heightened when children with emotional and
19 behavioural difficulties are involved, due to their perceived vulnerability (Cooper,
20 2006). During the interviews, a reflexive approach hoped to enable the children to
21 give honest, authentic responses about aspects of themselves, their thoughts, their
22 feelings and values.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Data Collection Procedures Pre and Post Intervention**

29
30 The following outlines the data collection procedures for the evaluation of the
31 intervention. The SDQs, BIOS's, Boxall profiles and PBABC were given to the
32 children's class teachers to complete for the participating children one week before
33 the intervention began (stage 1). Following this the 5 children were interviewed by
34 the researcher, with each interview lasting approximately 45 minutes (stage 2).
35 During this interview the children completed the KFD drawings. Stages 1 and 2 were
36 repeated after the ten week intervention (becoming stages 3 and 4). The SDQ, BIOS
37 and Boxall profiles were also administered to the children's teachers three months
38 following the end of the intervention, to provide some measure of the longer term
39 impact of the intervention on the children's observed behaviours (stage 5).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data analysis**

49 Quantitative data analysis

50
51
52
53
54 The Boxall profile's manual was used to score, analyse and summarise the
55 children's behaviours. The PBABC were analysed through narratives of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 observations and scores both pre and post intervention. The children's scores on
4 the SDQ, BIOS were compared pre and post-intervention using descriptive statistics.
5
6

7 Qualitative

8
9
10 The Kinetic Family Drawings were interpreted using the KFD guide and Beaver's
11 work (2003).
12

13
14 The qualitative interview data was audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.
15 Thematic analysis was performed in relation to pre-determined themes (Hayes,
16 2000; Braun & Clarke, 2006). The predetermined or deductive themes were
17 extracted from key concepts of attachment theory.
18
19
20
21

22 **Findings**

23
24 As discussed earlier in this paper, the emphasis was on the qualitative data
25 produced by the interviews with the children. In this section a brief outline of the
26 quantitative data is reported in order to give the reader some context to the
27 qualitative data analysis presented. The observational aspects of the Boxall Profile
28 and the PBABC are discussed using a single case study. The remaining qualitative
29 data (interviews and drawings) are presented via the children's narrative and the
30 researcher's interpretation.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Quantitative Findings**

40 The overall quantitative findings of the research indicated that for the group of
41 children, the attachment-based intervention did have a positive impact on the
42 children's behaviours. The behaviour rating scales and profiles provided evidence
43 that the children had made progress in relation to their attachment behaviours and
44 difficulties.
45
46
47
48

49 **SDQ Scores**

50
51
52 INSERT FIGURE 2 Total Scores for SDQ
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Total scores for the SDQ were calculated pre, post intervention and at follow up ten
4 weeks later for all 5 children (Figure 2). The children's scores showed an overall
5 decrease in their total difficulties scores following the intervention and at follow up.
6
7

8 **BIOS Scores**

9
10
11
12
13
14 INSERT FIGURE 3 Total scores for BIOS
15
16
17

18
19 Total scores for the BIOS were calculated pre, post intervention and at follow up ten
20 weeks later for all 5 children (Figure 3). All five children's BIOS scores increased at
21 follow-up ten weeks later. For two of the children, child P and T, their scores
22 increased steadily between pre, post and follow up to the intervention. For children
23 F, J and J2, there was a slight decrease in their BIOS scores at post intervention,
24 with an increase greater than their initial pre intervention score at follow up.
25
26
27
28

29 **Profiles of Behaviour based on Attachment Behaviour characteristics**

30
31
32 Total scores for the Profiles of Behaviour were calculated pre, post intervention and
33 at follow up ten weeks later for all 5 children (Figure 4). The overall pattern of
34 PBABC showed a decrease in scores of attachment behaviour difficulties.
35
36

37
38 INSERT FIGURE 4 Total Scores for Profiles of Behaviour
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Qualitative Findings

Pre-intervention and Post-intervention Themes

Two themes are reported here both pre-intervention and post intervention, they were chosen to demonstrate the reported improvement in the children's relationships with their peers, family and teachers.

