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ABSTRACT

The Child Attachment Interview (CAI) is being developed to explore children’s mental representations of attachment as manifested through the content of their language and behaviour. The attachment measure intends to bridge the gap that currently exists for children in middle childhood (aged 8-12). This study has explored the psychometric properties of the CAI in an effort to determine its reliability and validity. The sample consisted of 15 mothers who had 30 children between them. The mothers were administered the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) and the thirty children were administered the CAI. A re-administration of the CAI was carried out on 28 of these children approximately two months later in order to evaluate test-rest reliability. The reliability of the CAI classifications proved to be high over time, suggesting a stability of responses across time. Inter-rater reliability was also established at a high level and the internal test construction was found to be very satisfactory. To examine the CAI’s discriminant validity, the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children -Third Edition (WISC-III UK), and the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-Revised (CELF-R UK) were administered. Parents also completed the Child Behaviour Check List (CBCL) to measure for clinical morbidity. Concurrent validity was assessed by observing the correlation between the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) and the CAI. Predictive validity was assessed through the mother’s interview transcripts from the AAI. The CAI classifications were found to be independent of demographic variables such as, gender, age, social economic class, one or two parent households and ethnicity. The classifications were also independent of discriminant variables such as, intelligence,
language ability and clinical morbidity. Only a weak correlation was found between the
SAT and the CAI. However, the reliability and validity of the SAT is questionable. Clear
evidence of the predictive validity of the CAI was demonstrated by a 68% concordance
rate between mother and child interviews, which is consistent with previous research
findings. In summary, the evidence for the psychometric properties of the CAI seems
encouraging. However, concurrent validity needs to be established.
Chapter 1.

INTRODUCTION

The Early History of Attachment Theory

In the 1950’s and 60’s John Bowlby, a British psychoanalyst, developed attachment theory to account for psychopathology in personality development that could not easily be explained by psychoanalytic theories. Attachment theory is now widely regarded as one of the most viable, most promising theories of personality and social development.

Unlike other theories of social behaviour, personality development and emotional bonds, this theory has evolved through direct observations and scientific analyses of data. Many of its propositions are now empirically testable hypotheses as a result of modifying the theory to fit the data. Hence, the theory and the research have evolved together and still continue to evolve.

Attachment theory integrates insights and data from four different domains: ethology, control systems, cognitive psychology and psychoanalysis. Ethology is the science of animal behaviour in their natural habitat. Control systems theory focuses on how elements in a system influence each other, with hierarchies of goals and plans determining observable responses. Cognitive psychology is the study of how people think, how they mentally represent reality and organise their representations of it, and how they interpret, screen, reorganise and recall information. Psychoanalysis is the study of the unconscious affective and cognitive processes and their effects on personality and behaviour. Contributions from these four domains have enriched attachment theory and its application to intimate human relationships from infancy through to adulthood.
This thesis introduces the major concepts in attachment theory and describes some of the well established findings from early research. Then it introduces the different measurement yardsticks used for assessing attachment in infancy, preschoolers and in adulthood, highlighting the measurement gap.

For the first decade of attachment research, almost all of the research focused on infancy. There are subsequently three major methods for assessing attachments in infancy: the naturalistic observations, the Strange Situation and the attachment Q-set. Each will be described as they inform how the construct of attachment has become measurable.

The goal of attachment research is to recognize and understand patterns of behaviour and their function in real life. In addition to being naturalistic, observations must be both longitudinal and lengthy to be maximally useful. Mary Ainsworth's (1967) two early studies are excellent examples of what can be done and learnt through the realm of longitudinal naturalistic observations. Her studies in Uganda and Baltimore focused on infant mother attachment by observing babies, toddlers and their mothers in their homes and their child-rearing practices. She recorded the occurrence and onset of specific behaviours related to attachment. Through these observations she was able to distinguish three groups of babies: those who were securely attached, and cried less than others, those who were insecurely attached, and cried more than others, and those who were not yet attached, (defined in this way because they did not respond to the mother differently from the way they responded to other adults). Ainsworth was not only able to describe the phases of attachment but also relate the security of the infant's attachment to an indirect measure of the quality of care the mother gave. The measure was rated on the
excellence of the mother as an informant about her baby, and a rating based on interviews that took place over a series of visits.

Guided by the observations made from those studies Ainsworth and Wittig (1969) developed the ‘Strange Situation’ laboratory procedure. The laboratory situation was set up to activate the attachment system at a level not routinely observed in the home and perhaps to dramatise individual differences in the organisation of attachment behaviour.

The Strange Situation consists of eight episodes which are as follows: mother and infant are introduced to a laboratory play room where they are later joined by an unfamiliar woman; while the stranger plays with the baby, the mother leaves briefly then later returns; a second separation ensues during which the baby is completely alone; finally, the stranger returns, followed later by the mother. This enables observers to see how the baby organises behaviour in relation to each, and to compare their effectiveness in soothing the baby if he or she becomes upset. Using Ainsworth et al., (1978) guidelines the intensity of the interactive behaviours is coded into three categories.

The A Category - Avoidant Attachment with two sub groups.

The B Category - Secure Attachment with four sub-groups.

The C Category - Resistant Attachment with two subgroups.

Babies who fall into group ‘A’ show conspicuous avoidance of proximity to, or interaction with the mother in the reunion episodes. Those in sub-group A1 ignore the mother almost completely, those in sub group A2 show moderate proximity - seeking behaviour mixed with strong proximity avoiding behaviour.
Babies who fall into group ‘B’ (Secure Attachment) actively seek proximity to and contact with the mother, or at least interaction with her, especially in the reunion episodes. Babies in sub-group B1 show strong initiative in interaction across a distance. Babies in subgroup B2 seek proximity and contact with the mother more than B1 babies do, but less than B3 babies do. B1 and B2 babies sometimes show some avoidant behaviour especially in the second reunion. B3 often regarded as the most securely attached, actively seek and maintain physical contact with the mother. B4 was initially defined as wholly preoccupied with the mother throughout the Strange Situation but Ainsworth remained open to clarification and partial redefinition of this category.

Babies classified into category ‘C’ show moderate or strong resistance to their mothers. Babies in sub-category C1 show strong proximity seeking and contact maintaining behaviour, but also show obvious resistance. Those in sub-group C2 show conspicuous passivity towards their mothers. They are less active and seem less competent than other babies. During the reunion episodes they are more likely to cry and look helpless than to crawl to their parents. They demonstrate their resistance by fussing, refusing to play with toys, resisting contact and resisting interference, but are not as energetically fierce as babies in the C1 category. These babies were originally labelled as anxious ambivalent by Ainsworth et al. (1978). They may also be referred to as resistant as this is their defining characteristic (Colin, 1996).

Following on from Ainsworth and colleagues’ lead, Main and Solomon (1986) developed the ‘D’ category which was applied to infants who appeared to have no coherent strategies for handling separations and reunions. They identified three possible subgroups within the ‘D’ category: depressed, apprehensive and avoidant/resistant. These
are tentative descriptions as the researchers noted that many group ‘D’ babies do not fit any of the three subgroups.

**Validity of the Strange Situation**

To be valid the Strange Situation must accurately assess the pattern of a baby’s attachment behaviour and the pattern observed in the laboratory must have a meaningful relation to the pattern of the baby’s behaviour in a natural setting.

Lamb and colleagues (1985) did a detailed review to examine the validity of the Strange Situation, they concluded from their findings that the Strange Situation does appear to have convincing levels of construct validity. That is it accurately measures what it is supposed to measure, namely the quality of an infant’s attachment to a caregiver. The Strange Situation categories have convincing external validity, both concurrent and predictive as they measure how the baby is doing around the time of the strange situation assessment (concurrent validity) and also measure how the child should develop later in life (predictive validity).

However, the naturalistic observations and the Strange Situation do have limitations. Naturalistic observations are lengthy and expensive and as a result hardly ever conducted. The coding system for the Strange Situation is valid for a very limited age range (eleven to eighteen months). The procedure cannot be repeated too soon without compromising the validity of the assessment. It can also be inconvenient for caregivers to bring their babies to the laboratory. Prompted by the limitations of these methods, Waters and Deane (1985) developed the Attachment Q-set. They designed their measure with Bowlby’s control systems model of attachment in mind. They wanted to
measure the degree to which the young child (twelve to thirty-six months) used the attachment figure as a secure base across time and in different situations.

**The Attachment Q-Set**

The Attachment Q-set consists of 90 descriptive statements which refer to some specific behaviour and taps one of the following constructs: security, detachment, self-efficacy, aspects of object orientation, communication skills, predominant mood, response to physical comforting, fearfulness, anger and trust. The items use non-evaluative terms to reduce the risk of observer bias. For example, one item says the child actively solicits comforting when distressed.

An observer sorts the items into three piles then sub-divides those three into nine piles ranging from the least to the most characteristics of the child, in each case. The observer works from outer piles towards the centre so that the final result is a unimodal and symmetrical array of items. Each pile has a predetermined number of behavioural items in it so that a score can be given based on its placement. For example, each of the five items in the first pile (the pile of statements that are least characteristic of the child), gets a score of one. Each of the eight items in the next pile gets a score of two, and so on. The five items in the last pile each get a score of nine. When two or more observers use the Q-set to describe the same child, the investigator can form a composite description of the child by averaging the scores each observer gives for the same item. The observers are either trained research assistants or the child’s usual caregiver, who will have been familiarised with the procedure for sorting the items. The caregiver observes the child for a week with the expectation of completing the full nine pile Q-sort at the end of the week,
then observes for another week and provides another sort. Any Q-sort is a forced choice procedure. High or low scores are not likely to occur by chance because a fixed number of items must be in each pile when the sorting is done. The data from a Q-sort can be analysed in different ways. Waters and Deane (1985) recommend comparing the Q-sort description of each subject with a criterion sort provided by experts. The purpose of the criterion sort is to provide operational definitions of the constructs of security, dependency and sociability.

Measurement Reliability

The Attachment Q-set has several advantages compared with the Strange Situation. It rates the degree of security on a scale; it can be repeated almost as soon, and as often, as an investigator wishes; it can be administered almost anywhere and natural caregivers can provide the data. In order to establish whether the measure is reliable there is a need to demonstrate that observers can provide reliable data. Mothers, fathers and other regular caregivers are the obvious observers as they know most about their children. However, they may say their children’s behaviour is more desirable than it really is, and some mothers may have a defensive preoccupation that prevents them from perceiving their children’s behaviour accurately.

Research assistants are less likely to be biased, however they have less opportunity to observe the child. Waters and Deane (1985) noted a high positive correlation between trained observers Q-set scores who observed the children twice for two, three to four hours, and mother’s Q-set scores. The authors conclude that their results indicate that both trained observers and mothers can provide reliable data.
Construct Validity

In order to establish the validity of the Attachment Q-set it is necessary for researchers to demonstrate that children who get higher scores for security also get scored as more secure on some other adequately validated measures of security of attachment. The ultimate criterion is verification by lengthy naturalistic observations. Do parents’ Q-set descriptions match what an objective observer would see over a period of months or is 6-8 hours of observation sufficient time to reflect the pattern of behaviour? Neither question has been empirically addressed. The other validated measure of security of attachment is the Strange Situation.

Researchers such as Belsky and Rovine (1990) found a very high correlation with security scores and social desirability scores from mother’s Q-set descriptions of their children. After adjusting statistically for social desirability, the security scores from the mothers Q-set were associated with Strange Situation classifications. Van Dam and Van Ijzendoorn (1988) also obtained similar results in a study of 39 toddlers. The test-retest reliability scores for security, dependency, sociability, and social desirability from the Q-set were good. Other researchers such as Vaughn and Waters (1990) and Valenzuela and Lara (cited in Main, 1990) have also found significant associations between Strange Situation classifications and observer Q-set descriptions. Although the validity of the Q-set has not yet been fully established, the early results on measures of validity are hopeful and warrant continued exploration of the measure.
Assessment in Childhood

Several promising approaches have emerged to assess patterns of attachment and degrees of security in children who are 3-7 years old. In childhood, as in infancy, we must rely on behaviour to make inferences about security of attachment, but behaviour becomes more subtle and complicated with age. By the age of three years, the arrival of language and increasing psychological development allows more complex and appropriate ways of measuring attachment. Attachment research has sought to elucidate attachment patterns via representational models. Bowlby (1969, 1982, 1973, 1980) certainly introduced a number of important ideas about representational models. He defined a representational model or working model as an individual’s conscious and unconscious representation of the world and himself in it. The models include affective and cognitive components that act as an appraisal system and a guide to understanding the meaning of an event and selecting a response. Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1995) and Bretherton (1991) have added considerable detail to the theory of development and effects of representational models. The measure needed should yield information about the child’s self-reliance, defensiveness, anger and their confidence about their parents availability and supportiveness. It should also yield information about how the child represents his/her model of attachment relationships.

The most widely used approaches to assessing patterns of attachment in preschoolers and in children who are about six years old rely on the separation reunion paradigms. Most of the researchers investigating possible methods of assessment have concluded that Ainsworth’s Strange Situation procedure, with minor modifications because of the child’s pre-school cognitive and linguistic skills, works well for
illuminating patterns of attachment behaviour and the underlying representational models. Two different systems, the Cassidy-Marvin system (Cassidy et al., 1992) and the Miami system (Crittenden, 1991) have been developed for interpreting, coding and classifying the behavioural data from 3 and 4 year olds. In addition, Bretherton et al. (1990) devised a system for drawing inferences about representational models of attachment from pre-schoolers' completions of a set of stories about separations from the parents. The researchers who developed the system recommend supplementing reunion data with another source of information about the security and pattern of the child's attachment. These and other methods of assessing security of attachment in pre-schoolers and somewhat older children are introduced below.

**Pre-schoolers: Separation-Reunion Paradigms**

After much experimentation with a variety of separation reunion paradigms, most of the researchers investigating possible methods of assessment have concluded that Ainsworth's Strange Situation procedure if modified, (by increasing the separation time) does indeed present enough stress to make assessment of pre-school attachment possible. The coding manuals for scoring and interpreting the behaviour differ noticeably as they account for the cognitive and linguistic skills, however the assessment procedure is almost identical.

**The Cassidy-Marvin System**

The first three categories in the Cassidy and Marvin system are closely analogous to the secure, avoidant, and resistant classifications for infants in the Strange Situation.
The fourth category, insecure -disorganised-controlling, matches a classification Main and Cassidy (1988) developed for the reunion behaviour of 6 year olds, many of whom had been classified as anxious in infancy.

Cassidy et al. (1992) reported that the pre-school coding system uses ‘age appropriate manifestations’ of proximity seeking, contact maintaining, resistance and avoidance. To develop their system of coding and classifying the attachments of children who are two and a half to four and a half years old, Cassidy et al. (1992) system closely resembled the Main and Cassidy system for children who were 5 to 7 years old, which was validated with reference to the infant Strange Situation categories. This is a reasonable scientific approach to developing and beginning to validate assessment systems as it is easier to study continuity and change over time. However, this approach assumes that the same four categories are in fact useful and appropriate for classifying the organisation of attachment at each age. To date this assumption is untested and could possibly be incorrect. Researchers need to obtain data about whether this system for classifying pre-school attachment produces classifications that reflect the child’s history, correlate with the child’s current functioning, and predict the child’s future function in ways that are congruent with attachment theory.

The Miami System

Crittenden (1991, 1992a) developed the Miami system of classification. Her theoretical perspective was influenced by her observations of abused and neglected children. Instead of classifying the children entirely on their behaviour like the Strange Situation classifications the Miami system takes into account the regulation of feeling
Validation of the Miami system came from associations between attachment classifications based on this system and concurrent data about the same dyad in other settings. The mother’s sensitivity to the child during the dyadic interaction and the overall quality of child rearing were related to attachment classifications.

Both the Cassidy and Marvin system and the Miami system have produced meaningful results in relation to other data from prior, concurrent or later assessments. Efforts to improve each system are still ongoing.

**Pre-schoolers: Story Completion**

Bretherton, Ridgeway, and Casey (1990) attempted to access three year olds’ representational models by giving them a set of stories to complete about issues relevant to attachment. The experimenter tells the child the beginning of a story and then asks the child to show and tell him/her what happens next. The child has small family figures with which to act out an ending to the story.

In the first story the child spills juice and the mother responds. In the second, the child falls and hurts her knee. In the third, the child is sent upstairs to bed and then cries out that there is a monster in the bedroom. In the fourth, the parents leave for an overnight trip, leaving a grandmother to look after the two children. In the final story, the grandmother looks out of the window the next morning and tells the children the parents are coming back. The stories provide opportunities for the child to reveal expectations
about the attachment figure as an authority figure and as a source of comfort in times of
pain or fear about separations.

The classifications based on the story completion were compared with the
classifications of reunion behaviour using the Cassidy-Marvin criteria, the results
indicated a significant level of agreement as seventy-five per cent of the children received
concordant classifications. However, classifications of the type of insecurity were not
consistent across procedures. If both the story completions and the Q-sets were valid
measures of attachment, the security and insecurity scores should have been highly
correlated. The story completion assessment is still experimental. Bretherton et al. (1990)
suggest that extensive naturalistic observations would be valuable for validating any
method of assessing attachment in pre-schoolers.

Assessment around Six year olds: Reunion Behaviour

Main, Kaplan, and Cassidy (1985) undertook a follow-up study known as the Berkeley
Social Development Project. They assessed forty children near their sixth birthdays
whose attachment to both parents had already been studied in infancy. The Berkeley
researchers developed several measures based on the separation/reunion paradigms as this
is the principal source of evidence about patterns of attachment in infants in the Strange
Situation. Main and her colleagues planned an hour’s separation as they anticipated that a
separation of only a few minutes may not activate attachment behaviour.

On arrival at the laboratory a member of the research team took a photo of the
child and his or her parents. Next, the family watched a film about changes in a two year
olds behaviour as he underwent a 10 day separation from his mother. Then the parents left for different offices.

A female examiner then interacted with the child for fifteen to twenty minutes after the parents left. Next, she administered the Klagsbrun-Bowlby (1976) version of the Hansburg Separation Anxiety Test (HSAT) which is described in the next section. The child was then presented the family photo and their reaction was observed. Following this, the child had a period of free play until the parent returned.

The principal measure for security of attachment was based on the child’s response to being reunited with their parent. The parents returned separately and each of their reunions was videotaped for three minutes.

The video tapes were carefully viewed repeatedly and a coding system was developed based on the quality of the reunion behaviour. The working definition of secure attachment was: confidence that the attachment figure was accessible and would show warm interest in the child. The working definition of avoidance was: the masking of anger, affection, discomfort, distress and the desire for closeness. Cassidy did most of the viewing and reviewing whilst remaining blind to the Strange Situation classifications.

**The Hansburg Separation Anxiety Test**

The Hansburg Separation Anxiety Test (HSAT) is a projective test originally developed by Hansburg (1972) for adolescents but adapted for four to seven year olds by Klagsbrun and Bowlby (1976) and further modified Main et al. (1985) from which the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) was developed with the Berkeley sample of six year olds. The original test procedure is as follows; the examiner presents the child with six
photographs of young children experiencing separations from their parents, one photograph at a time. In the mildest example, the parents are saying goodnight. In three others; one depicts the parents asking the child to play while they talk, in the second the parents bring the child for their first day of school, and in the third the parents leave for the weekend. The most intense scenario depicts the parents leaving for a two week trip. The children in the pictures are approximately four to seven years old. The protagonist in the photographs corresponds to the gender of the child being tested.

The examiner tells the child, ‘Parents worry sometimes what children think when they have to go away for a while’ and asks the child, ‘Tell me what you think a child your age would do when parents go away for a little while.’ After showing the child each picture the examiner asks the child what the child in the picture would feel and what the child in the picture would do.

The children’s verbal and affective responses are scored for emotional openness which is defined by the child’s ability to imagine appropriate negative affects (loneliness, sadness, fear, anger) and their ability to give reasons for why the child might feel this way. The underlying assumption of the SAT is that children will project onto the child in the picture their attachment related feelings and experiences and thus their internal representations of attachment relationships. It was predicted that emotional openness would reflect security of attachment.

Main et al. (1985) also developed a scale for coding the child’s expressed coping strategies in response to a picture of parents leaving for a two week holiday. The highest scores are given for the child actively persuading the parents not to go or by preventing the separation by other means such as hiding in the boot. High scores are also given if the
child expresses their anger or distress. The strategic coping score for the response to this single question was strongly correlated with security of attachment in infancy with the Berkeley sample.

The children of the Berkeley sample were also assessed for their response to a family photograph. Using videotapes, judges were asked to estimate the security of the child’s feelings about his or her family. Children were rated ‘secure’ if they readily accepted the photograph, smiled and made positive comments. They were considered insecure if they actively turned away from the picture or refused to accept it.

There was a strong correlation between response to the family photograph and security of attachment to the mother in infancy.

**Validity of Measures in the Berkeley Study**

Main et al. (1985) suggest the measures used to classify reunion behaviours and the responses to the family photo both strongly correlated with the measures of security of attachment to the mother in infancy. This, they suggest not only is evidence of validity but also evidence that security of attachment is highly stable from infancy to age six in stable middle class families. However, both measures require replication before we can gauge their accuracy with any confidence.

The adapted HSAT was found to have a strong correlation with security of attachment to the mother in infancy. However, it showed no relation to security of attachment to the father in infancy.

If the various measures of security are all valid, children should get similar scores on each method. The rating of security with the mother on reunion behaviour was, as
hoped highly correlated with emotional openness in the HSAT and their responses to the family photo. However, the rating of security with the father showed little or no relationship with the other two measures of security. This pattern of correlation suggests that in families where the mother is the primary caregiver, the child’s attachment to her has much more impact on the child’s overall security than the attachment to the father does.

Grossmann and Grossmann, (1991) replicated the format of the Berkeley study with a sample of six year olds from Regensburg. They also found a high correlation between infancy ratings and ratings at age six. If attachment patterns are stable over time this study seems to suggest that the reunion codings are measuring what they intend to measure, the six year olds’ attachment pattern. However, the Regensburg data shed no light on those classified into the group D Category with disorganised-controlling behaviour.

The preliminary evidence seems to suggest that Main and Cassidy’s system for coding has substantial validity. In these studies it appears to measure what it intends to measure and assigns accurate classifications to most children. Main and Cassidy (1988) also report the classification of reunion behaviours remains stable over one month in the test-retest reliability assessments.

However, a more recent study by Shouldice and Stevenson-Hinde (1992) assessed children aged four and a half years old both on the SAT and by a separation reunion paradigm, similar to the Strange Situation, they found that the results between these two procedures were not strong enough to justify using the SAT as an alternative to direct observation of attachment behaviour. At this stage further exploration is needed in
the development of representational methods in order to replace direct behavioural
observation and analysis (Melhuish, 1993). The most logical approach is perhaps a multi-
method assessment of attachment that embraces both representational and behavioural
analysis when studying attachment in early childhood.

It is important to consider in Main and Cassidy’s reunion paradigm that one
parent returned three minutes before the other so that the child already had three minutes
to regain comfort and to cope with tensions aroused by the first parent’s reunion. In short,
the reunion with the first parent may have influenced the child’s behaviour towards the
second parent. Future research needs to consider the differences of each parent’s
interpersonal communication and the possible influence this may have on the child.

The second consideration is that Main and Cassidy’s coding system relies solely
on the child’s behaviour to assess a pattern of attachment. Between the ages of five to
seven the dyad, not the individual, maintains the stability of interaction patterns in the
relationship. When one partner makes a change the other makes a complementary change
that maintains homeostasis. Consequently directly coding the dyad’s behaviour may be
more informative.

**The Parent-Child Reunion Inventory**

Based on the observed attachment behaviours observed by Main and Cassidy’s
system, Marcus (1990) developed the Parent Child Inventory to rate the degree to which
each of twenty behaviours occur at reunion. From these, rating a score for security of
attachment can be derived. Behaviour checklists can be problematic because parents may
be reluctant to report negative behaviour. However, Marcus (1991) asked foster parents to
fill out the parent child inventory and got meaningful results which were related to other measures in his study which included interviews with the foster children, assessments with the social workers, and the Achenbach Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL)(1978). The advantage of this procedure is it is fast and easy, however, more research is obviously needed to establish its validity.

**Adolescent Attachment**

The attachment questions that are unique to adolescence have not yet received much attention. The research that is available has two major limitations. First, the population that has been studied are college students between the ages of eighteen and nineteen. Consequently, hardly any of them are of low intelligence and most probably come from relatively middle-class families. The second limitation is that most of the research to date comes from individuals’ responses to questionnaires. These range from a probing clinical interview to a simple self-report on a single item included on a questionnaire. More work needs to be done before any of the methods used can be regarded as fully validated.

**The Adult Attachment Interview**

The first method developed specifically for assessing adults’ attachments was the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI), a structured, fifteen question, semi-clinical interview that focuses mainly on the subjects early attachment experiences and current thoughts about them (George, Kaplan, and Main, 1985; Main and Goldwyn, 1985).
The subject is asked to choose five adjectives to describe what the relationship with each parent was like during childhood. The trained interviewer makes no particular effort to put the subject at ease as the intent is partly to ‘surprise the subconscious’ (Main, 1991). The subject is then asked for episodic memories to illustrate why he/she chose that particular adjective to describe his/her parent. Sometimes the specific memories illustrate the general description well, sometimes they contradict it, sometimes they are unable to recall a specific example.

The interviewer also asks what the subject did in childhood when he/she was upset, hurt or ill. They are asked whether they ever felt rejected or threatened by their parents, and if so, why they now think their parents had behaved as they did. There are also questions about separations, and about whether the subject had experienced separation through a death in childhood or adulthood. The interviewer would ask how the subject feels about his/her parents now and how the experiences he/she had described have influenced his adult personality and functioning.

The coding for the AAI relies solely on what the subject says, not on what he/she does. Non-verbal behaviour and voice inflections are not taken account of, as the coder works with a printed transcript of the interview. Main and colleagues have revised the guidelines over the years and learning to apply them takes considerable time and training.

In analysing the interview the coder examines the subjects attitude towards attachment. The coder examines contradictions and inconsistencies carefully. The interview is rated on nine point scales for security with respect to experiences, ideas and feelings surrounding attachment. Security is defined largely by the overall coherence of the subject’s presentation of his attachment history. The focus is on the adult’s
representational models of attachment, especially the ability to integrate both factual and affective information from both episodic and semantic memory. Subjects classified as secure focus easily on the questions, they can easily explain what lies behind their responses, and appear to the coders to be truthful. Subjects that are rated as being insecurely attached tend to show incoherence in a variety of ways such as anomalous changes in wording, intrusions into the topic, slips of the tongue, use of metaphors or rhetoric that is inappropriate to the context of the discourse, inability to focus on the interview questions and outright self-contradiction. In short, the subject appears to have difficulty accessing information related to attachment and keeping the information organised and/or preventing it from undergoing distortion.

There are four categories for classifying adults states of mind with respect to attachment as indicated through their responses to the AAI: secure, dismissing, preoccupied and unresolved. Various researchers have at times substituted the terms secure for autonomous or balanced, dismissing for detached or avoidant, preoccupied for ambivalent or resistant.

Adults characterised as secure not only are able to give a strikingly coherent account of their early experiences and how those experiences have affected them, they also value the attachment relationships and recognise their importance: they tend to believe attachments and the experience related to them influence an individual’s personality. They easily integrate positives and negatives and are able to be objective in describing any particular relationship. They tolerate flaws in themselves and others and do not idealise their parents.
Not all subjects who are rated as secure report favourable childhood experiences. Some have had unfavourable experiences, particularly loss or rejection. However, despite this, they appear to have thought about them, perhaps understood the reason for them, and resolved their feelings about them.

The adults characterised as dismissing report that attachment relationships are not important. Most show one or two striking patterns. In one pattern, the subjects report semantic and episodic memories about their parents that contradict each other. They may say their parents were wonderful, almost perfect but are unable to offer any supportive evidence. The second pattern is the insistence they simply cannot remember anything from childhood. A few dismissing adults can recall negative childhood experiences, these individuals have a tendency to derogate and dismiss them. This may be an effective strategy to keep attachment memories and wishes at a distance.

Individuals classified as preoccupied are still embroiled with the family of origin. They may be still struggling to please them and emotionally dependent on them. They often give long interview responses with entangled confusing run on sentences that may be irrelevant or tangential to the questions asked. They also often use general terms for example ‘that sort of thing’ or use nonsense words such as ‘dada dada dada’. In short incoherence permeates their use of language.

The fourth category for classifying AAI responses is ‘unresolved’. These adults have experienced losses or abuse or other traumatic events (Ainsworth and Eichberg, 1991). They oscillate between positive and negative viewpoints and appear to be confused about the trauma giving irrational answers and showing an inability to stay with
the topic of the interview. They are also unable to organise information about their attachment histories coherently.

In some studies, researchers have not used the 'unresolved' classification and have forced classifications into one of the other three categories. This may compromise the reliability and validity of the study.

There is substantial literature demonstrating that classifications obtained from the Adult Attachment Interviews of parents match the classifications of their infants’ reunion responses to them in the Ainsworth Strange Situation. According to Van IJzendoorn (1995), eighteen studies have documented a significant match. Thus the Ainsworth et al. (1978) infant classifications, Secure, Insecure/Avoidant, and Insecure/Ambivalent/Preoccupied correspond remarkably well to Adult Attachment Interview classifications of their caregivers as Secure, Dismissing, and Preoccupied/Entangled respectively.

Fortunately, however, attachment theory is not overly deterministic as there are other factors that influence the child’s emerging model. The research to date does indicate there is not 100% concordance rate between mother and infant attachment classifications.

Grossman and Grossman (1991) report their interviews with adults offered some insights into what helps change an insecure model of attachment into a secure one, they identified four factors which seem to be important: psychotherapy, illness, supportive spouses and emotionally significant others. They suggest a serious illness may make even an avoidant adult depend on someone’s care which in turn can sometimes help the individual to realise that loving care is reliably available.
More recent research by Fonagy et al. (1996), Fonagy and Target, (1997); Fonagy, Steele, Moran, Steele and Higgitt (1991) have demonstrated that an individual’s ability to appreciate the mental and emotional states of others is rooted in the presence or absence of attachment security. Therefore, the critical factor in influencing the security of attachment is a parent’s capacity for productive reflection on ideas related to attachment as this serves as a protective resilience-enhancing function, and reduces the likelihood of intergenerational transmission of insecurity (Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Higgitt and Target, 1994).

**Father-Child Relationships**

Several investigators have explored whether the pattern of attachment in an infant generalises from the relationship with the mother to the relationship with the father. Most of the early studies of concordance between an infant’s Strange Situation classification with his mother and the Strange Situation with his father failed to find any significant association between the two (Grossman and Grossman and Wartner, 1981: Main and Weston, 1981) suggesting infants’ attachment relationships to their mothers is independent of their attachment relationship to their father. The baby’s behaviour in the Strange Situation towards his mother depended on what sort of interaction he has with her and the baby’s interaction with his father depends on what sort of interaction he has experienced with him.

Recognising the limitations of these early studies which all used small samples, Fox, Kimmerly and Schafer (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of the data which included seven-hundred and ten babies. Unfortunately, while this research was being carried out
the D category had not been defined, therefore all their data was forced into the A, B or C classification system. Despite this limitation the results are of interest. They found a significant association between security of attachment to one parent and security of attachment to the other, between type of insecurity with one parent and type of insecurity with another, and between sub-category of security with one parent and sub-category of security with the other. Basically their results suggest that babies who were secure with their mother also tended to be secure to their father, certainly, more often than would be expected to occur by chance. There may be several reasons to account for why some concordance does exist between the pattern of attachment to the mother and pattern of attachment to the father. Firstly, the individuals’ representational models of attachment probably influences both whom a person marries and the quality of care he or she gives to babies. Secondly, a sensitive mother can provide both modelling and scaffolding for a less sensitive spouse or vice versa, which could increase the likelihood that the second parent would respond sensitively to the infant. Thirdly, a second parent may take over when the first parent is inconsistent or unresponsive which would protect the baby from feeling rejected and buffer the effects from deficiencies and distortions in the other parent’s care. Although the incidence of concordance is greater than would be expected by chance the meta-analysis did indicate that very strong concordance did not exist as 1 out of 4 babies had a secure attachment to one parent but an anxious attachment to the other. These findings seem to suggest the infants behaviour in the Strange Situation reflects experience with the specific caregiver, not a general model derived from one relationship which transfers automatically to all others.
Sibling Relationships

In this early phase of attachment research, relevant research exploring attachment patterns between siblings is relatively minimal. There is some evidence that the relative harmony of the securely attached child’s relationship to the parents is re-enacted by the child’s interactions with younger siblings. Teti and Ablard, (1989) and Volling and Belsky (1992) support these findings. They found that children with secure attachment patterns were less conflictual during periods of joint play with their younger siblings than anxiously attached children. Volling and Belsky (1992) also examined the different contributions between mother and father and the effects these have on predicting siblings interactions.

They found that children whose fathers had been observed as more facilitative and positively affectionate in their interactions were more confident socially, than children whose fathers were not supportive.

Attachment in Middle Childhood-The Missing Link

Obviously theorists and researchers have taken major steps towards developing reliable and valid ways to study attachment in infants, young children and adults. Currently innovative ways of assessing attachment in middle childhood are now emerging in an attempt to redress the measurement gap. This project seeks to explore the validity and reliability of a newly developed assessment tool, The Child Attachment Interview (CAI). To date, the SAT is the best measure of attachment in middle childhood. However, like most measures it has advantages and disadvantages. Arguably, the advantages are: the child is not the direct focus of the questions so he/she is less likely to
give socially desirable answers; he/she is unaware of what the researcher is interested in, therefore there is less censorship, the material is quite rich in quality because these measures tap unconscious material, the questions permit a multiplicity of responses and have no rules of right and wrong. The disadvantages seem to outweigh the advantages. A fundamental flaw in the SAT is there is scant documentation on the psychometric properties of the SAT. Furthermore, as it is a projective test it is difficult to determine the reliability of the child’s answers as they may not truly refer to himself/herself but to someone else such as his/her brother or a friend. It is also difficult to determine whether the responses reflect how the child would like to be or how he/she truly believes he/she is. A major disadvantage of this test is that in the 1990’s separations are commonplace in many families, therefore it is questionable whether separation reunion paradigms depicted in photographs actually induce a sufficiently stressful situation that triggers the child’s representational models of attachment. Bearing in mind that in middle childhood every child will have spent time away from home just going to school and many children may have spent weekends with friends or on school trips. Furthermore, analysing the results is largely down to the subjective interpretation of the assessor making inter-rater reliability difficult to obtain.

The SAT does not consider the relationship between cognition, language and attachment security. Harter (1986) suggests there is an important conceptual change at age eight in relation to global judgements and/or in articulation skills. Whether a child is able to provide a coherent response to the questions posed in the SAT may depend to some extent on their ability to articulate the answers. The McCarthy, (1998) study is the only one that has examined the influence of language upon security of attachment and it
failed to find a significant relationship between scores on the British Picture Vocabulary Test and SAT scores. These findings seem to suggest security of attachment is independent of language ability.

The SAT classification system implies an integrated internal working model of attachment for both parents. However as mentioned earlier Fox, Kimmerly and Schafer (1991) did find that infants pattern of attachment did sometimes differ. These findings suggest the measurement tool needs to consider whether an individual degree of security is on a continuum or not. This will help predict what form problems are likely to take if they emerge.

Colin, (1996) recommends attachment measures should gather information about self reliance, defensiveness, anger, the child’s confidence about the parents availability and supportiveness, the parents’ provision of comfort and support, dyadic communication patterns and other clues about cognitive behavioural strategies and representational models of the attachment relationship. This is indeed a tall order, however the CAI attempts to consider all of the above in order to overcome the limitations of both the semi-projective and behavioural assessment methods in this age group. Firstly, the child is asked directly about their experiences. Secondly, control for academic competence is considered using sub-tests from the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children Third Edition U.K (WISC. III. U.K). Control for expressive linguistic capacity is also considered using the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Revised (CELF R). Thirdly, the CAI asks questions concerning the child’s relationship with both their mother and father, and these are separately classified, in order not to assume an integrated working model of attachment. Fourthly, the coding system considers not only the content
but the form of communication which taps into the child’s internal working model and thus attachment organisation. (Oppenheim, D., and Waters, H., 1995).