INSERT TABLE 1

The need to be noticed (pre-intervention)

This theme was identified in five children's accounts and was divided into two sub themes; social and emotional needs and adults acknowledging achievements.

Child F talked about how it was important that his teacher noticed that he was upset, (he had an argument with his friend) he needed someone to acknowledge that he was feeling sad. F did not feel that his emotion was being noticed by his teacher, and that this was something that he needed for him to feel better.

"...Yes it would be good if she saw me and then she comes over to me and tells me that she knows that I am angry and upset and maybe then she can talk to him and make it all o.k. and tell the horrible boys that they were horrible". C(F)

Another child talked about when she was feeling sad, the learning support assistant noticed and would often talk to her about her feelings. Child J2's comments reflect the importance of this in helping her to feel more confident:

"It does help me...when Mrs F tells me that I can come to her room and talk it does make me feel a lot better and I know then that I'll be alright and will be able to feel better for the rest of the day..." C(J2)

Adults acknowledging achievements via verbal comments, or other rewards were very important to these children. The need to be acknowledged for achievements by

1
2
3 the token of a certificate was important to one child as it was something visual and
4 concrete. Adults noticing and praising the children whilst they were behaving
5 appropriately provided the message that they were in the minds of the adults.
6
7

8 **Difficulty in managing and articulating emotions (pre-intervention)**

9
10
11 This theme was further divided into 'Managing emotions' and 'Difficulty in articulating
12 feelings'. The children reflected a need to be able to manage their emotions and in
13 particular, access self-help strategies:
14
15

16
17 *"I try to calm down...I count up to ten and then I try to breath out and then I calm*
18 *down but sometimes it doesn't always work and I don't feel better". C(P)*
19

20
21 Child J also talked about how difficult it was to calm down following feeling upset,
22 particularly if it was in relation to his favourite activity such as sport. J was often
23 observed by his teachers to be displaying anger and unable to manage this emotion:
24
25

26
27 *"I don't know...[shrugs] I can't always kind of get better because I am upset and I*
28 *don't know what I can do [shrugs]". C(J)*
29

30
31 The children had limited abilities to articulate their feelings, even in light of their
32 young age. It was as though the children were unaware of the social and emotional
33 aspects of themselves and unsure of how to put their emotions into words in order to
34 communicate them to an adult. Child P continuously looked down at her knees and
35 couldn't express in words her sad feelings:
36
37

38
39 *"I...[looks down at knees]...I...[shrugs]...she (referring to herself) might be sad and*
40 *feel....[shrugs]...I don't know...I don't know....[looks down at knees]". C(P)*
41
42

43
44 This brief narrative suggests that child P was an anxious child who had no or little
45 experience expressing her anxieties and or emotions.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Forming a sense of belongingness (post intervention)

'Being together as a group' and 'sense of security' were the two sub themes identified in the children's accounts. After the intervention the children's comments reflected a sense of belongingness; they felt more secure as a group not only within the Secure Friendships group but also in their own class groups:

"Like being in the Secure Friendships group, this one. I liked it and it was like this is my group and I come here every Wednesdays...and we all sit together and do all the things like news time and we share. I like it, it's really good". C(T)

Another child spoke about how he felt he was part of something special, similar to being in a family. The sense of sharing experiences and completing tasks together made him feel that they were all part of one unit. The children also expressed a feeling of safety and security both whilst within the intervention group and within themselves *following* the intervention. One child talked confidently about getting support from others:

"I can go in that room [pointed to adjacent room] and do my work and there are lots of things in there that I can use and I can ask Mrs F if I can use them...Ryan could do that on the island" (referring to a scenario in the interview question to a child 'Ryan' who was alone on an island and needed to seek help). C(J2)

J2 was now more confident that people in the school would help her if she approached them. She had an expectation that she would receive help, supporting the notion that her internal working model had shifted. This sense of security related to other figures in the school providing a 'secure base', a sense of predictability and security in which the child could feel a 'safe haven'.

Quality of Friendships (post intervention)

From pre-intervention analysis, there was more of a sense of the '*quantity*' of friendships assuming greater importance than the '*quality*' of the friendships.