This study examines the psychometric properties of the CAI in an endeavour to establish whether it is a promising instrument for explaining the development of children’s attachment to adults. As the CAI is a recent measure of child attachment patterns, the psychometric properties have not yet been reported. Like the AAI, it has been designed to preserve the depth and nuances of natural discourse and to yield insight into formal and substantial aspects of the subjects thought processes that are related to attachment. The CAI also offers a coding system that can be quantitatively analysed. This project will focus on seven psychometric issues:

1. the inter-rater reliability of the coding criteria,
2. reliability over time and across two interviews,
3. comparisons across secure and insecure classifications on the CAI scales,
4. internal consistency of the scale,
5. the concurrent validity of the CAI in relation to the SAT,
6. the relationship to intelligence, expressive language ability and clinical profile (as determined by the CBCL),
7. determining whether the classifications obtained from the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) of the mothers match the classifications of their childrens’ interview responses to them from the CAI.
Inter-Rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability is necessary to check the reliability of observations between two raters and determine the extent to which their ratings agree. This will provide information on how good the coding system is as a whole, and how good each individual rater is.

Test-Retest Reliability

Firstly, as the CAI is a semi-structured interview, it is particularly important that its reliability is tested over time (tests-retest) Therefore subjects in this study were interviewed twice, two months apart, by the same interviewer. A period of two months was chosen to reduce the risk that the subjects would remember some of their responses to the first interview, thereby inflating the instruments reliability. A longer period might have increased the risk of changing life circumstances which may influence the subjects mental representation of attachment experiences. The primary focus therefore is to establish the instrument’s reliability under stable conditions.

Comparisons across Secure and Insecure Classifications on the CAI Scales

It is important to determine whether there is a difference between each scale score that defines security and insecurity of attachment to mother and father.

Internal Consistency

Internal consistency needs to be established to determine whether all the scales from the CAI are related to each other and form a construct of security.
**Concurrent Validity**

The SAT is the only available measure which attempts to measure attachment classifications in middle childhood. Therefore, it is the only measure that can be used to assess how well the CAI correlates with the SAT.

**Discriminant Validity**

The CAI may be influenced by the child’s cognitive and language abilities and or any clinical problems they may have. The ability to use language and the ability to manipulate mental representations are the hallmarks of intelligence. It may be possible for children to form increasingly accurate, detailed models of attachment relationships and to develop increasingly effective behavioural strategies for managing them. It may also be possible for children to develop increasingly subtle psychological defences.

**Predictive Validity**

The crucial test for the CAI’S validity is the correspondence between parents attachment representations as assessed by the AAI and their child’s attachment representations. If the CAI is a valid measure, there should be a high degree of concordance between the mother’s AAI classifications and their children’s CAI classifications.
Chapter 3

METHOD

The method is divided into six sections, the first section describes the demographic details of the sample of children. The second section explains the administration of the CAI to the children and the coding manual. The third section describes the administration of the AAI to the mothers. The fourth section describes the sub-tests administered from the WISC-III and the CEL-R, and describes the CBCL. The fifth section describes the administration of the SAT. The final section describes the intended data analyses.

Design

The CAI was initially piloted on seventeen children and these interviews provided the basis for refining the interview protocol and for devising the CAI coding system. In this study, the revised version of the CAI was administered to a non-clinical sample of thirty children in their homes. The initial interviews were then coded independently by two raters to establish inter-rater reliability. The thirty children were then re-interviewed approximately two months later to establish the initial test-retest reliability. The Adult Attachment Interview, (George et al., 1985) was also administered to each mother (fifteen in total) and coded independently. The focus was on the two-way classification (secure or insecure, for each mother and child).
Participants

Ethical approval for this part of the study was obtained under the auspices of a larger standardisation project at the Anna Freud Centre (Appendix 1). Normally developing children were recruited through letter contact with teachers and parents. The letters explained the nature of the project and invited their children to take part in this study (Appendix 2 and 3). Parental and child consent forms were completed by parents and child following the administration of all the test material (Appendix 4 and 5). Respondents included children from both inner and outer London. The sample consists of a total of thirty children, fourteen boys and sixteen girls, whose ages range from eight years exactly to twelve years six months. The mean age for the boys is nine years eight months and the mean age for the girls is ten years three months. Fourteen of the children’s parents represented social class I (professional and managerial); six social class II (intermediate occupations); three social class III (skilled occupations) and five social class IV (partly skilled occupations) two were unemployed according to the criteria of the classification and coding index (1980). Over three-quarters of the sample (twenty-seven) were white, all of British origin, except that three were Europeans, one child was Asian and two were Afro-Caribbean. Twenty-two of the children were from two parent families, five of the children had reconstituted families whereby they lived with their biological mothers and step-fathers, however the children from these families all had regular contact with their biological fathers. A total of three children came from one-parent families.
Procedure

The Child Attachment Interview

The Child Attachment Interview (Appendix 6) is a semi-structured interview that is video recorded and structured entirely around the topic of attachment, principally the child’s current relationship to their mother and father. The child is introduced to the interview through a warm up question which asks them to talk about their family circumstances, the next question attempts to elicit the child’s self concept by asking them to provide three words to describe themselves and to support these words with examples. They are also asked to describe their relationship with their parents and again provide specific examples to illustrate their descriptions. The child is asked to recall a time when they have felt upset or misunderstood and to describe what happens when they are ill and hurt as well as about loss and separation. In addition, there is a question that attempts to elicit the child’s perspective regarding parental conflict as this may have implications on their emotional security. Another question attempts to elicit which characteristics the child does and does not value in their parents. This question is intended to determine the impact the parents have on the child’s identity. The interview rounds off with a question asking the children what they would wish for when they grow up if they had three wishes. This question is intended to neutralise any emotional issues that may have emerged from the interview.
The Coding System

(Appendix 7)

All verbal and non-verbal responses made at the time of administration were recorded by the video-tape. Responses were scored following established guidelines devised by Yael Shmueli-Goetz (YSG) and Adrian Datta under the supervision of Dr. Mary Target, who is an experienced researcher in the field of childhood and adulthood attachment. The operational criteria for coding the CAI are summarised below. (The original coding manual can be found in Appendix 2).

Emotional openness and range of emotional terms used. This scale focuses on the affective description rather than the behavioural expression of the child. Emotional openness takes account of the range of feelings the child describes, the degree the child is able to place those feelings within a relational context and the ability of the child to express the interplay of affect, mental states and behaviour. Each scale is rated on a nine point scale. This scale has five defined anchor points (1,3,5,7,9). In the scale of Emotional Openness 1 indicates low emotional openness and nine denotes high emotional openness.

Balance of Positive and Negatives References to Attachment Figures (AF’s). This scale is designed to measure the child’s ability to contemplate both good and bad qualities of their attachment figures. The majority of children tend to use more positive terms to describe their parents. This positive bias is accounted for in the rating. The nine point scale rated one for highly unbalanced - attachment figures referred to solely in positive or negative terms and nine for highly balanced - the child showed evidence of
being able to contemplate, express, and fully elaborate upon both positive and negative aspects of the attachment.

**Use of Examples.** This scale assesses the child’s ability to provide relevant and appropriate examples. If a child is unable to provide examples, prompts are used to establish whether they are demonstrating avoidance strategies or just an inability to recall the event. The nine point scale assigns one to the children who represent a narrative with no examples despite frequent prompting and nine to those who represent a narrative with at least four richly detailed and illustrative examples.

**Preoccupied anger with respect to mother** and **Preoccupied anger with respect to father.** Both scales attempt to measure the degree to which the child expresses anger that is uncontained and overwhelming when describing relationship episodes (REs). A distinction is drawn between the expression of anger which serves to draw care taking behaviour and aggression or violence that attacks the attachment figures and threatens attachment relationships. This scale is rated on a nine point scale with ‘1’ for anger which was described but not re-experienced and nine for anger which is clearly expressed and escalation is evident to the rater.

**Idealisation of attachment figures.** This scale measures the extent to which the child’s representations of the AF are distorted in a positive direction. Evidence for the distortion is identified if the child provides a generalised positive description of the attachment figures but is unable to substantiate these with positive examples. The central question to the rater is. “How credible are general descriptors of A.F’s in the light of specific examples?” This was rated on a nine point scale with one indicating no idealisation-positive generalised statements are consistently supported by relevant relationship
episodes and nine for highly idealising- positive generalised descriptions are prevalent throughout the narrative, but not substantiated by specific examples.

**Dismissal of Attachment** This scale measures the extent to which the child adopts a strategy that serves to minimise the importance of AF and relationships by active dismissal. The degree to which the child deliberately rejects or excludes the expression of vulnerability, dependency or the need for comfort in situations that are related to stress such as illness, physical hurt, conflicts separations and death is central to this rating. The degree of dismissal as operationalised on this scale is dependent on the severity of the event and the age of the child. This was rated on a nine point scale one indicates the child values the relationship and appears comfortable expressing vulnerability in response to separation and loss, and nine indicates the child’s affect is deliberately and systematically excluded, and the self is presented as invulnerable.

**Resolution of Conflicts within RE’s.** This scale rates the child’s ability to recount an episode containing conflict which is subsequently resolved. Solutions may be positive, negative or passive. The conflicts range in severity from a minor disagreement to conflicts arising from separation and loss. This was rated on the nine point scale, one for clearly unresolved conflicts characterised by destructive or negative responses. Nine for very clearly resolved conflicts.

**Self-Organisation.** This scale attempts to assess the degree to which a child is able to initiate resolution to conflicts through being an active agent that can organise and execute a sequence of actions. Alternatively, they may be passive or impulsive in their response to conflict. The nine point scale rated one for very low self-organisation where resolution to conflicts are dominated by extreme passivity or impulsiveness, and there are no planned
self-initiated resolutions. A score of nine indicates the child is very highly self-organised, and resolutions to conflicts are self initiated, clearly planned and executed leading to satisfactory outcomes.

**Overall Coherence.** This scale integrates information from the Idealisation, Preoccupied anger, Dismissing and Use of Examples Scales. It attempts to gauge the overall coherence of the child, and considers reflectiveness, spontaneity of discourse, relevance, comprehensibility and inconsistencies. This is rated on a nine point scale with one for highly incoherent narrative and nine for highly coherent narrative.

**Behavioural Analysis** notes any behavioural changes such as bodily movements in response to stress inducing questions, anxiety, maintenance of eye contact, tone of voice, discrepancy between behaviour in the interview and content of the narrative.

Based upon these ratings an overall classification was assigned to each interview with respect to the child’s representation of their relationship with their mother and father independently. The overall classification was either secure or insecure. In order to indicate the strength of the classification, each interview received a sub-classification. The sub-classification ratings were 1 = Very Secure 2= Secure 3= Insecure, 4 = Very Insecure. As the quality of the relationship with each parent was rated separately it was possible to receive a secure classification with respect to one parent and an insecure classification with the other.

In order to be assigned a secure classification, ratings had to be five or above for *Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive and Negatives, Use of Examples, the Resolution of Conflict, Self Organisation, Overall Coherence,* and ratings had to be no more than three for *Idealisation, Dismissal and Preoccupied Anger.*
The classification of Insecure was assigned to those children who scored five or less for *Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive and Negatives, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflict, Self-Organisation* and *Overall Coherence*. In addition they had to be assigned three or more on *Preoccupied anger, Idealisation and Dismissal*.

To obtain a ‘Very Secure’ classification the child must score seven or above for *Emotional Openness, Balance of Positives and Negatives, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflict, Self Organisation, Overall Coherence* and three or less on *Preoccupied Anger, Idealisation and Dismissal*.

To obtain a very insecure classification the child must score four or less on *Emotional Openness, Use of Examples, Balance of Positives and Negatives, Resolution of Conflict, Self Organisation, Overall Coherence*, and five or more on *Preoccupied Anger, Idealisation and Dismissal*.

**The Adult Attachment Interview** (Appendix 8)

The Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) administered to the fifteen mothers closely followed the schedule outlined by George et al., (1985). It is a semi-structured interview that probes for descriptions of attachment around the individual’s relationship to their mother and to their father. The interview starts with a warm up question about the composition of the family origin. The mothers are asked to choose five adjectives to describe their relationship with each of their parents and to provide specific memories to support their descriptions. The interviewer asks directly about which parent they felt closest to; what they did as a young child when they were upset, hurt or ill as well as about loss, abuse and separations. In addition the subject is asked how they thought their
adult personalities were affected by these experiences; why in their view their parents behaved as they did; and how the relationship has changed over time.

The interviews were conducted in the parents’ home in a quiet room with chairs positioned at an angle of 90 degrees. A Sony TCM-1000A cassette recorder was used with two small external microphones (Sony ECM-144) pinned to the clothing of both interviewer and subject. In this way, slips of the tongue or speech errors could be accurately recorded.

The interviews lasted between one to two hours and were transcribed verbatim by one typist on the basis of transcribing guidelines provided by Mary Main (personal communication, January 1999). All fifteen interviews were independently rated by one trained judge, classified as reliable by Mary Main. The rating procedure followed the established guidelines (see Main Goldwyn, in press). Ultimate classification of the interview as secure or insecure depends largely on the extent to which the narrative satisfies four criteria of coherence:

1. A good fit between memories and evaluations concerning attachment,
2. a succinct yet clear picture,
3. the provision of relevant details,
4. clarity and orderliness.

The classification system assigns interviews to one of three groups, two insecure and one secure:

1. Insecure-dismissing, designated D for an interview that is brief but incomplete, marked by a lack of fit between memories and evaluations;
(2) insecure - preoccupied, designated E for an interview that is neither succinct nor complete and contains many irrelevant details, together with much passive speech or high current anger; and

(3) autonomous secure, designated F for an interview that robustly fulfils all or most of the criteria of coherence. In addition, alongside the best fitting D, E or F criteria some interviews are also classified as U for Unresolved with respect to past trauma or loss.

A single overall four-way classification D/E/F/U, of each interview was thus obtained. Additionally, those interviews classified U also received a best fitting D/E/F classification.

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale III. UK (WISC-III.UKI) and Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals
(Appendix 9 and 10)

To examine whether the CAI classifications may be influenced by differences in intelligence two separate domains of intelligence were examined; performance IQ and Verbal IQ. All children were administered individually four sub-tests from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Third U.K edition (WISC III. UK) in order to assess intellectual functioning. These tests allow the analysis of a child’s particular strengths or weaknesses in areas of ability and patterns of learning. The measurement of intelligence does not involve exact measurement, such as the measurement of length, however research has shown that intelligence scores are usually valid and reliable on most occasions and for children over seven years of age are considered to be quite stable scores within the general population. The WISC III U.K involves the assessment of verbal
ability and non-verbal intelligence. The verbal IQ scale was determined by two sub-tests, Vocabulary (word definition) and Similarities which assesses verbal concepts. On the performance scale which assess a child’s non-verbal and practical skills, the sub-tests included Picture Arrangement (a measure of visual sequencing of stories, which requires particular skills in the areas of temporal sequencing, and the anticipation of consequences) and Block Design (a test which assesses visuo-spatial skills).

Children who are more able to make use of synonyms, analogies, metaphors and generally more sophisticated language may convey their autobiographical experiences more fluently. Therefore, to examine whether the CAI classifications may be influenced by these differences the children’s language was assessed using three standardised sub-tests from the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Revised (Celf-R U.K.) (Semel, Wiig and Secord, 1980) (Appendix 10). The tests selected for this study look at children’s understanding of language as well as how children communicate their wants and needs. The CELF-R provides an overall measure of children’s expressive communication skills and yields an expressive communication age. The first sub-test Formulated Sentences assesses the child’s ability to formulate simple, compound and complex sentences. The second sub-test administered Recalling Sentences which assesses the child’s ability to recall and reproduce the surface structure of a sentence as a function of syntactic complexity. The third and final sub-test is Sentence Assembly, this is a supplementary sub-test for assessing the ability to assemble syntactic structures into grammatically acceptable and semantically meaningful sentences. A communication composite score is computed as the sum of the scale scores, these are then converted to a normed referenced standardised score based on the child’s age. High levels of inter-rater
reliability (internal consistency, test retest, inter-rater) and Validity (content, criterion and construct) are reported in the third edition of the manual. To ensure all the sub-tests were administered correctly the author had received training from a Clinical Psychologist and Speech and Language therapist.

**The Child Behaviour Checklist**

(Appendix 11)

In addition to cognitive and language measures, mothers served as respondents for assessments of their child’s adaptive behaviour and behaviour problems. The mother’s assessment of her child’s behaviour problems was obtained from the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach and Edelbrock, 1981). Mothers rate the frequency of different behaviour problems from a one hundred and eighteen item questionnaire using a three point scale. From its sub-scales, a summary score for externalising (aggressive, destructive) and a summary score for internalising (anxious, withdrawn) problems, and a behaviour problem profile can be obtained.

**The Separation Anxiety Test**

(Appendix 11)

The Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) (Klagsbrun and Bowlby, 1976; Slough and Greenburg, 1990) was administered as a measure of concurrent validity. It consists of nine photographs that provide age appropriate separation situations for age eight to twelve year olds. The SAT is introduced to the child as follows: “I’ve got some pictures here and I want you to help me to tell some stories about them. These are pictures about...”
Each child is then shown the photographs one at a time, in numerical sequence. Pictures are designated mild or severe in accordance with other SAT scoring systems. The examiner explains the scene depicted on the photograph to the child as each photograph is presented. These are as follows:

1) The boy/girl is going away on a school trip for two weeks. Here he/she is saying goodbye to his/her mum and dad. (severe)

2) Mum is going shopping and the boy is staying at home alone. (mild)

3) Mum is going into hospital. (severe)

4) Mum and dad are going out for the evening. (mild)

5) Dad is leaving home after an argument. (severe)

6) The boy/girl is in town with his/her dad. Dad says “Go and spend your pocket money, I’ll wait here.” (mild)

7) It is the boy’s/girl’s first day at a new school. (severe)

8) The boy’s/girl’s dad is going away to work. (mild)

9) Mum and dad are going away for a few days and the boy/girl is staying with his/her uncle. (severe)

Following the description of the photograph each child is asked ‘‘How does the boy/girl feel? Why does he/she feel that way?’’ and ‘‘What’s the boy/girl going to do?’’ If the child does not answer the question or says ‘‘I don’t know.’’ the question is rephrased or a gentle neutral probe is used.

All verbal responses to the SAT made by the participants at the time of administration were recorded on audio-tapes. Responses were scored using the scoring
indices for the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test (Slough, Goyette and Greenburg, 1988). The summary scores were calculated by considering all three parts of the answers i.e. the salience of feelings, the focus of justification for feeling and the content of coping, and the total response allocated to one of the twenty-one categories which differentiate particular aspects of the answer (e.g., recognition of stress, coping styles etc.). The sub-categories were then scored from the following system; a four point attachment rating score, (4 = high to 1 = low) to responses to each of the five severe separation pictures and given a summary score range of four to sixteen, and a three point avoidance score to each of the nine pictures producing a summary score range from nine to twenty-seven.

**Planned Data Analysis**

The relationship between demographic data and attachment security will be explored using independent samples t-tests for the age variable, and Chi Square analyses to determine gender, social economic status, ethnicity and one or two parent households (or reconstituted families).

Inter-rater reliability will be established using the Spearman rho’s correlation coefficient for ranked data. This will compare the level of agreement for all the scales across two raters.

The level of agreement between the raters for the overall classification of secure or insecure for each parent respectively, will be determined using the Cohen Kappa statistic, and the degree of inter-rater reliability for each sub-classification will be determined using the Kendall tau b analysis.
Comparisons across secure and insecure classifications on the CAI scales for mother and father will be determined using a Mann Whitney U analysis. Internal consistency will be computed using the Cronbach alpha co-efficient to determine if the CAI scales are related to each other.

The Kendall tau b analysis will be used to determine the correlation between the SAT and the CAI.

Discriminant validity will be determined using independent sample t-tests analyses to establish whether intelligence, language and clinical morbidity are independent of attachment classifications.

The level of agreement between mother and child’s classifications shall be determined using the Cohen Kappa statistic. A high level of agreement would suggests the CAI has good predictive ability.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

Results are presented in five sections. The first section reports on the demographic findings and the relationship these variables have on attachment security. The second section reports on the reliability of the CAI, including inter-rater reliability and test-retest reliability. The third section reports the difference between the scores for secure and insecure classifications. The fourth section presents results pertaining to the internal consistency of the CAI classifications. Finally, the fifth section reports the results pertaining to the discriminant and predictive validity of the CAI.

The Relationship Between Demographic Data and Attachment Security

In order to determine if any covariates should be used in subsequent analysis, the child’s classification of security with both mother and father was examined in relation to demographic variables. The relationship between age and attachment classification was determined by independent sample t-tests and was found not to be significant in relation to mother ($t = 0.326, \text{df} = 26, \text{n.s.}$), or father ($t = 0.801, \text{df} = 26, \text{n.s.}$). The effects of the remaining demographic variables (gender, social class, ethnicity and one or two parent households or reconstituted families) were established using Chi-square analyses for the CAI attachment classifications to mother and father respectively.

Results pertaining to ethnicity demonstrated no significance with respect to mother
(\chi^2 = 6.09, df = 3, p = 0.107), or father (\chi^2 = 4.85, df = 3, p = 0.183); no statistical significance was evident in relation to gender with respect to mother’s attachment classification (\chi^2 = 2.49, df = 1, p = 0.115), or father’s attachment classification (\chi^2 = 1.29, df = 1, p = 0.26); likewise, social class demonstrated no statistical significance to mother’s or father’s attachment classification (mother’s \chi^2 = 2.24, df = 3, p = 0.53; father’s \chi^2 = 0.39, df = 3, p = 0.942), nor to ethnicity (\chi^2 = 9.875, df = 9, p = 0.361).

Children from one or two parent families did not indicate any statistically significant difference in the quality of their attachment pattern to either parent (mother \chi^2 = 0.87, df = 2, p = 0.64; father, \chi^2 = 0.905, df = 2, p = 0.64). In summary, none of the demographic variables showed any statistical significance in relation to attachment security classifications to either mother or father.

**Inter-Rater Reliability**

Inter-rater reliability was investigated because the CAI demands the scorer to make judgements during scoring which may be subject to personal biases. YSG (PhD Attachment Researcher) and the author independently scored the first twenty CAI responses from a video recording of the child’s interview. All the scales of the CAI were compared across raters using the Spearman’s correlation co-efficient for ranked data. The scales ranged from \( r_s = 0.418 \) to 1.000. The exact percentage of agreement was also calculated and ranged from 50% to 100%. Table 1 below illustrates the percentage of agreement and correlation between the two raters on each scale.
### Table 1 Correlation Co-efficient (r’s) and percentage of Exact agreement between raters on all scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlation between Rater 1 and Rater 2. Agreement (r’s)</th>
<th>Percentage of Agreement on CAI rating Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Openness</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Positive and Negatives to Attachment Figures</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Examples</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied anger to mother</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied anger to Father</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Mother</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Father</td>
<td>.766**</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Mother</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Father</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Conflict</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self organisation</td>
<td>.441*</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>.846**</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (1-tailed).

In addition to calculating the level of agreement for each scale, Cohen’s Kappa was used to examine the level of agreement between the raters for each classification assigned to each parent respectively. The Kappa value for mothers was, $\kappa = 0.792$, and fathers, $\kappa = 0.900$. Both these values demonstrate a very high level of agreement between raters for both mother and father respectively.
Inter-Rater Reliability for Sub-Classifications

All the CAI's were assigned a sub-classification which was coded on a four point scale: 1 = Very Secure, 2 = Secure, 3 = Insecure and 4 = Very Insecure, for both mother and father. The level of agreement between the two raters for the assignment of these sub-classifications was established by Kendall tau b coefficient (τ) where τ = 0.692 for the mother's sub-classification, and τ = 0.708 for the fathers sub-classification. Both of these Kendall tau b values indicate a good level of agreement between the two raters.

Test-Retest Reliability

A readministration of the CAI was carried out on twenty-eight of the sample of children approximately two months after the first test by the same administrator. Two children of the original sample were unable to participate for the follow-up session due to German Measles. The Spearman rho coefficient demonstrated a positive correlation between all the scales apart from the idealisation scales for mother and father. Furthermore, all but the idealisation scales reached statistical significance.
Table 2 Test-Retest Reliability Correlation Co-efficients of the CAI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Spearman rho Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Openness</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of +ve’s and -ve’s</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>p = 0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Examples</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Mother</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Father</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Mother</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>p = 0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Father</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>p = 0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Mother</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Father</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>p = 0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Conflict</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>p = 0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self organisation</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>p = .259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>p ≤ 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of agreement between the first and second administration of the CAI for the main classifications for mother and father was calculated by using the Kappa statistic. The kappa value for the mother, \( \kappa = 0.837 \) indicates a very good agreement. (1.00 = perfect agreement)

The kappa value for the father, \( \kappa = 0.635 \) is slightly less, but still indicates a good strength of agreement.
The percentage of agreement between the first and second administration for sub-
classifications was also calculated. The Kendall’s tau b value for mother’s sub-
classification, \( \tau = .537, p = .002 \), and for the father’s sub-classification \( \tau = .475, p = .002 \),
both indicate a statistically significant level of agreement for the sub-classifications
between the first and second administration of the CAI.

**Differences between Secure and Insecure Classifications on the CAI Scales**

One would expect there to be significant differences along the nine dimensions used to
determine the child’s attachment classification between children classified as secure and
insecure. Using the Mann Whitney U test it was possible to establish that all but two
dimensions that of preoccupied anger to the mother (\( U = 88.00; p = 0.25 \)) and
preoccupied anger to the father (\( U = 88.000; p = 0.25 \)) were significantly different from
each other. Table 3 and 4 report the Mann Whitney-U values, means, standard deviations
and probabilities (1 tailed) for the comparison between the nine dimensions of those
children classified as secure and those classified as insecure for the mother and father
respectively.
Table 3 Comparisons on all the CAI Dimensions between Secure and Insecure Classifications for the Mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Secure (N=18) Mean</th>
<th>Insecure (N=10) Mean</th>
<th>Mann Whitney-U</th>
<th>Significance (p&lt; 1 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Openness</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of +ve’s and -ve’s</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>18.500</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Examples</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Mother</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Father</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Mother</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>65.000</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Father</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>50.500</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Mother</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>25.500</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Father</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>24.500</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Conflict</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self organisation</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Comparisons on all of the CAI Dimensions between Secure and Insecure Classifications for the Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Secure (N=16) Mean</th>
<th>Insecure (N=12) Mean</th>
<th>Mann Whitney-U</th>
<th>Significance (p&lt; 1 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Openness</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of +ve's and -ve's</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Examples</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Mother</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger to Father</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Mother</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealisation of Father</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Mother</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of Father</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Conflict</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self organisation</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Internal Consistency**

In order to establish whether all the scales from the CAI contributed to the classification of security, Cronbach's alphas were computed for classifications to the mother and father respectively. Internal consistency of CAI scales for the mother was established, $\alpha = 0.9029$ and for father $\alpha = 0.9070$. The scales are therefore highly related to each other and seem to form a construct fit of indices of security.

**Comparisons between Attachment Classifications on the CAI and SAT**

The overall classification assigned to each CAI was either secure or insecure, likewise each SAT transcript was assigned with an overall classification of secure or insecure. The association between the CAI and the SAT attachment classification was established using the Kendall tau $\beta$ co-efficient ($\tau$) where $\tau = 0.335, p = 0.066$ for the mother's classification and $\tau = 0.182, p = 0.336$ for the father's classification. There was therefore no evidence that the SAT and the CAI were measuring the same construct.

**Discriminant Validity**

An Independent samples T test analysis was used to determine if there was a relationship between the mother's and father's CAI classifications and the child's intelligence, expressive language and CBCL scores. No relationship was found for any of these discriminant variables as none reached statistical significance. The results are illustrated in the following tables 5 to 7.
Table 4. A Comparison between the Mother’s and Father’s CAI Classifications and the Mean CBCL Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAI Classifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (df)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.39 (26)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-.1.058</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.90 (18)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.46 (26)</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>-1.349</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47.92 (25)</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. A Comparison between the Mother’s and Father’s CAI Classification and the Mean Intelligence Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAI Classifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (df)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>109.11 (26)</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110.35 (22)</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>106.73 (26)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-.931</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112.80 (25)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. A Comparison between the Mothers and Father's CAI Classification and the Mean Expressive Language Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAI Classifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (df)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Expressive Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99.8 (26)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1.205</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106.0 (21)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Expressive Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98.8 (26)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.1.401</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>105.69 (25)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maternal and Child Attachment Security

Table 8 displays the association between mothers’ patterns of attachment based on their AAI transcripts and the children’s security of attachment to the mother and father. The results indicate an sixty-eight percent concordance between the mother and child, and a sixty four percent concordance between the father and child. These results suggests there is an intergenerational match between classifications of security and insecurity. However, the child attachment classification is just a broad classification of secure or insecure with sub-classifications of very secure or very insecure, therefore these results are weakened by the lack of specific association between the pattern of security or insecurity that the mothers’ can be classified into.
Table 8. A Comparison between the Mothers AAI Classifications and the Child CAI Classifications for the Mother and the Father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Classification</th>
<th>AAI Classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Kappa Value (κ)</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
<th>Percent. Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 4

**DISCUSSION**

The discussion will be divided into four sections. The first section will examine the findings pertaining to the psychometric properties of the CAI, and critically evaluate their limitations. The second section will discuss the findings in light of previous and current research. The third section will discuss themes from the CAI scales and highlight patterns relating to different classifications. The fourth section will consider the implications of these research findings and future recommendations.

**Inter-Rater Reliability**

Inter-rater reliability was examined in three ways. Firstly, all the scales were rated blind by two raters then compared. Secondly, the overall main attachment classifications for the CAI were compared between the two raters. Finally, the sub-classifications assigned to the CAI were compared between the two raters. The findings from these comparisons will be discussed systematically.

**Inter-Rater Reliability for the Scales**

The percentage of agreement on the rating scales ranged from 50% to a 100% agreement. The high level of agreement between the two raters coding the scales suggests that two independent coders familiar with the CAI can conceptualise the same phenomena in similar ways. The anger scale for both mother and father proved to have the highest level of agreement as both these scales received a rating of one for all the
children in this sample. Perhaps this scale is not relevant to attachment in a non-clinical sample or perhaps it is not a useful at all. Future research needs to explore how children of this age group express anger towards their parents. The scales that had the lowest level of agreement were the dismissive scales and the idealisation scales. Possibly greater discussion and clarification over these two concepts is needed to operationalise these two scales which in turn would improve their reliability. The levels of agreement for the 6 remaining scales were impressive which could indicate there is less ambiguity in their operational definitions. The inter-coder agreement figures for the CAI classification system are comparable with those reported by Adrian Datta and Yael Shmueli-Goetz (in A. Datta’s 1998 unpublished dissertation).

**Inter-Rater Reliability for the Classifications**

The results indicate that there was a very high level of agreement between the two raters in classifying the attachment patterns of the children. This could be a result of considerable discussion concerning the coding manual or simply that the CAI is a robust measure. Clearly further research is needed to confirm the latter speculation.

**Inter-Rater Reliability for Sub-Classifications**

Inter-rater reliability again was very high for the sub-classifications of the CAI. This finding is perhaps not surprising as one would expect a degree of concordance with the main classifications and the sub-classifications. The children in this sample who were assigned a classification of ‘Very Insecure’ were easily identifiable as most of their answers were consistently lacking in substance or detail. Only one child was assigned the
'Very Secure' category she consistently provided plenty of evidence to substantiate the quality of her attachment patterns throughout her narrative, therefore determining which sub category she should be assigned was relatively straightforward.

**Psychometric Properties of the CAI**

**Test-Retest Reliability**

The test-retest results were very positive on all the scales suggesting a considerable stability of responses across a two month time period. The high reliability scores suggest that the degree of error is minimal. This is a source of optimism for the generalisability of the scale and the use of the CAI as a measurement. Interviewer effects do not confound these findings as the same interviewer administered both interviews. It might be argued that the two month period between the first and second interview was too short which could have inflated the stability of the CAI, as the children may have memorised some of their initial responses and reproduced them in the second interview. In the case of the Strange Situation some studies showed the procedure to be unreliable because of recency effect (Ainsworth et al., 1978). In other studies, classifications only remained the same over a period of six months when family circumstances remained the same (Thompson et al., 1982). There are several reasons why this is implausible with the CAI. Firstly, recency effect may be less of a problem with the CAI as it is a semi-structured interview that incorporates behavioural observations. In contrast to the Strange Situation where classifications are determined solely through behavioural observations. Secondly, the children all completed the WISC, CELF-R and SAT before the CAI so memorisation of the CAI may be confounded by the contents of these other tests. Thirdly,
the interview does not include questions with ambiguous right or wrong answers, or with a range of answers that are restricted in any way. Fourthly, the children all said they could not remember what they had said in the first interview and tended to give different responses in the second interview. Furthermore, if questions had been remembered, children might have come across as more coherent in the second interview which was not the case.

**Internal Consistency**

The high internal consistency found for all the scales from the scales of the CAI suggests that the CAI are all tapping the same construct. However, we cannot categorically assume this construct is attachment without determining the discriminant and concurrent validity of the CAI.

**Discriminant Validity**

With respect to discriminant validity, the CAI classifications turned out to be uninfluenced by verbal and performance intelligence, expressive language and CBCL scores. These findings are consistent with Bakermans-Kranenburg and IJzendoorn (1993) who also found the AAI was uninfluenced by verbal and performance intelligence. It should be noted that a total of four sub-tests from the WISC-R were used to determine the child’s level of intelligence, this may have had the effect of increasing the standard error of measurement as the reliability coefficient of the WISC-R is based on six verbal sub-test scores and seven performance sub-test scores. Therefore, in this study it may be more accurate to consider the full scale score as an estimate of intelligence.
It is also important to draw attention to the fact that subjects were only assessed on their expressive language abilities. Ideally a measure of their receptive language skills would have provided a more comprehensive assessment of their language abilities. However, if all the sub-tests from the WISC-R had been administered and the entire CELF-R administered this would have extended the time considerably to test each child and almost certainly reduced the level of compliance. The average length of time to administer the number of sub-tests that were administered was approximately two and a half hours, and clearly most of the children from this sample indicated verbally or non-verbally they had had enough.

The Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach and Edelbrock, 1983) was used as a control for any psychiatric morbidity. One of the limitations of the questionnaire is that parents are requested to complete this, therefore there is a risk of them providing socially desirable responses rather than an objective measure of their child/children’s behaviour.

The results suggest that no significant differences were observed on age, gender, social economic status, ethnicity or one or two parent households. However, these findings should be interpreted with caution as the number of children who participated in this study is comparatively small. Furthermore, these results need to be considered in light of previous research which has found that social economic status consistently predicts security of attachment (Fonagy, 1998).

Although this study provides impressive evidence with respect to the psychometric properties of the CAI, certain limitations have to be taken into account. The study was conducted on a sample of mainly white middle-class intact families through
self-selection which may restrict the generalisability of the results. It is not clear whether the same results would have been obtained in a clinical sample or children from lower socio-economic classes.

**Concurrent Validity**

There was a weak correlation between the SAT main classifications and the CAI classifications with respect to mother and father. Both measures are supposed to measure the same construct so these results are at best perplexing and at worst worrying. To unravel the more perplexing angle it is useful to consider possible reasons for these findings. Firstly, the author was not formally trained in coding the responses (although advice and practice was received from a trained coder). Secondly, some children’s answers were very brief at times, making it almost impossible to classify their responses accurately on the given scales because of very limited information.