1
2
3 However, during post-intervention analysis, the children were able to articulate more
4 about the quality of their friendships:
5
6

7 *“S is my friend. I think I get along with her ‘cos she really does listen to what I am*
8 *saying and when I am feeling a bit upset and nervous she knows that I am and she*
9 *helps me to get better.” C(J2)*
10
11

12 Friendship meant someone who was listening to what J2 was saying and
13 acknowledging times when she was feeling upset and nervous. Another child
14 reported on how special his friendship was with one child in particular:
15
16

17 *“He’s a really good friend to me ‘cos he makes me laugh when I am feeling a bit sad*
18 *..... He says nice things to me and we play together all the time like we are special*
19 *friends I think we are”. C(F)*
20
21
22

23 Child F was able to describe qualities of his friendship, “makes me laugh”, “says nice
24 things to me” and “play together”.
25
26
27

28 The children’s accounts also indicated a greater ability to manage conflicts with
29 others. One child reported how following a fight with another child, he was able to
30 manage this effectively by walking away:
31
32
33

34 *“I sometimes have a fight with him [child] like we shout but then after I walk away*
35 *from him it’s better and I am better. It doesn’t upset me and then I can stay on the*
36 *green and not get into trouble [behaviour reward policy in school]..... But not*
37 *always but now I can do this much much more”. C(J)*
38
39
40
41

42 Child J’s comments referred to a strategy that he used in order to avoid conflict at
43 the same time, J acknowledged that he was not always able to walking away to stay
44 out of trouble.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Case study of Kinetic Family Drawings of Child P**

53
54

55 P’s two drawings are presented here to again illustrate the improvement in the
56 children’s relationship skills and experiences.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT FIGURE 5 (pre-intervention drawing)

Main points interpreted from P's pre-intervention drawing:

In P's KFD, she drew herself on one side of a tennis game net and her two sisters on the other side. They were all drawn as playing singles tennis game although P was drawn by herself against the 2 'united' sisters. P's mum and dad can be seen in a car facing outwards, suggesting a sense of togetherness with one another but perhaps not with the children. These 'compartments' also suggested that the parents are functioning as a united unit within their relationships, but distinct from their children. It may also have suggested P's perception of her parents 'abandoning' her. P's brother is drawn at the top of the page and is watching television, indicating that he is an important family member. P's older sister is at the sink washing up, smiling and perhaps taking on an adult responsibility.

INSERT FIGURE 6 (post intervention drawing)

Main points interpreted from P's post intervention drawing:

All siblings are drawn playing football in a circle. P's brother is kicking a ball towards P who is raising her hand saying 'me'. This suggests that her brother is noticing her and attending to her needs when she requests it. This resembles a more secure individual with their needs being met. All family members have smiles. Mum and dad are again in a car facing forwards, with road marks on the page, suggesting that

1
2
3 they are confident in their directions and where they are going. Perhaps P is also
4 confident in their 'journey' and that she knows that they will return to her.
5
6
7

8 **Summary of differences for KFD pre and post-intervention for child P**

9
10
11 There appeared to be more of a sense of togetherness in P's post KFD and being
12 part of a social group. The children were drawn 'united' in the post drawing and
13 there was no net or barrier between them. The siblings were drawn to have a better
14 'sense' of themselves as they were drawn individually and independently. There
15 also appeared to be an equal status for everyone and P a feeling of safety and
16 security. Post intervention, P's drawing suggested that she was more confident that
17 when her parents left her, they would return and meet her needs.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 The overall findings of the research demonstrated that for this group of children, the
26 attachment-based intervention did have a positive impact on the children's
27 behaviours. The rich, descriptive qualitative data together with the behaviour rating
28 sales and profiles provided evidence that the children had made progress in relation
29 to their attachment behaviours and difficulties.
30
31
32
33

34 **Discussion**

35
36 The findings suggest that the IWMs of children with insecure attachments could be
37 positively shifted and thus have an impact on the social and emotional behaviours of
38 children. Howes (1999) stated: "*Internal Working Models form within relationships*
39 *and can, of course, be modified and 'disconfirmed' at any stage in the lifespan if*
40 *individuals experience new, influential attachment relationships"* (p.41). Secondly,
41 the findings suggest that children can form some type of attachment to adult figures
42 other than their primary caregiver. In this research, the learning mentor in the
43 intervention group represented the key attachment figure, and therefore appeared to
44 provide a much needed 'secure base' for the child. In Bion's (1993) theory of
45 thinking, he claimed that anxiety needs to be contained by a significant other in order
46 for the child to experience thinking and thus reduce their anxiety. The findings of this
47 research supported the notion of containment within this relationship would help
48 support the forming of a secure base.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Implications for EP Practice