Research to date has demonstrated mixed findings about the psychometric properties of the SAT which seriously questions the robustness of the SAT as a measure of attachment. For example, the test-retest reliability although positive was found to be low on all scales suggesting a considerable instability of responses across time. This is a source of concern for the generalisability of scores and the use of the SAT. Wright et al (1995) argue that the test is designed to surprise the unconscious and therefore second administration of the test may have provoked children’s defenses. However, the AAI has also been designed to surprise the unconscious, yet does not appear to have encountered the same problem regarding stability over time as demonstrated by Bakeman-Kranenburg and IJzendoorn’s (1993) findings. They did an extensive psychometric study
and found the AAI classifications to be stable across a two month time period. Similarly, the CAI has been designed to surprise the unconscious, this factor does not seem to have had any adverse effect on the test-retest results. Furthermore, each child was asked if they could remember the interview from the last time, before the administration of the CAI and every child’s response was negative to this question.

The strength of the internal consistency of the SAT scale is also questionable as the scale for self-reliance had a low internal consistency suggesting it is a poorly constructed scale, or possibly that it is independent of the attachment scale altogether. Bearing in mind these limitations, it is perhaps not surprising only a weak correlation between the SAT and CAI was found. However, unfortunately, the SAT is the only available measure that attempts to measure quality of attachment in middle childhood, therefore, it was the only measure that could be used to assess concurrent validity.

**Predictive Validity**

The classifications obtained from the CAI matched their parents’ classifications obtained by the AAI in sixty-seven per cent of cases. Although a correlation does not, of course, prove a causal relationship, testing this cross generational link is the first step in determining the validity of the CAI. Other researchers have demonstrated a similar degree of concordance in relation to the AAI and the Strange Situation. For example, George et al., (1996) found a 70% concordance between Ainsworth’s infant classifications, Secure, Insecure/Avoidant and Insecure /Ambivalent / Preoccupied, and the Adult Attachment Interview classifications of their caregivers, Secure, Dismissing Preoccupied and Entangled. There is also a substantial body of literature demonstrating that classifications
obtained from the Adult Attachment Interview of parents closely match the classifications of their infants’ reunion responses to them in the Ainsworth’s Strange Situation. Van IJzendoorn (1995) found eighteen studies documented a significant match. Other studies demonstrate evidence for intergenerational transmission of attachment classification (Benoit and Parker, 1994). Fonagy et al. (1991), Ward and Carlson (1995) and others, have been able to predict infant attachment status from parental attachment status assessed before the infants birth from parents who differed in terms of culture, age, ethnicity, and socio-economic status.

In recent years, predictive validity has also been studied in clinical populations. Van IJzendoorn and Bakermans-Kranenburg (1996) found a strong association between insecurity and clinical status. Adam, Sheldon-Keller and West (1996) demonstrated a strong association between suicidal ideation in adolescents and Unresolved attachment. Fonagy et al., (1996) found associations between borderline personality disorder and a rare sub-category of Preoccupied attachment.

The CAI still needs further development as specific patterns of attachment quality have not been formally identified. However, it is possible to identify matches in the working models of the mothers compared to those of their child or children from examination of the raw data. In this study mothers with secure models generally had children with secure attachments; mothers with dismissing models generally had children with dismissing responses; and mothers with proccupied models generally had children with relatively entangled interviews styles. As the CAI is still in its infancy in terms of development these working models need further refinement.
Exceptions to the Cross-Generational Patterns

The results not only found a number of statistically significant associations between parent and child attachment patterns but also some notable exceptions to these cross-generational patterns. A very interesting finding highlighted from this research is the variability of attachment classifications between different siblings. Twenty-five percent of the children from families with more than one interviewed child had different attachment classifications to their mothers and brothers or sisters. One would expect that if the mother’s working model of attachment influences the child’s pattern of attachment, the mother’s attachment classification should predict all her children’s classifications.

Within this sample, eight of the mothers had more than one child within the 8-12 year age range who agreed to be interviewed. Three of these mothers had twins plus another sibling. Two sets of twins were non-identical the other one set was identical. Research on twins in relation to attachment theory is currently ongoing. Findings to date suggest that 62% of identical and fraternal twins have different attachment classifications to their mothers (personal communication, Pasco Fearon).

A significant minority (32%) of children from this sample had different attachment classifications to their mothers. It is interesting to speculate why this might be the case. In view of the Fox, Kimmerly and Schafer’s (1991) research, which found differential attachment patterns in mothers and fathers, it is possible these children have been more influenced by their father’s internal representations than their mother’s. Steele et al. (1996) argue it is the mother that has the greater influence as opposed to the father in infant-parent classifications. However, they acknowledge the fathers influence after the first two years of life is predictive of different areas of adaptation in children. Perhaps
fathers might have more impact in middle childhood than in infancy. As fathers were not interviewed in this study it is impossible to substantiate this possibility. Unfortunately, very few researchers have made direct observations of infant-father interactions to determine whether these interactions contribute to the development of different patterns of attachment. The evidence we do have to date is that infants behaviour in the Strange Situation reflect independent attachment relationships to both parents. Given this finding, it is possible that the fathers influence could significantly effect the child’s overall representational model of attachment.

Fonagy et al. (1991b) has empirically demonstrated that parents who are able to appreciate the mental and emotional states of others are also more likely to have securely attached children. One mother whose own classification was insecure scored 7 on the reflective functioning scale which may account for her daughter’s classification of secure. The factors which may contribute to this variance shall now be considered.

Possible Factors Accounting for Variability

An interesting question raised by these findings is what factors may account for the variability of classifications between siblings. Up to this point attachment researchers have not examined the effects of inconsistent or differential maternal behaviour across sibling pairs for the development of infant mother attachments. However, there is some research evidence that considers the influence of the environment on individual differences in behaviour. The research evidence to date suggests behavioural variability is due as much to the environment as to hereditary factors. (The word environment includes any non hereditary influence such as biological factors for example nutrition or viruses).
Plomin and Daniels (1987) argue that the non-shared environment is the most important source of environmental variance for personality, psychopathology, and cognitive abilities after childhood. The variability between siblings in the development of psychopathology is exemplified by the research on identical twins at risk of developing schizophrenia. Although concordance rates vary widely for schizophrenia in monozygotic twins the results indicate that most identical twins do not have an effected co-twin. As monozygote twins are genetically identical pairs, the non-shared environment is the only plausible explanation for these striking differences within pairs of identical twins.

Environmental factors are as important as genetic factors in determining the potential for the development of psychopathology.

This suggests that researchers need to consider the environment on an individual by individual basis rather than a family by family basis as behaviour development is specific to each child rather than general to the entire family.

The research on the non-shared environment has identified that siblings growing up in the same family have quite different family experiences in terms of their parents treatment, their interaction with their siblings, experiences beyond the family and chance (Dunn and Plomin, 1990). Environmental factors which could lead to observed differences between children in the same family include birth order, gender differences of siblings, interactions between siblings, differential treatment by parents and extra familial influences like peers (Dunn and Plomin, 1990). Any environmental factor can be construed as contributing to the non-shared environment, for example even parental affection, because parents may be more affectionate to one child than another (Dunn and Plomin, 1990).
Research identifying which environmental factors are associated with behaviour is in its early stages. Plomin and Daniels (1987) suggest there is a need to develop a measure that can capture the child's active selection, modification and creation of environments both within the family and outside the family in order to understand the specific non-shared environmental influences.

Investigating observations of family interaction differences in the perception of the family environment and ways in which children contribute to the creation of the differential experience may begin to elucidate the processes by which children in the same family experience different environments.

**Cross-Generational Patterns within Siblings**

The majority of children interviewed within the same family had the same attachment classification as their brothers or sisters. These findings support Brody and Stoneman (1986) who suggest that sibling relationships relate to the qualitative aspects of the parent child relationship. Attachment theorists (Bowlby 1969, 1982. Bretherton, 1985) speculate that young children who enjoy a secure attachment to their parents develop internal working models of their parents as loving and responsive and of themselves as worthy of love and support. Stroufe and Fleeson's (1986) notion is that young children internalise and carry forward aspects of the caregiver role in their relationships with others. This notion is supported by Teti and Ablard (1989) who found that children with secure attachments to their mothers were more likely to comfort their younger siblings when the younger ones were distressed. They also found the highest
proportion of older sibling hostility directed towards infants were found in dyads with a less secure older child and an insecure infant.

All the mothers in this sample who were assigned a Secure/Unresolved classification, had their first born child classified as secure, however subsequent children from these mothers had a tendency to be less secure or even insecure.

The mothers in this sample classified as highly Insecure/ had children who were unable to substantiate the adjectives they used to describe either parent with concrete examples to illustrate the quality of the interaction.

In some mothers classified as Insecure/Preoccupied there was a tendency for their children to idealise the quality of their relationships with their relationship with their parents. We should not expect a perfect match between the parent’s state of mind with respect to attachment and the child’s attachment pattern as other factors also influence the child’s attachment pattern for example an adult with secure, open working representational models of attachment might in stressful circumstances, lack the time or energy to respond sensitively to their children. However, theory does lead us to expect a high degree of concordance between the parent’s representational model and the child’s attachment pattern.

**Father’s and Sibling Relationships**

There is a conspicuous absence of research pertaining to the role fathers play in the development of sibling relationships. A study by Macdonald and Parker (1984) found that the father’s contribution to the development of children’s peer relationships may be quite distinct from the mother’s. For example, a mother’s verbal stimulation is correlated
with her son's peer popularity, a father's physically playful, affectionate and socially engaging interaction is predictive of a boy's popularity with peers. Volling and Belsky (1992) support these findings and suggest that facilitative and positively affectionate fathering is related to prosocial and friendly interactions between siblings as well.

**Themes from Mother and Child's Interviews**

Following the warm up question the child is asked to use three adjectives to describe themselves. They are specifically asked not to use adjectives that describe what they look like, but adjectives or words that describe their personality. Children with a classification of insecure or very insecure seemed to find this question particularly difficult. Many were only able to give adjectives that described their physical appearance for example one child described himself as "tall" and "dirty." Another boy who was classified as insecure gave this response to the question, "I like football, I have blonde hair ...I'm small..........." One girl was unable to give any adjectives at all, despite prompting. Some children classified as insecure were able to provide three adjectives but then were unable to substantiate these with examples. Children assigned the classification of secure gave responses such as "probably kind, sometimes naughty." ".....funny, clever, sometimes shy." These children were usually able to substantiate these adjectives with illustrative examples such as: "quite friendly - um.... it was probably the other day when loads of people broke up at school... I tried not to be enemies with anyone, like go on peoples sides and everything. I just tried to be friends with everyone even though they didn't want me to." Previous research findings exploring the issue of self concept in relation to attachment theory have also found differences among securely and insecurely
attached children. Cassidy’s (1988) study explored the concept of self image by using a puppet. The puppet interviewed the child about how some unspecified other viewed them. Cassidy found meaningful differences in how secure children described themselves compared with avoidant children. The securely attached children saw themselves positively, but most admitted they had normal imperfections. The insecurely attached children claimed that others saw them as perfect. One of Bowlby’s (1969, 1982, 1988) and Ainsworth’s (1972, 1983) major propositions about how early attachments affect personality development was that secure attachments lay the foundation for flexible adaptive behaviour and resilience in the face of stressors. These qualities have been termed ego resilience. Children who were unable to describe themselves in any other way other than physically seemed to be inhibited and rigid suggesting they have weak ego controls.

The Emotional Openness scale had some interesting responses to questions relating to death. One child classified as very insecure gave the affective response to his grandmother’s death that he felt “normal.” His sister’s response to how her mother might have felt following her grandmother’s death was “can’t remember how she felt.”

The child then asks “how many minutes left” (in reference to when the interview finishes). Both these children seemed uncomfortable discussing any feelings of any kind and if they were able to label any affect they used monosyllables. The striking thing about these interviews was the absence of information about any relationship in their lives.

These interviews are comparable to their mother’s transcript who when asked to describe the relationship with her own parents, she says, “my father was a builder so he’s been working all the time and he was working day and night actually and my mother I can’t
remember her.. working....and the very funny thing is, I don’t recall anyone in my
house.......as a child the house was empty.’’ Later on in the interview when she is asked
to describe her adult relationship with her parents she says ‘‘I like my mother, I think I
don’t love her, I like her because she’s my mother but I wouldn’t choose her, I don’t
know. ....I have been standing against my father and we have terrible fights....terrible
fights.’’ The overall theme expressed from this mother’s transcript is of parents that were
physically and emotionally unavailable. These themes are reiterated in her children’s
impoverished descriptions. In contrast a secure CAI describes her relationship with her
mother as very close. The example she gives to illustrate this adjective is ‘‘when my
friends are being horrible to me I was being bullied. I used to get bullied and come home
crying and she’d cuddle me and say it was alright, she made me feel better.......A girl
was being horrible she used to gang up on me. She wasn’t very nice. I went home crying
and sat on my mum just for the whole evening she comforted me that was nice.’’ The
mother’s transcript describes a similar warmth and closeness with her own mother ‘‘.....I
was worried the whole time they were away and the evening they got back, we went back
to the old routine and I sat on my mum’s lap and a cuddle and a tickle and I was all
happy again .......’’

The ‘Balance of Positives and Negatives for Attachment Figures’ scale. It was notable
that most children in middle childhood had a tendency to describe their parents
positively. With a few notable exceptions, one child when asked in what ways would she
like to be like her mother she replied, ‘‘none...in anyways I can think of...’’ and in
response to the question in what ways wouldn’t she like to be like her mother she said:
‘‘having two silly brothers, one’s large and gets drunk and one’s stupid, don’t like his
hairstyle, don't like her hairstyle, wonky teeth, glasses, not good at singing, drawing, she hasn't got a job at the moment. gets the odd job hasn't got a husband.' The AAI transcript from the mother used positive adjectives to describe her own mother but was consistently unable to support these adjectives with specific memories. For example, she describes her mother as loving, caring and attentive, but when asked is unable to pick out specific incidents "...all I have is an overall view my memories of particular incidents are usually nasty ones......I don't think I'd taken a huge amount of interest in my mother before because my father was this overwhelming personality.''' Throughout this mother's narrative there is a pervasive lack of closeness in her description of her mother and at times she actively devalues her relationship with her mother, for example "she irritates the hell out of me......blankness emotionally...obviously I love her we're very close....it's your archetypal mother daughter relationship.''' This tendency to normalise her lack of closeness demonstrates a lack of resolution and restriction in feeling as she is using strategies to demonstrate she was not really affected or rejected as an individual.

In contrast a securely classified child responded to the same questions about how she'd like to be like her mother, her response was, 'have her personality, really nice' and in response to the question in what ways wouldn't you like to be like your mother she says, 'she wouldn't like to shout much.' The mother's AAI describes a close relationship with her own mother. 'We were close, she was understanding, she was warm and friendly I felt closest to my mum um because she was the only one who was always there.''' She is able to illustrate all these adjectives with specific memories, "I had my first ever migraine......and she sat up the whole night with me, holding my hand and stroking my face, and she was just there.'"
The ‘Use of Examples’ scale. Children with an insecure attachment classification were often unable to give examples of incidents when they had been ill or hurt. For example in response to the question ‘‘What happens when you’re ill?’’ One child’s response was ‘‘I don’t know. stay home if it’s bad.....(pause)... Can’t remember the last time.’’ Mother’s transcript ‘‘. ....cutting my knee.....and my finger....I can’t remember sitting in my mum’s lap, I suppose that’s why I asked my mum if she loved me, sometimes I felt maybe I wasn’t ...(laughs) I don’t know.’’ Secure children were usually able to give rich illustrative examples to these types of questions. For example one securely classified child’s response was, ‘‘My mum looks after me ....she brings my covers down on the settee, brings me drinks. If I’ve got a sore throat she brings me throat sweets. She looks after me....cuddles me for a bit.’’ This child’s mother’s has been classified as secure as she is able to reflect on her feelings of rejection and seems forgiving towards her own mother ‘‘...she always had too much to do, there was always you know too many kids and working too hard....’’ Both her children’s interviews describes a mother who is accessible to them.

The ‘Preoccupied Anger’ scale, towards mother and/or father was not evident in any of the children interviewed in this sample. At this stage it is difficult to determine whether this dimension is obsolete until the CAI has been administered on a clinical sample of children.

The ‘Idealisation’ scale: this was evident in one child’s interview who in response to the question ‘‘What happens when your mother gets upset with you?’’ She responds saying, ‘‘I know she gets upset , but I love her all the time. Sometimes we have arguments we know everything is done for our own good and safety.” A sense from this interview is
that the child needs positively wrap-up statements she makes throughout the interview although there was not adequate evidence for positive experiences. The child’s mother, when asked to choose five adjectives to describe her relationship with her own mother she responds by saying, “.....Er....I can remember it being a happy time I mean,.....um... can’t think of the actual words....Um....I mean I don’t know if I was expected, but I was always .....seemed to be there to help with the little ones...” Her attachment pattern is assigned as insecure/preoccupied as the experiences she relates throughout her narratives are neither fruitful or incisive.

The “Dismissal” scale. On this scale children who did not acknowledge missing their parents after a separation or did not acknowledge any emotional affect after a death were assigned high ratings on this scale. Their mothers replicate this in their transcripts in response to questions relating to their own separations from their parents seeming to dismiss the importance of their attachments to their parents and keeping the attachment deactivated.

The “Resolution of Conflict” scale. Children were asked to describe what happens when their parents become upset with them. Secure children were able to identify how they felt and recognise their parents’ feelings. On the whole they knew why they were in trouble, they thought their parents’ response was fair and they usually resolved the conflict by a self initiated apology. “......I go up to her and say sorry for whatever I’ve done.”

The “Self organisation” scale. This construct appears to be measuring the same as resolution of conflict. Children tended to score similarly on both these scales. There is not
a specific question that directly addresses this construct. Perhaps the interview needs to include a question that assesses a child’s ability to problem solve.

The “Overall Coherence” scale. On this scale Children classified as secure presented a freeflowing picture of their experiences with very little prompting, “...I’d forgotten to feed the rats for a week. My mum went into her room and I went into my room and I started crying. I didn’t really know what to think because they did really stink. I was really sorry, because I don’t like upsetting my mum.......” Some children classified as insecure were assigned low ratings on this scale because they provided excessive irrelevant information or barely provided any information. Insecure mothers assigned with low scores on this construct also had similar patterns of incoherence.

**Behavioural Analysis**

The CAI is designed to bridge the gap between the study of attachment in infancy and adulthood by incorporating a behavioural and representational measure of attachment (Ainsworth, and Wittig, 1969; Main Kaplan and Cassidy, 1985). However, the current behavioural analysis just provides a crude measure of behaviour at the end of the interview. Further refinement of the behavioural analysis is necessary such as paying particular attention to the child’s behaviour during salient dyads about the quality of their relationship with each parent and their non-verbal responses when asked about separations. This may provide useful additional information about the child’s classification status.
Ethical Considerations

As the CAI is designed to surprise the unconscious it may leave some children feeling distressed. Sensitivity in its administration is therefore essential. None of the children in this sample seemed unduly perturbed by the content of the CAI as demonstrated in their willingness to participate for the test-retest interview. Mothers on the other hand were at times very upset during and after the administration of the AAI. On several occasions the tape recorder was stopped and mothers were asked if they still wished to continue. All the mothers agreed to continue despite their distress. Empathy and understanding are therefore essential prerequisites when interviewing people about their attachment history.

Methodological Limitations and Future Recommendations

Although this study provides much supporting evidence with respect to the psychometric properties of the CAI, in particular its reliability and discriminant validity, certain limitations have to be taken into account. Firstly, this study was conducted with a sample of mainly middle-class subjects from intact families because of the moderate participation rate and self-selection. This may restrict the generalisability of the findings as it is not clear whether the same results would have been obtained with a lower socio-economic population, a clinical sample, or with a population from a different ethnic background.

Secondly, there were three sets of twins in the sample which is a high proportion considering the total number of participants was only thirty. Again this factor may restrict the generalisability of the findings.
Thirdly, it is possible that if the author had been trained in the administration and coding of the SAT, there may have been a higher concordance level between the SAT and the CAI classifications.

Fourthly, fathers were not interviewed in this study. It is therefore only possible to speculate the effect the fathers’ attachment pattern might have on children of this age group.

The limitations of the study suggest a number of topics for future research: replicating this study using a heterogenous sample of children will provide information on the extent these results can be generalised to other populations; interviewing fathers would enable a closer examination of the father’s role in effecting their child’s quality of attachment; and adequate training in the use and administration of the SAT may eliminate possible spurious findings.

**Implications of the Research Findings from this Study**

The CAI seems a very promising instrument in its ability to assign an overall classification of security or insecurity in children between 8 to 12 years. Further, refinement of this measure is needed to define specific patterns of attachment. However, the results concerning the psychometric properties of this instrument are impressive. Empirical replication of these findings is necessary in order to determine the extent of the measures reliability and validity. If the CAI proves to be a reliable and valid measure its utility as a clinical assessment tool cannot be overestimated. It will be able to offer a rich, integrated set of hypotheses about the individual’s development of security, self image and intimate relationships. Specific patterns in attachment may also predict what
problems might emerge. The degree of security might also predict the degree of risk in the development or severity of problems. For example, a child classified as avoidant may have difficulties in forming close relationships with peers at school increasing their sense of isolation, which may subsequently lead to depression or the development of a personality disorder.
CONCLUSION

The Child Attachment Interview arises from the attachment theory tradition utilising an empirically derived classification system that it is theoretically plausible. It seems to have the ability to evoke unconscious feelings and attitudes towards attachment through states of mind and seems to access rich and important information about attachment. The interview assesses current internal working models of caregiving relationships and examines feelings and behaviours that arise from current dyadic relationships.

The CAI has demonstrated impressive psychometric properties. Classifications appeared quite reliable over a two month period. With respect to discriminant validity, the CAI appears to be uninfluenced by verbal and performance intelligence, expressive language ability and clinical morbidity.

Thirty children originally participated in this study, two were unable to complete the re-test because of illness. The majority of the children were from white middle class intact families. Although this sample is not representative of the general population and therefore restricts the generalisability of the results, the intention of this study was to test the CAI's reliability and validity. Therefore, stable life circumstances were an essential consideration to minimise interference of instability evoked by changing life circumstances.

The intercoder agreement was substantial and comparable to those reported in other studies of the AAI classification system (Fonagy et al., 1991). The changes in classifications could not be attributed to interviewer effects as the same interviewer
administered the CAI on both occasions. The predictive validity of the CAI is very promising. The child-mother attachment classifications showed the expected correspondence and is comparable with those reported in other studies (Van IJzendoorn, et al., 1991). The test-retest was measured over a time period during which few changes in life circumstances were reported. Under less favourable circumstances and across a longer time period the CAI classifications may reflect the impact of major life events.

The limitations of this study suggest a number of topics for future research. To enable a closer examination of discriminant variables such as intelligence, language abilities and clinical morbidity where a larger sample needs to be studied. Furthermore, future studies should test the CAI’s stability over longer time intervals. This would provide the opportunity to test whether changes in the CAI are related to changes in the child’s circumstances. Finally, replication studies using lower socio-economic status families, clinical groups, and children from different cultures will need to assess the generalisability of these results. In view of the limitations of the SAT perhaps it would be more useful to assess concurrent validity using a modified behavioural assessment (such as a modified Strange Situation paradigm). Alternatively, the CAI could also be validated by assessing infants classified in the Strange Situation and then again in middle childhood, or classifying children in middle childhood and then again as adults. As the research evidence suggests early experiences relevant to attachment are statistically associated with later outcomes of attachment classifications. However, development is always a product of the individual’s history and current circumstances and one of the problems with longitudinal studies is not only accessing the entire original sample, but also controlling for changing life circumstances.
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Dear Dr Target,

Joint UCL/UCLH Committees on the Ethics of Human Research: Committee Alpha
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Title: A core battery of change measures for the psychological treatment of children

Thank you for your letter of 29 January supplying further information at the request of the Committee. I am writing to let you know that this application is now approved. You may therefore go ahead with the study.

Please note that it is important that you notify the Committee of any adverse events or changes (name of investigator etc) relating to this project. You should also notify the Committee on completion of the project, or indeed if the project is abandoned. Please remember to quote the above number in any correspondence.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor M Hobsley
Chairman
Dear ........

We are currently conducting a research project at the Anna Freud Centre to investigate the efficacy of psychoanalysis for children with severe emotional disorders. Before we are able to start assessing these children, it is necessary to carry out our various measures on a number of children aged between 8 and twelve who do not necessarily have emotional problems.

You may already know of the valuable work done at the Anna Freud Centre which offers, free of charge, psychotherapy to children and adolescents presenting with emotional and behavioural problems. In the current economic climate, it is difficult to obtain the financial resources needed to fund the centre and consequently there is an increasing need to justify this form of treatment. As a result, research which investigates the efficacy of treatment offered here has become essential.

A research team headed by Peter Fonagy, Freud Memorial Professor of Psychoanalysis at University College London, and Mary Target, Senior Research fellow, are currently planning a prospective study which intends to investigate child, parent and family outcomes of child analysis. At this early stage of the study, we need to obtain information about the way in which normal children perform on the tasks which we have selected as measures of outcome. This is why we are approaching you, to ask you for help by giving us access to children in your school.

We hope to involve parents and teachers and to carry out a battery of tasks with individual children aged 8 to 12 with a focus on the child’s overall social, cognitive and behavioural development. The situation should be an unstressful one which we would expect the children to enjoy themselves.

We appreciate that schools are under a great deal of pressure, particularly now with the extra work arising from the National Curriculum, and consequently we are asking for very limited involvement from teachers themselves. With your permission, arrangements would be negotiated directly with parents to fall out of school hours and parents would be under no obligation to participate. We anticipate that parents, teachers and children would benefit from their involvement in the project and provided parents consented, we would be pleased to share our findings with your staff.

If you would like to discuss the matter further or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0171-275-7431. In the meantime, I look forward hearing from you soon.

Thank you for giving these issues your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Tania Pilley.
Appendix 3

Dear Parent,

For the past two years psychologists at University College London have been working with families and children of primary school age. We have been interviewing children and their families about their development, for example, friendships, milestones and relationships. Surprisingly little is known about how children of this age usually develop socially and emotionally, what sort of problems they commonly have and how long they last. Increasing our understanding in these areas should help us to help children better, in the future, when they have problems.

We would like to check that it would be all right for one of the research team to phone you or call round, to explain more about the project, and to see whether you would like to join us. If you could fill in the bottom of this letter and return it to the teacher we will be able to contact you either by post or telephone, or if you indicate that you would not like to learn more we will know not to contact you again. In the meantime, if you have any questions or would like to contact us by phone, please feel free to phone me (0958-347816).

Thank you for thinking about this.

Yours sincerely,

Tania Pilley.
Trainee Clinical Psychologist.

Date.......................... 

I ....................................and my child........................................ would like/not like to be contacted to learn more about the project, and to see whether we would like to join. Our telephone number is...........................................
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Confidential
University College London
PARENT CONSENT FORM

Consent to Participate in Research Study

I (Name of Parent / primary carer) ............................................................

of (Name of child) ...............................................................................

Address..............................................................................................

..............................................................................................

agree that my child / ward may take part in the research project undertaken at University of London.

I confirm that the nature and demands of the research team have been explained to me and that I understand and accept them.

I also understand the I may withdraw and may withdraw my child / ward from the research project if I find I am / they are unable to continue at any time.

Signed .................................................Date.............................................

Witnessed by .................................................Date.............................................

INVESTIGATOR’S STATEMENT

I have explained the nature, demands and foreseeable risks of the above research to the subject.

Name .................................................Position .................................................

Signed .................................................Date .................................................
Appendix 5.

Confidential
University College London

CHILD CONSENT FORM

Consent to Participate in Research Study

I (Name of Child) ...............................................................
of (school).............................................................................

I have been told what the study is about and have read the information sheet about this
study which explains what I have to do. I have asked any questions I might have.

Signed................................................................. Date..............................

Witnessed by ..................................................Date..............................

INVESTIGATORS STATEMENT

I have explained the nature, demands and foreseeable risks of the above research to the
subject.

Name .................................................................Position......................

Signed by .................................................................Date..............................
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CHILDHOOD ATTACHMENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

(8 TO 12 YEAR OLDS) (Revised Edition VI, 05/12/98)

The CAI aims to access children's mental representations of attachment figures and significant others (if appropriate). One way of potentially accessing these representations is asking children about their experiences with, and perceptions of, their parents.

The CAI is not predominantly designed to elicit biographical or episodic information, rather it attempts to capture the affective nature of the relationship described.

Central to the CAI is the degree to which the child conceives their parents as emotionally available, responsive and thereby able to use them as a secure base. More specifically, the CAI seeks to tap into memories the child may hold concerning times of crises (e.g., personal injury, bullying), separations from parents (planned and unplanned), in addition to positive aspects of their relationships with their parents (cuddling, talking, spending time together).

The interviewer should consistently hold in mind the importance of assessing the child's view of the Relationship Episodes (REs). Therefore, prompts should reflect this emphasis.

Some children are able to recount coherently and sequentially the events within which the REs are contained. However, others may require additional help in the form of scaffolding from the interviewer in order for them to tell the story in a way that can easily be understood and subsequently coded. The questions ask the child about his or her relationship with attachment figures and about specific situations in that relationship, such as when Mum gets upset or when Mum and Dad argue.

During the interview it is extremely important to get specific examples from the child in response to EACH AND EVERY question. This is VERY important on questions 2 which asks the child for three words to describe themselves and questions 3 and 5 which ask what it's like to be with Mum and Dad respectively. You MUST ask the child for an example for each of the words they give, as the coding system for this interview relies on the child giving specific examples to illustrate each of the words he/she uses. For instance, in question 3 the child might say that it feels safe, happy and relaxing to be with Mum, so you must ask the child for an example of when it felt safe, an example of when it felt happy and an example of
IMPORTANT GENERAL PROMPTS

Prompts are not principally given to find out more episodic information. Instead they are offered to provide clarity concerning the nature and quality of the child's attachment representations. In other words, there is an emphasis within the CAI on quality not quantity.

♦ If the child responds with concrete, physical attributes or purely factual information (see for example question 2) then attempt to explore the affective nature of the description relayed. If the child does not respond with a RE, do not persist, simply move on.

If potential REs are identified anywhere throughout the interview then:

1. Initially ask the child to tell the story from the beginning.
2. If the child has problems with sequencing their narrative orientate them by asking for specific details surrounding the events (e.g., Who was there? What happened? What was there? What did you do?)
3. Ask how the child and other (if relevant) felt in the situation.

Presenting the interview

Present the interview by saying:

“This is an interview about you and your family. I am going to ask you some questions about yourself first and then I will ask questions about your relationship with your parents. For each question I will ask you to give me some examples. This interview is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. I would just like you to tell me how you really think and feel about what you and your family are like. The interview will last about half an hour (30 minutes)”.

1) Can you tell me about the people in your family. (May need to qualify by saying “That is the people living together in your house” if child starts describing extended family members).

This is a warm-up question and it’s aim is not to try and obtain biographical information but rather to engage the child in the interview and reduce any unnecessary anxiety.

2) Tell me three words that describe yourself, that is not what you look like, but what sort of person you are (It may be useful to say “that is your personality or character”. Some children may find it helpful to imagine writing a letter to a pen pal). 1........... 2............ 3.............

a) Ask for specific examples to support each adjective, i.e., “Can you give me an example of when you felt” 1........ 2....... 3........

Prompts: After each example, prompt the child as appropriate focusing on any specific relationship episodes (See introduction).
3) Can you tell me three words to describe your relationship with you mum? (can add “that is, what it’s like to be with your Mum?”).

1........... 2........... 3............

a) Ask for specific examples to support each adjective, i.e., “Tell me about a time when you felt 1..... 2....... 3....... with her”

Prompts: Immediately after each example prompt the child for more detailed description of the relationship episode as necessary (See introduction).

4) What happens when Mum gets upset with you?

a) Prompt: If you’ve done something wrong or done something to upset her, what does she usually say or do?

Ask for a specific example, can say “Tell me the last time mum got upset with you”.

b) How did you feel when that happens?

c) How did you think your mum feels when that happens?

d) Why do you think she does that?

e) If child does NOT take this to mean getting angry:- Further prompt: What happens when your Mum tells you off/is angry with you?

f) Do you know why she tells you off or what you have done wrong?

g) Do you think it’s fair?

5) Can you tell me three words to describe your relationship with you Dad? (can add “that is, what it’s like to be with your Dad?”).

1........... 2........... 3............

a) Ask for specific examples to support each adjective, i.e., “Tell me about a time when you felt 1..... 2....... 3....... with him”

Prompts: Immediately after each example prompt the child for more detailed description of the relationship episode as necessary (See introduction).

6) What happens when Dad gets upset with you?

a) Prompt: If you’ve done something wrong or done something to upset him, what does he usually say or do?

Ask for a specific example, can say “Tell me the last time mum got upset with you”.

b) How did you feel when that happens?

c) How do you think your dad feels when that happens?

d) Why do you think he does that?

e) If child does NOT take this to mean getting angry:- Further prompt: What happens when your dad tells you off/is angry with you?
f) Do you know why he tells you off or what you have done wrong?
g) Do you think it’s fair?

7) Can you tell me about a time when you were upset and wanted help

Prompt: You were trying to tell someone something and no one understood what you meant? Or, there was something you wanted someone to do and no one understood you?

If the child says that this hasn’t happened, offer suggestions:

e.g.; how would you feel if; your teacher told you off in front of the whole class, or you asked your friend to play after school and they said no because they didn’t like you anymore, or you were bullied at school.

Prompt for a specific example when child felt upset or misunderstood.

8) What happens when you’re ill?

Prompt for a specific example i.e., “Can you tell me what happened?”. What did you do? Does anyone stay at home with you?

9) What happens when you hurt yourself?

Prompt for a specific example, i.e., “Can you tell me about a time when…?”. What did you do? Who was there?

10) Has anyone close to you ever died? Has an animal ever died?
   a) What happened? Was the death sudden? Did you go to the funeral?
   b) How did you feel about it?
   c) How do you think it made other people feel? (e.g. Mum, Dad, sibling?)

11) Is there anyone that you cared about who isn’t around anymore? (This should be asked as an extension of question 10 only if this issue has not been covered previously).
   a) How did it feel when they went away? Did things change much?
   b) Do you keep in touch? If yes, how, if no why do you think that is?

   If child says no: Tell me about a time when things changed. (e.g. moved house, went to new school, parents separating, friend left).
   a) How did you feel?
   b) Do you keep in touch? If yes, how, if no why do you think that is?

12) Have you ever been away from your parents for longer than a day? (very important question concerning separation from parents, try therefore to get as much information as possible).
Prompts: Prompt to get a clear idea of the incident the child is describing (i.e., When, Who they were with, Where to, How long for, What they did)

a) What was it like to be away from you parent/s?
b) What do you think it was like for your mum and dad?
c) What was it like seeing mum and dad again?

13) Do your parents sometimes argue?
Prompt for a specific example, can say “Can you tell me about the last time your parents were arguing”

a) How do you feel? Why do you feel like that?
b) Why do you think they do that?
c) How do you think they feel?
d) Do they know how you feel?

14) a. In what ways would you like to be like you mum?
   b. In what ways would you not like to be like you mum?
   c. In what ways would you like to be like your dad?
   d. In what ways would you not like to be like your dad?

15) Ending Question: If you could make three wishes when you are older what would they be? (finish up question, should be asked in playful manner and affirm the child’s answers, e.g., “ah, that sounds really good”).
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1.0 Background

The CAI scoring system incorporates elements from both the Strange Situation Procedure (SSP) scoring and the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) scoring and classification systems.

The CAI is conceptualised as in some respects analogous to the SSP in that it calls upon the activation of the attachment system and is characterised as a meeting between a child and a stranger/experimenter in an unfamiliar setting. It is thus postulated that the child would draw upon mental representations or internal working models of his/her attachment figure/s in the interview as enabling or inhibiting engagement in the task. Children who hold internal working models of parents as a secure base, as accessible and responsive are likely to be less resistant and anxious. These children would also exhibit a higher degree of emotional openness and greater coherence in the interview thus drawing “Parallels between the secure base phenomenon in infancy and the security implicit in emotional openness” in later childhood (Kaplan, 1984). Hence, the nature and quality of the experimenter - child interaction and the degree to which material raised within the interview is explored may in some ways reflect the child's internal working models of his/her attachment figures. Whilst the CAI is designed to access the child’s mental representations of parents, the coding also relies upon a detailed behavioural analysis as an important source of information in arriving at an attachment classification.