The practical implications of this paper focus on the need for developing individualised, attachment interventions with teachers in order to facilitate children's perceptions of the teacher and school context as a secure base. Vulnerable pupils and those at risk should be identified in the early years. This is particularly important for those children who are often quiet, withdrawn and overlooked. By early identification, these children may be prevented from becoming overly aroused, so that their anxiety levels do not increase to extremes levels which may later become problematic. The child's needs should be addressed holistically (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Sameroff, Peck & Eccles, 2004). Interventions should be comprehensive and systemic in their efforts to address the multiplicity of factors that contribute to the pupil's difficulties.

The school context provides key opportunities for children to form strong attachment-like relationships with adults other than their parents, such as teachers or learning mentors. Few teachers or LSA's have sufficient training in psychological models such as attachment difficulties necessary to undertake work with these children. A whole-school approach can create a positive culture, focussing on shaping values, attitude and promoting trust, support and guidance for staff (Riley, 2010; Wetz, 2010). Gerda Hanco's (1985, 1990, 1995) 'Joint Problem Solving Workshop', reflects this approach, which consists of a work discussion group, for teaching staff, based on creating a 'safe' and 'secure thinking space' in which teachers and staff can present their experiences of challenging pupils. EPs can support schools in grasping and maximising these opportunities.

Further Research

Exploring how these children can use their 'altered' IWMs with their primary caregiver at home would provide deeper insight into their attachment behaviours and the more positive initiation of interactions between parent and child. The children's parent may be interviewed pre and post intervention to explore how the children's behaviours may have altered at home. This would provide greater evidence for whether the children's IWMs were significantly changed and generalised across multiple contexts. Further related research might also explore whether the social

1
2
3 and emotional skills acquired in the intervention group are transferred back into the
4 children's main classrooms.
5

6
7 Longitudinal studies and follow up gains could examine the impact of a longer
8 attachment based intervention within the school context where children are involved
9 over the course of six months to a year.
10
11

12 13 **Conclusion**

14
15 Intervening in the lives of children can be a challenging and dynamic process. This
16 paper provides a strategy for intervention and understanding behavioural and
17 emotional difficulties related to attachment. By providing a 'secure base' in the
18 school context, within a small group experience, the children's difficulties were
19 shown to be contained and managed. The research highlights the unique position of
20 the EP in supporting staff in schools in implementing individual and group
21 interventions, focussing on how children feel about themselves and their expectation
22 of others. Efficacy of these interventions may be enhanced if they are combined with
23 other interventions which target individual, dyadic, family, school and the community.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The core to Bowlby's attachment theory was the concept of early relationships
34 between infants and their caregivers leading to the formation of mental
35 representations of the self, others and the self in relation to others – the internal
36 working model (Bowlby, 1969). The possibility that this working model can be
37 positively shifted is an exciting and promising prospect. It is hoped that these
38 encouraging research findings will inspire those working with children in schools to
39 form attachment interventions for fragile and vulnerable children and ameliorate the
40 impact of insecure attachments.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **References**

54
55 Ainsworth, M. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44(4),
56 709-716.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ainsworth, M. & Wittig, D. (1969). Attachment and exploratory play behaviour of one
4 year olds in a strange situation. In B. Foss (Ed.) *Determinants of Infant Behaviour*
5 *IV*. London: Methuen.
6
7

8
9 Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of Attachment: A*
10 *Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
11

12
13 Ainsworth, M., D. Salter, & S. M. Bell. (1970). Attachment, Exploration, and
14 Separation: Illustrated by the Behaviour of One-Year-Olds in a Strange Situation.
15 *Child Development* 41, 49–67.
16
17

18
19 Beaver, R. (2003). *Educational Psychology Casework: A Practical Guide*. London:
20 Jessica Kingsley Publishing.
21