The scoring system is based initially on identifying Relationship Episodes (REs) within the entire interview. REs are subsequently coded individually and form the basis for an overall attachment classification with respect to Mother and Father independently.
2.0 Working Definition of REs

Any part of the narrative where the child describes an interaction between themselves and an attachment figure would constitute an RE. Most REs would involve interaction with the child’s mother and/or father. Some REs may include other family members, teachers and friends and these episodes may be used to inform the child’s overall attachment classification. However, on occasions it is necessary to apply a more flexible definition when the narrative produced by the child concerning attachment-related experiences is impoverished. In those circumstances, ‘non-interactions’ should be recorded especially in children who adopt an avoidant style, as often these are the best these children will provide.

Clear examples of relationship episodes:

“*My relationship with my mum is good because we just like to be together. Often we will just have cuddles together because we like each other*”.

“*My relationship with my mum is dodgy at times. She gets angry with me when I have an argument with my brother and will send me to my room. A few minutes later she would call me and I would say sorry.*”

Example of a ‘non-interaction’:

“*The last time I was with my mother was yesterday. I was playing football with my friends outside*. This example would constitute a ‘non-interaction’ in that although AF is alluded to, there is no direct contact between the child and the AF.
3.0 Coding Sequence

Step 1: Identify Relationship Episodes (REs) throughout the interview and record on coding sheet.

Step 2: Assign rating on scales identified in coding manual.

Step 3: Based upon rating assigned in step 2, assign Secure/Insecure attachment classification with respect to Mother and Father independently.

Step 4: Assign a sub-classification of Secure/Very Secure or Insecure/Very Insecure.
4.0 Operational Criteria for scoring REs

The following scales could be grouped in different categories – could be linked to a particular attachment classification, could be a form vs content distinction; experience scales vs. state of mind scales.)

4.1 Linguistic Analysis

4.1.1 Emotional Openness and range of emotional terms used. This scale is concerned with the affective description rather than the behavioural expression of the child. Emotional openness takes into account the range of feelings that the child describes, the degree to which the child is able to place those feelings within a relational context and has an appreciation and is able to express the interplay of affect, mental states and behaviour. Emotional openness is rated on a nine-point scale with 1 for low emotional openness and 9 for high emotional openness.

1 – No mention of affect and no illustrations. A child who makes little or no reference to emotional states of self and others throughout the narrative. A narrative that is dominated by concrete and physical characteristics of self and others. Descriptions of AFs are set within a utilitarian frame and they are only valued for what they can do or provide in material terms.

3 – Affects are labelled but not illustrated. A restricted range of affects are mentioned and are rarely accompanied by descriptions, which if present are impoverished. In addition, emotional states are not recognised as being temporary and there is no appreciation of their impact upon others.
5 - Limited range of affects only substantiated to a small degree. The child is able to identify and express a limited affective range and provides limited episodic illustrations. There is the sense that the child provides the basic structure of the emotional narrative such that the gaps can predominantly be completed by the rater. Hence, illustrations are present but are not fully elaborated. Additionally, the child may show limited understanding of the impact of emotional states on others.

7 - A full range of emotional states with some elaborated examples. The child identifies multiple affects grounded in relevant examples. However, richly detailed illustrations are not consistent throughout the narrative and the rater is required to ‘fill-in’ the gaps. The child may demonstrate an understanding of the impact of emotions on others and recognise that emotional states change across time and context.

9 - Affectively laden narrative with consistently detailed illustrations. High emotional openness. The child is able to describe a variety of emotional states and recognises that emotions are temporary and context specific. The child is able to provide a detailed depiction of their feelings, which are grounded in the REs and/or in the social context described, and also demonstrate an understanding of their likely impact on others.
4.1.2. **Balance of Positive and Negative References to Attachment Figures (AFs).**

The child is able to describe both good and bad qualities of, and interactions with, their AFs and does not solely refer to the AFs in negative or positive terms. (NB. It is expected that the majority of children will tend to use more positive terms to describe their parents. This bias towards the positive should be considered when rating). This scale is independent of the Use of Examples scale and should be rated accordingly.

1 – **Extreme polarisation.** A child who refers to AFs solely in positive or negative terms. The child’s narrative does not contain references to the alternative viewpoint.

3 – **Unbalanced.** Little mention of both positive and negative attributes of at least one parental figure but this only occurs in one part of the interview. If child does mention the alternative viewpoint, he/she adopts a strategy in order to block out the thought by not talking, replying “I don’t know” or digressing.

5 – **Moderately balanced.** In approximately half of the narrative there is evidence of the child being able to consider both positive and negative aspects of AFs. This contemplation may be tentative and unelaborated.

7 – **Balanced.** Mixed emotions are expressed throughout the majority of the interview. The child is able not only to contemplate but also express both positive and negative references to AFs.

“*My relationship with Dad is fun and dodgy. It is fun because we make up jokes together and dodgy because he teases me*”. 
9 - **Highly balanced.** A child who is able to label both positive and negative aspects of the relationship with AFs throughout the narrative. The child shows evidence of being able to contemplate, express, and fully elaborate upon both aspects of AFs.

4.1.3 **Use of Examples.** For example, in extreme avoidance the child consistently cannot remember, or replies with "I don't know" or "nothing". In such cases it is important to crudely establish that the child is using an avoidance strategy rather than genuinely not being able to recall. It is therefore essential to prompt for other more concrete memories such as what the child did the previous day or what the child ate for dinner the previous evening. This would allow to possibly distinguish forgetting from 'defensive exclusion' (Bowlby, 1980). The idealising child would be able to provide a generalised description of their overall relationship with their AFs but will not be able to substantiate it with specific examples. Another pattern can be observed where the child is unable to provide generalised descriptions or specific examples pertaining to AFs.

1 - **No examples despite frequent prompting.**

3 - **Very occasional use of examples.** Interviewer elicits them but the examples provided are not relevant or illustrative. The examples are either rare and not detailed and do not provide a complete account of the RE despite prompts. There is not one single illustrated answer.

5- **Limited.** Around half of the prompts elicit examples, they are on the whole understandable but not very detailed. The interviewer needs to use their imagination to fill in the gaps. All the examples are very recent or only dominant themes are presented. Only one good example is provided. Children who offer examples that are tangential and consistently provide superfluous detail which is irrelevant to the question being addressed should be assigned this rating.
7 – **Predominantly illustrative examples.** Relatively little difficulty in offering detailed examples, although some of the examples will be irrelevant or narrow. At least three richly detailed, appropriate and relevant examples should be offered.

9 – **Fully illustrated examples.** At least four richly detailed and complete examples are provided with minimal prompts. The examples provided need to be relevant and appropriate.

4.1.4 **Preoccupied Anger.** The degree to which the child expresses anger that is uncontained and overwhelming when describing REs. A distinction is drawn between the expression of anger which in an attachment context could serve to call forth care taking behaviour and aggression or violence that seeks to attack attachment figures and threaten attachment relationships. Only expressions of anger should be rated on this scale and not aggression, violence. Code separately for each parent.

1 – **Anger is described but not re-experienced** and has been clearly resolved. Thus, no current anger is expressed.

**Insert 107 transcript here**

3 – **Anger is expressed and re-experienced to a slight degree.** There is suggestion that traces of anger are still present. However, anger is contained and is not pervasive throughout the narrative.

5 – **Anger is clearly stated and is not resolved.** However, it is not markedly present throughout the narrative and tends to be limited to one or two episodes. Anger is a persistent but not dominant theme, although it is re-experienced to some degree it does not escalate and therefore is not pervasive throughout the narrative.
7 – Anger is expressed in description of REs and is unresolved. There is an indication of escalation of anger that brings forth other related memories. Anger is clearly a pervasive theme and the child’s references to anger seems to fuel their angry preoccupation.

9 – Anger is clearly expressed and escalation is evident to the rater. Repeated references to anger are made which leak into other parts of the narrative. Anger is an all-pervasive theme and dominates the majority of the narrative and there is therefore no question that the child is angrily preoccupied.

4.1.5 Idealisation of Attachment Figure/s. This scale measures the extent to which the child’s representations of AFs are distorted in a positive direction. Idealisation on this scale is rated on a continuum from ‘no idealisation’ to ‘highly idealising’ and does not measure derogation, which is accounted for within the dismissal scale below.

The child only provides generalised positive descriptions of attachment figures and relationships that are not substantiated by concrete examples. Evidence for distortion is identified in the relationship between generalised descriptions and probable experience. This is a separate scale from the scale of balance of positive and negative references to AFs in that idealising children may not use more positive descriptions than other children but the discrepancy between the general and specific is the basis for this rating. The central question the rater is asking is “How credible are general descriptors of AFs in the light of specific examples?”

Code separately for each parent.

Preliminary analysis of existing interview responses suggest that children may adopt the following strategies of idealisation. These however, are not mutually exclusive and can all be manifest within the narrative:
I. The child may provide a generalised description but does not substantiate it with an example (e.g. responses such as ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I can’t remember’ in response to requests for specific examples to generalised descriptions).

II. The child may provide a positive generalised description that is subsequently contradicted by an unfavourable example (e.g., a child may describe his/her mother as ‘very loving’ and yet provide an example where the mother was rejecting in some form).

The following is an extract from a girl (C819) explaining why she sees her relationship with her mother as “friendly”:

“Well, we don’t have many fights so ahm, we rarely fall out.” Can you give me an example of when it felt friendly with your mum? Well, my sister and my mum and dad were having a fight about who fed the guinea pig. Me and my sister kept fighting about it and then my sister was threatening like my mum and my mum was threatening my sister and everything and then ahm, I kind of felt a bit scared and then I came downstairs and my mum was being friendly to me. Well, my mum was threatening to kill the guinea pigs and my sister said 'If you kill the guinea pigs I am going to run away and everything.'”

III. The child provides a generalised description that is only partly substantiated by near-miss examples. Near-miss examples are those where the child initially offers a seemingly contradictory or irrelevant example which subsequently is turned around and shown to be relevant (e.g., child describes mother as ‘caring’ and subsequently offers an incident where the mother was unable to take care of the child’s needs but who eventually is described as being available to meet the child’s needs).
1 – Positive generalised statements concerning AFs and experiences are consistently supported by relevant REs. The child provides episodic examples that are relevant, do not contrast with the general description given, and does not employ any of the strategies of idealisation presented above. Examples can be brief but must not be contradictory.

3 – Positive generalised descriptions are on the whole substantiated by specific REs. However, there may be one or two instances where the child does not provide convincing examples and may employ any one of the strategies of idealisation outlined above.

5 - Generalised positive descriptions of attachment figures and relationships are only partly supported often by unclear, or near miss, episodic examples. Alternatively, the child may provide episodic examples which are mildly contradictory, partial or unclear. Furthermore, the child may provide a neutral statement that is not supported.

7 – Generalised positive descriptions are rarely substantiated by specific examples. Very positive generalised descriptions of AFs are sparsely supported. A neutral description is associated with a markedly negative and thus contradictory example, or there are several instances where the valence of the story shifts from positive to negative. Alternatively, neutral or balanced descriptions may be contradicted by episodes which contain rejecting or abusive behaviour.

9 – Positive generalised descriptions are prevalent throughout the narrative and are not substantiated by specific examples. If episodic examples are provided, these are invariably contradictory to the generalised descriptions put forward. The child may throw in gratuitous praise and spontaneously insert unsolicited positive descriptions. Alternatively, there may be a shift in valence which is pervasive.
4.1.6 Dismissal of Attachment. This scale measures the extent to which the child adopts a strategy that serves to minimise the importance of AFs and relationships by active dismissal. Any expression of vulnerability, dependency or the need of comfort from AFs is deliberately rejected and excluded. The degree to which information concerning attachment-related stress such as child’s illness, physical hurt, conflicts, separations and death is central in rating on this scale. This scale should be rated in relation to the probable specific experience but independent of the child’s history. For example, a separation of two weeks would be considered a major event even if the child has had repeated separation events in their earlier life. The degree of dismissal as operationalised on this scale is dependent upon the severity of the event and the age of the child.

Accordingly, three classes of events have identified from minor through to major. Thus, it is assumed that such events have varying degrees of impact upon the child and the attachment relationship. The child's failure to acknowledge the effect of a major event as a potential threat to the attachment relationship will be rated highly on this scale, whereas a child who fails to acknowledge the likely impact of a minor event will only receive a low to moderate rating.

As a guide the following can be used but the age of the child also needs to be taken into account:

Minor event: The child experiences a physical or emotional pain that would normally require the parent to comfort the child. Examples would include situations such as when the child is ill with a cold/flu/or other minor childhood ailment, child has an accident that can be immediately attended to and does not require medical intervention,
Moderate event: Circumstances that would constitute a moderate event include a planned separation of 1-2 days duration, more significant accidents or illnesses which require medical intervention.

Major event: These events, by definition, are not likely to occur very often. Separations of longer than one week, unplanned separations, loss through death of close family member or friends (often pets will fall into this category but not necessarily), serious physical injuries or illnesses which require prolonged medical intervention which may include hospitalisation. rations from AFs, death of a close family member or friend.

1 – Valuing. The child affectively acknowledges both minor and major events and appears comfortable with expressing vulnerability in response to separation and loss.

3 – The child expresses some feeling of vulnerability in relation to some major events but denies vulnerability with respect to some minor events.

5 – Emotional vulnerability in response to minor events is largely denied. Some acknowledgement of the impact of major events is present but this may be limited.

7 – The feelings of vulnerability evoked by separation and loss are denied for all minor events and the majority of major events, although these may be partially acknowledged.

9 – Affect is deliberately and systematically excluded. Vulnerability to rejection and disappointment is denied and the self is presented as invulnerable. Major events, e.g. separation from parents for longer than 3 days, are totally denied or dismissed as inconsequential.
4.1.7 Resolution of Conflicts. The child is able to recount an episode containing conflict which is subsequently resolved. Solutions may be positive, negative or passive. Positive solutions include examples of reconciliation initiated by the child or parent. Negative solutions include destructive and potentially catastrophic scenarios that may be incomplete. Passive solutions are those where the child describes a situation where the conflict has not been directly addressed, e.g.; the child watches television or plays a computer game following a conflict or disagreement. Conflicts range in severity from a minor disagreement to conflicts arising from separation and loss.

1 – Clearly unresolved conflict. These are often characterised by destructive/ negative responses. For example a child may minimise the sense of separation by talking about absent people in the present tense.

3 – Unresolved.

5 – Limited resolution. Although resolutions to conflicts are not systematically addressed there is the sense conveyed to the rater that the issues have been resolved. The process of resolution is not described.

7 – Resolved

9 – Very clearly resolved. Conflict is accurately reported and then is systematically addressed, ultimately arriving at a solution that seems satisfactory for the rater.

4.1.8 Self-Organization Scale. This scale attempts to assess the child’s representation of self-agency and self efficacy. It is assumed that secure children will represent themselves as being active agents who are able to
plan, organise and execute a sequence of actions which lead to a satisfactory resolution. Two main strategies have been identified that may lead to a low score on this scale; a strategy whereby the child adopts a passive stance or alternatively an impulsive one. Passivity is defined as the experience of having performed no action to address the problem akin to notion learned helplessness, e.g.; child would go to watch television which is not regarded as a actively initiated solution. Impulsively is defined as the experience of having performed an action that seemingly cannot be rationally linked to the conflict situation, e.g., the child just finds himself/herself responding to a conflict situation in an ill-thought out manner which lacks any forward planning.

1 – **Very low self organisation.** Resolutions to conflicts are dominated by extreme passivity or impulsively and there are no clearly planned self-initiated resolutions.

3 – **Low self organisation.** Resolutions to conflicts are on the whole passive or impulsive. Self-initiated solutions may be alluded to but these are not clearly stated or elaborated.

5 – **Moderate self organisation.** Self initiated resolutions to conflicts are limited in frequency and are interspersed with more passive and/or impulsive responses. The child does not necessarily demonstrate an awareness that his/her behaviour leads to a satisfactory/desired outcome. Thus, the sense conveyed is that the child employs a ‘hit and miss’ strategy.

7 – **High self organisation.** Self initiated and well planned solutions to conflicts predominate. However, there may be no more than one passive and/or impulsive solution. The child is aware that his/her behaviour directly leads to a positive/desired outcome.
9 – **Very high self organisation.** Resolutions to conflict are predominantly self-initiated, clearly planned and executed leading to satisfactory outcomes.

4.1.9 **Overall coherence.** This scale to some degree integrates information from the Idealisation, Preoccupied Anger, Dismissing and Use of Examples Scales. These scales thus constitute feeder scales that are used to gauge the initial level of overall coherence which is subsequently fine tuned by consideration of violations and/or evidence of high coherence as outlined below.

This scale comprises both positive and negative indices of coherence. Coherence indices are not weighted equally, some are considered to be more fundamental to coherence than others. Violations of coherence as manifested in various forms throughout the narrative may be compensated by evidence of reflectiveness and spontaneity in discourse, both considered as positive indices of coherence.

A. **Positive indices of coherence.** Scores can be inflated by **2 points by the positive indices of fresh speech and reflectiveness.**

**Fresh speech**
Fresh speech is defined as speech that reflects a new understanding, when the child is making sense of something for the first time, as distinct from a scripted or well-rehearsed account. Such speech gives the impression of thinking aloud.

**Reflectiveness**
Reflectiveness refers to the ability to appreciate and consider intentionality in oneself and others. (In time this may be used as a separate scale, especially when reflective self probes are inserted into the protocol).
B. Negative Indices of Coherence – Violations to Coherence

When considering violations of coherence the rater should be mindful of the way in which the feeder scales have a bearing upon coherence. The components of coherence contained within these scales need to be extrapolated to provide a comprehensive evaluation of overall coherence. Thus, the feeder scales link with coherence in the following ways:

The “idealisation” scale highlights contradictions and inconsistencies contained within the narrative and demonstrates the extent to which the child is able to provide convincing evidence for what they say.

The “dismissing” scale reveals the quantity of the narrative, i.e. those children with high scores on this scale are likely to provide very brief and incomplete descriptions.