22
23 Belsky, J. & Fearson, R. M. (2002). Early attachment security, subsequent maternal
24 sensitivity and later child development: Does continuity in development depend upon
25 continuity of care giving? *Attachment & Human Development*, 3, 361-387.
26
27

28
29 Bennathan, M. & Boxall, M. (1998), *The Boxall Profile: Handbook for Teachers*, The
30 Nurture Group Network.
31

32
33 Bion W.R. (1984). *Second Thoughts: Selected Papers on Psychoanalysis*. London:
34 Maresfield Reprints.
35
36

37
38 Bion, W.R. (1993). *Second thoughts*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
39

40
41 Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss, Volume 1: Attachment*. London: Hogarth
42 Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
43

44
45 Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss, Volume 2: Separation: Anxiety and Anger*.
46 London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
47

48
49 Bowlby, J. (1975). *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 2*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
50

51
52 Bowlby, J. (1979). *The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds*. London:
53 Brunner-Routledge.
54

55
56 Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and Loss, Volume 3: Loss: Sadness and Depression*.
57 London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Pscyho-Analysis.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Bowlby, J. (1984). 'Caring for the young: influences on development'. In R. Cohen,
4 B. Cohler & S. Weissman (Eds.) *Parenthood: A Psychodynamic Perspective*. New
5 York: Guilford Press.
6
7

8
9 Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*.
10 London: Routledge.
11

12
13 Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative*
14 *research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
15
16

17
18 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: experiments by*
19 *nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
20

21
22 Brownlow, C. & O'Dell, L. (2002). Ethical Issues for Qualitative Research in On-line
23 Communities. *Disability & Society*, 17(6), 685-694
24

25
26 Burnett, P. C. (1998). Measuring behavioural indicators of self-esteem in the
27 classroom. *The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 37, 107-116.
28

29
30 Burns, R. C. & Kaufman, M. D. (1970). *Kinetic Family Drawings: An introduction to*
31 *understanding children through kinetic drawings*. London: Constable.
32

33
34 Bus, A.G., & Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1988). Mother-child interactions, attachment,
35 and emergent literacy: A cross-sectional study. *Child Development*, 59, 1262-1272.
36

37
38 Cooper, P. (2006). Awareness, understanding and the promotion of educational
39 engagement. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 11(3), 151-153.
40

41
42 Cooper, P. & Tiknaz, Y. (2005). Progress and challenge in Nurture Groups:
43 evidence from three case studies. *British Journal of Special Education*, 32(4), 211-
44 222.
45
46

47
48 Cooper, P. & Tiknaz, Y. (2007). *Nurture Groups in School and at Home: Connecting*
49 *with Children with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*. London: Jessica
50 Kingsley Publishers.
51

52
53
54 Cooper, P. & Whitebread, D. (2007) 'The Effectiveness of Nurture Groups: evidence
55 from a National Research Study', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 12(3), 171-
56 90.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed*
4 *methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

5
6
7 Decker, D.M., Dona, D.P. & Christenson, S.L. (2007). Behaviourally at-risk African
8 American students: The importance of student-teacher relationships for student
9 outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45(1), 83-109.

10
11
12 Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *Every Child Matters*. London: DfES.

13
14
15 Department for Education and Skills. (2005). *The Social and Emotional Aspects of*
16 *Learning*. London: DfES.

17
18
19 Dicarlo, M. A., Gibbons, J. L., Kaminsky, D.C., Wright, J. D. & Stiles, D. A. (2000).
20 Street children's drawings: Windows into their life circumstances and aspirations.
21 *International Social Work*, 43, 107-120.

22
23
24 Egeland, B. (2004). Attachment-based intervention programs for young children. In
25 R. E. Tremblay, R. G. Barr & R. Peters (Eds.) *Encyclopaedia on Early Childhood*
26 *Development*. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood
27 Development, 1-7.

28
29
30 Garner, P. W. & Waajid, B. (2008). *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*.
31 *Vol 29(2)*, 89-100.

32
33
34 Geddes, H. (2006). *Attachment in the classroom*. London: Worth Publishing Ltd.

35
36
37 Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note.
38 *Journal of Child Psychology, Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 38 (5), 581-586.

39
40
41 Graham-Bermann, S. A., Lynch, S., Banyard, V., DeVoe, E. & Halabu, H. (2007).
42 Community-based intervention for children exposed to intimate partner violence: An
43 efficacy trial, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75(2), 199-209.

44
45
46 Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K. & Waters, E. (2005). *Attachment from infancy to*
47 *adulthood: The major longitudinal studies*. New York: Guilford Press.

48
49
50 Hanko, G. (1985, 1990, 1995) *Special needs in ordinary classrooms: from staff*
51 *support to staff development*. Oxford: Blackwell.

1
2
3 Horowitz, J.L., & Garber, J. (2006). The prevention of depressive symptoms in
4 children and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*
5 *Psychology*, 74, 401-415.
6
7

8
9 Howes, C. (1999). Attachment relationships in the context of multiple caregivers. In
10 J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment* (pp.671-687). New York:
11 Milford Press.
12

13
14 Kennedy, J. H. & Kennedy, C. E. (2007). Attachments Theory: Implications for
15 School Psychology. *Journal of Early Childhood and Infant Psychology*, 3, 7-25.
16
17

18
19
20 Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and
21 adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.),
22 *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50 (1-2),209, 66-
23 106.
24
25
26

27
28
29 Moritz Rudasil, K. & Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. (2009). Teacher-child relationship
30 quality: The roles of child temperament and teacher-child interactions. *Early*
31 *Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24(2), 107-120.
32
33

34
35 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (2008). *Promoting children's*
36 *social and emotional wellbeing in primary education*. NICE public health guidance
37 12. London: Department of Health.
38
39

40
41 Prior, V. & Glaser, D. (2006), *Understanding Attachment and Attachment Disorders:*
42 *Theory, Evidence and Practice: Child and Adolescent Mental Health Series*.
43 London: Jessica Kingsley
44

45
46 Riley, P. (2010). *Attachment Theory and the Teacher-Student Relationship*.
47 London: Routledge.
48

49
50 Sameroff, A. J., Peck, S. C. & Eccles, J. S. (2004). Changing ecological
51 determinants of conduct problems from early adolescence to early adulthood.
52 *Development and psychopathology*, 16(4), 873-96.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Seth-Smith, F., Levi, N., Pratt, R., Fonagy, P. & Jaffey, D. (2010). Do Nurture
4 groups improve social, emotional and behavioural functioning of at risk children?
5 *Educational and Child Psychology*, 27(1), 21-34.
6
7

8
9 Shaw, D.S., Dishion, T.J., Supplee, L., Gardner, F., Arnds, K. (2006). Randomized
10 trial of a family-centered approach to the prevention of early conduct problems: 2-
11 year effects of the family check-up in early childhood. *Journal of Consulting and*
12 *Clinical Psychology*, 74,1-9
13
14

15
16 Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)/Social and Emotional Aspects of
17 Development (SEAD) Strategies, DfES, 2007, 2005; DCSF, 2008.
18
19

20
21 Sroufe, L. A. (1988). The role infant-caregiver attachment in development. In J.
22 Belsky & T. Nezworski (Eds.), *Clinical implications of attachment* (pp. 18-40).
23 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
24

25
26 Sroufe, L. A., Carlson, E., Levey, A. & Egeland, B. (1999). *Implications of*
27 *attachment for developmental psychopathology*, 11, 1-13.
28

29
30 Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., Carlson, E. A. & Collins, W. A. (2005). *The development*
31 *of the person: The Minnesota study of risk and adaptation from birth to adulthood*.
32 New York: Guilford Press.
33
34

35
36 Waters, T. (2004b). *Writing Stories with Feeling: An evaluation of the impact of*
37 *Therapeutic Story writing groups on Pupil's Learning*. Pilot Evaluation Report for the
38 Southeast Region Special Educational Needs Partnership.
39

40
41 Waters, T. (2004a). *Therapeutic Story Writing*. London: David Fulton.

42
43 Wetz, J. (2010). Is initial teacher training failing to meet the needs of all our young
44 people? Berkshire: Centre for British Teachers (CfBT) Education Trust.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60