The “use of examples” establishes the extent to which the child is able to provide relevant evidence for what they say. This scale is central in determining the comprehensibility of the narrative as a whole. Narratives that are impoverished in elaborated REs are considered low on the coherence scale.

The “preoccupied anger” scale similar to the “dismissing” scale provides a measure of the quantity contained within the narrative. However, the “preoccupied” scale frequently records overly detailed and potentially irrelevant accounts.
Major violations.

**Spontaneous Vs inhibited narrative production/Comprehensibility.** This scale measures the extent to which the child is able to produce a narrative that is constructed by themselves with limited number of interviewer prompts. Does the narrative hang together? How much mental effort does it take to understand the narrative? Stories are conflated and relevance is not obvious. Does the narrative contain too much or too little detail?

**Contradiction and inconsistencies within narrative.** For example, a child who uses the adjective ‘kind’ to describe his father but later reports that he would not want to be like his father as he wants to be kind (see 3.1.4.)

Minor violations.

**Dysfluency of discourse.** Any excessive pauses, hesitations, digressions should be noted. The dialogue is principally initiated from the child and the interviewer prompts are kept to a minimum.

**Perseveration.** The extent to which the child may become stuck in talking about a person, event or feeling and cannot seem to respond to the new demands of the interview. The narrative therefore may contain repetitious descriptions. Excessive Perseveration would link to unresolved classification.

When scoring attention must be paid to the frequency and intensity of violations to coherence and/or positive indices of coherence.

1 – **Highly Incoherent.** The narrative contains consistent major and minor violations and there is no evidence of positive indices of coherence. Violations may include:
General comments are either consistently unsupported by specific examples or actively contradicted.

3 – **Incoherent.** Major violations predominate and the narrative is full of minor violations. There is no more than one positive index of coherence.

5 – **Moderately coherent.** The narrative contains a few coherent passages but there are quite a number of minor violations and no more than 2 major violations. However, a narrative that contains more than 4 positive indices of coherence, despite several major violations, can be assigned this rating.

7 – **Coherent.** There is no more than one major violation and only 2-3 minor violations. However, the presence of positive indices are not necessary to be assigned this rating.

9 – **Highly coherent.** There are no examples of major violations and only 1-2 minor violations. However, to be assigned this rating at least one positive index of coherence must be present.
4.2 Behavioural Analysis.

4.2.1 Marked behaviour change in response to a particular question, e.g.; turning away, drawing legs up to body, slouching in chair.

4.2.2 Marked anxiety during interview (e.g., fidgeting, rocking, wanting to go back to parent).

4.2.3 Maintenance of eye contact.

4.2.4 Tone of voice both overall (e.g., flatness, excitement) and in relation to particular questions.

4.2.5 Discrepancy between behaviour in the interview and the content of the narrative. Pay particular attention to emotional openness and coherence scales. For example, a child may smile or laugh when recounting an incident of being frightened and chased by his angry mother and subsequently crying under the bed covers. In this example, there is a clear incongruence between the child’s behaviour, i.e., smiling, and the content of story which was clearly distressing for the child. (This can be seen as a dual communication where the content reveals that the child is in touch with vulnerable feelings/ shows a degree of emotional openness but his/her manner is in opposition to the content.

4.2.6 Ability to maintain engagement with the task throughout interview. Negotiation of appropriate boundaries within the interview setting. The child should ideally maintain a healthy degree of guardedness and reserve in relation to the interviewer whilst not compromising emotional openness.
5.0 Guidelines for Assigning Attachment Classifications with Respect to Mother and Father

1) Assign an overall rating for mother and father independently.

To obtain a Secure classification, the child must receive a rating of 5 or above on the scales of Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive/Negative References, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflicts, self-Organisation and Overall Coherence. In addition, the child must be assigned a score of 3 or less on the Idealisation, Dismissal and Preoccupied Anger Scales.

To obtain an Insecure classification, the child must be assigned a rating of 5 or less on the scales of Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive/Negative References, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflicts, self-Organisation and Overall Coherence. In addition, the child must be assigned a score of 3 or above on one of the following Idealisation, Dismissal and Preoccupied Anger Scales.

2) Assign a sub-classification of Secure/Very Secure or Insecure/Very Insecure.

To obtain a Very Secure sub-classification, the child must receive a score of 7 or above on the scales of Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive/Negative References, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflicts, self-Organisation and Overall Coherence. In addition, the child must be assigned a score of 3 or less on the Idealisation, Dismissal and Preoccupied Anger Scales.

To obtain a Very Insecure sub-classification, the child must receive a score of 4 or below on the scales of Emotional Openness, Balance of Positive/Negative References, Use of Examples, Resolution of Conflicts, self-Organisation and Overall Coherence. In addition, the child must be assigned a score of 5 or above on one of the following Idealisation, Dismissal and Preoccupied Anger Scales.
Need to insert further scales:

**Facilitative scale** (this may well pick up the dismissive children and would form part of the experience scales vs. state of mind scales. Is the parent represented as facilitative—are they seen as caretaking. Judging the number of REs where the AF is helping, assisting etc. the child in given situations. There need to be specific examples. 1=never helpful; 5=50:50; 9=Parents represented as helpful (cf. Idealisation?).

**Passivity scale** (this would be inchoate negativity???, where 9 would be a heavy negativity about the way the child expresses themselves, although the negativity is inferred on the part of the rater. This would be characterised by unfinished sentences, change of subject etc.). Also insert probable experience scale which would include loving/warmth, responsiveness, role-reversal, neglect/rejection. How do we infer this from mental representations, as there must be a relationship between probable experience and state of mind.

The questions answered or diverted scale needs to be integrated into passivity scale, which would in many ways be a sub-scale of coherence.

**Questions answered or diverted** (NB: be sure child understands the questions). The extent to which the child provides material that is directly related to the question.
This measure assesses the degree to which a child is able to engage with the content and/or process of the interview. A child may answer the question directly, providing the interviewer with relevant information. Another strategy that some children employ is to divert the interviewer away from the topic currently being addressed in the interview. This may take several forms. Firstly, a child talks tangentially to the question. For example, a child who is asked to provide a specific example of when his/her mother was angry with him/her replies that “My mother was really angry with my little sister this morning”. Secondly, a child who explicitly requests the interviewer to ask the next question. Thirdly, a child who responds by saying that the current question is difficult and is clearly unwilling to think about the topic and thereby blocking the interviewer’s line of questioning. Fourthly, a child may not respond at all to a question and may remain silent despite prompts for the interviewer.

Also need to change probes in protocol to specifically ask questions that reveal the reflection function of the child. For example, “What did your mum feel when.......?”

This is an example of aggression an not anger. This does not function to elicit care taking behaviour but merely to protect the self. Therefore, it is considered maladaptive within the attachment framework and would appear to indicate a disorganised pattern of attachment. No room for a relationship is indicated within the description and the child is very controlling and catastrophising. It is interesting to note that this child exhibited controlling behaviour throughout the interview.

“My friend Louis, no I didn’t’ use to play with him that much so I didn’t even use to play with him , so not him, he has left school, no, not him I
didn't use to, no, Is there any one else who moved away or something?
This boy I used to be good friends with him in year two and year three but
when he got to year three he used to be a real bad, cuss my mum and all
that, in year two and in year three cause it was so bad he had to get
expelled. So you don't see him anymore? Nah, and I don't wish to see him
anyway and if I saw him I'd battered him. But I thought you were friends?
I know, in year two we were good friends but now in year three, cussing
my mum and all that. What did he do to your mum? He was cussing my
mum a lot. I am going to go down to his house and break down the door
and beat him up and then get a big canon or I might, I am going to get a
big canon blow on the door and get a nuclear bomb and throw it in his
house and then I am going to get an atomic bomb and melt him. Atomic
bombs can melt people and stick their shadows to the wall. I know that is
very frightening. It sounds horrible someone melting and their shadow
sticking to the wall and they can blow up like a whole big town, nuclear
bombs can blow up a whole city. That might not be such a good idea,
because you would be killing all these people in the city. I would be killing
myself. People fire nuclear bombs without killing themselves, they
probably get a big catapult and fire it far and then they probably run out
of the whole but then before that they'll get their leg cannoned off".
INTRODUCTION

Although most of our assessments are about <Child's name>, we often find it helpful to with parents about what their own childhood was like, to give us a complete picture of family as a whole. I would therefore like to ask you some questions about your own childh experiences and early family life.

I'm going to be interviewing you about your childhood experiences, and how th experiences may have affected your adult personality. I'd like to ask you about your e relationship with your family, and what you think about the way it might have affected \ We'll mainly focus on your childhood, but later we'll get on to your adolescence and then what's going on right now. This interview usually takes about an hour.

If parents are very put off and appear very anxious about the interview, you SHOULD NOT procee

---

1 New interviewers should use this crib sheet. The less detailed crib sheet should be used as soon as possible as it is desirable to familiar enough with the interview that only a minimum of prompts are needed.

T:\Standardisation\Standard (Measures & Admin)\Measures\Administering\Notes on administering\AAI\AAI crib sheet - detail version.doc
1. Could you start by helping me get to know your early family situation, where you lived etc? Where born, if you moved around? Your family occupation?
   - Multiple caregivers - Who raised you?
   - See much of grandparents? Did they die before birth? Did your parents tell you about them?
   - Anyone else living with you?

2. Can you describe your relationship with your parents as a young child from as far as you can remember?

3. Can you choose 5 adjectives to describe your relationship with MOTHER from as far back as you can remember (5-12yrs)? This may take a while; I’ll ask why you chose them. (Write down).
   - Your relationship with her was ______. Any memories or incidents that come to mind with respect to ______? Repeat for other 4 words.
   - Long silence - take another minute and see if anything comes to mind.
   - General description - Good general description, but I’m wondering if there was a specific time that happened, that made you think about it as ______?

4. Repeat question 3 and probe for FATHER.

5. Which parent did you feel closest to? Why? Why not other parent?

6. When you were upset as a child, what would you do?
   - Upset emotionally when little, what would you do? Specific time?
   - Hurt, physically? Specific incidents?
   - Ever ill when little? What usually happened?
   - Do you remember being held by either of your parents at any of these times?

7. What is the first time you remember being separated from your parents? Any other times?
   - How did you respond? Do you remember how your parents responded?

8. Did you ever feel rejected as a young child? Looking back you may realise it wasn’t really rejection, but do you remember ever having felt rejected in childhood.
   - How old were you when you first felt this way, and what did you do?
   - Why do you think your parents did those things? Do you think they realised you felt rejected?

8a. Were you ever frightened or worried as a child?

9. Were your parents ever threatening with you in any way - maybe for discipline, or jokingly?
   - Some say parents threatened to leave them/send them away/used silent treatment - did this ever happen?

9a. Some people have memories of threats or of some kind of behaviour that was abusive. Did anything like this ever happen to you/in your family?
   - How old were you/How often?
   - Do you feel this experience affects you now as an adult? Does it influence your approach to your own child?
   - Any such experiences involving people outside you family? If yes repeat above probes.
10. How do you think your overall experience with your parents affected your adult personality?
   ➢ Any aspects to your early experience that held/set development back/negative effect on the way you are now?

11. Why do you think your parents behaved the way they did during your childhood?

12. Were there any other adults you were close to (like parents) as a child?
   ➢ Any adults especially important though not parental?

13. Did you experience the loss/death of a parent (or other close loved one) while young?
   ➢ Could you tell me the circumstances, how old were you?
   ➢ How did you respond then?/feelings at that time?
   ➢ Have your feelings regarding this death changed much over time?
   ➢ Did you attend the funeral/what was this like for you?
   ➢ What was the effect on your other parent/household? How did this change over time?
   ➢ Would you say this loss affected your adult personality?
   ➢ How does it affect your approach to your own child?

13a. Did you lose any other important persons during your childhood? Prompt as above.

13b. Have you lost other close persons, in adult years? Prompt as above.

14. Other than any difficult experiences you've already described, have you had any other experiences you'd regard as potentially traumatic?
   ➢ Any overwhelmingly or immediately terrifying experiences.

15. I'd like to ask a few questions about your relationship with your parents. Were there any changes in your relationship after childhood? We'll get to the present in a moment, but now I mean changes between your childhood and your adulthood?

16. What is your relationship with your parents like now as an adult? Your current relationship.
   ➢ How much contact with your parents at present?
   ➢ What is the relationship with your parents like currently?
   ➢ Are there any sources of dissatisfaction in your current relationship? Any sources of special satisfaction?

17. I'd like to move now to a different sort of question about an aspect of your current relationship with your child/children.imaginary 1-yr old. How do you respond now, in terms of feelings, when you separate from your child/children? Do you ever feel worried about child?

18. What would 3 wishes for your child 20 years from now be? Partly the kind of future you'd like to see for your child. I'll give you a minute or two to think about this one.

19. Is there any particular thing you feel you learned above all from your own childhood experiences? Maybe something you've gained from the kind of childhood you had?

20. We've been focusing a lot on the past. I'd like to end looking more into the future by asking what you hope your (imagined) child might have learned from their experience of being parented by you.
Discontinue after 3 consecutive failures.

Items 1 and 2 are considered failed only if both trials are failed.
For ages 5-6, normal sequence of preceding items after failure on item.

### Appendix 9.

Set out cards in sequence of dot pattern (hand corner of card) and record the child's response order according to card number (hand corner).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time limit</th>
<th>Comple. time</th>
<th>Response order</th>
<th>Score Circle the appropriate score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample: Drinks machine</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>2nd trial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Slide</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Picnic</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. River crossing</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Snack time</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Missing the boat</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hold-up</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gone fishing</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. House fire</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seeing stars</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ducks crossing</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rain shower</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Walking the dog</td>
<td>60&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 60&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pleasureful lunch</td>
<td>60&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 60&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Snow scene</td>
<td>60&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 60&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Crayons</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 30&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Newspapers</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 30&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. T-shirts</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 30&quot;</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Milk</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 30&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Earn</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 30&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Dress</td>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 45&quot;</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Money</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 75&quot;</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Bicycles</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 75&quot;</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pieris</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 75&quot;</td>
<td>310 / 65% or 30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Journey</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 75&quot;</td>
<td>45 mph</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cars</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1st trial 75&quot;</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total subtest score (maximum = 30)

---

**6. Arithmetic**

Discontinue after 3 consecutive failures.

For ages 7-16, reverse sequence of preceding items after failure on either of first two items administered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Time limit</th>
<th>Comple. time</th>
<th>Correct response</th>
<th>Score Circle the appropriate score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Count birds</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Count trees</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2-15, 15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leave 1</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leave 9</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ice cream</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Apple</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pencils</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cakes</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Books</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chocolate</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rulers</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15-11, 10-6, 5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total subtest score (maximum = 30)
3. Coding
Discontinue after 120 seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time limit</th>
<th>Complet time</th>
<th>Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Similarities
Discontinue after 4 consecutive failures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score Bar 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample: Red-Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Piano-Guitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candle-Lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shirt-Shoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wheel-Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Milk-Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Apple-Banana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cat-Mouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elbow-Knee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anger-Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Telephone-Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Painting-Statue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Family-Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ice-Steam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Temperature-Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mountain-Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rubber-Pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. First-Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Numbers 9 and 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Salt-Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If the child says that they are not alike, fails to respond, or gives an incorrect response, give an example of a 1-point response.
* If the child gives a 1-point response, give an example of a 2-point response.
* If the child gives a 1-point response, ask "How else are the numbers 9 and 25 alike?"
7. Block Design

Discontinue after 2 consecutive failures.
For ages 8-16, normal sequence of preceding items after failure on either trial of Design 1.

Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct design</th>
<th>Time limit</th>
<th>Incorrect design</th>
<th>Complete time</th>
<th>Correct design</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>Trial 1</td>
<td>Trial 2</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>Trial 1</td>
<td>Trial 2</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>Trial 1</td>
<td>Trial 2</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 0, 1 or 2

Total subtest score (maximum = 69)

8. Vocabulary

Discontinue after 4 consecutive failures.
For ages 9-16, reverse sequence of preceding items after failure on either of first two items administered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Umbrella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Vocabulary (continued)

Discontinue after 4 consecutive failures.
For ages 9-16, reverse sequence of preceding items after failure on either of first two items administered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score 0, 1 or 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Damkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alphabet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ancient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Brave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Absorb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Nonsense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Precise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Boast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Migrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Fable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Strenuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mimic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Rivalry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Seclude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Unanimous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Compel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Imminent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Affliction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Dilatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Aberration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total subtest score (maximum = 60)
## Appendix 10.

### CELF-R UK

Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-Revised

- **Name:**
- **Address:**
- **Age:**
- **Sex:**
- **Year:**
- **School:**
- **Teacher:**
- **Examiner:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Other Relevant Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Chronological Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standardized Scoring Summary

#### Ages 5-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulated Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalling Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ages 8 and Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulated Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalling Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LANGUAGE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standardized Scoring Summary (Ages 5-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standardized Scoring Summary (Ages 8 and Above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Formulated Sentences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 5+ Required to compute Expressive Language score and CELF-R Total Language score</th>
<th>Stimulus Manual 2</th>
<th>One repetition allowed</th>
<th>4 consecutive zero scores (or no responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Write the pupil's responses verbatim in the space provided. Refer to Tables 2.1 and 2.2 in Section 2 of the Examiner's Manual for scoring guidelines.

**Demonstration: books**

**Trial: shoes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. gave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. although</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. tall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. either</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. neither</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before presenting the remaining items, say, “Now, I'll give you two words to use in the same sentence. You can use the words in any order you choose, but you must use both words in the same sentence. Here’s the next picture.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. and because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. whatever until</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. and but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. before if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. whenever until</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. after unless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Error Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 5+ Required to compute Expressive Language score and CELF-R Total Language score</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None allowed 4 consecutive zero scores (no responses or sentences the 4+ errors)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle 3 if response is repeated exactly, 2 if there is one error, 1 if there are two to three errors, 0 if there are four or more errors, and NR if there is no response. Mark errors on the sentence or write an incorrect response verbatim in the space provided.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration: Turn left at the postbox.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial: The boat sailed across the lake.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The dog chased the cat.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the boy kick the ball?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The train was followed by the car.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the car followed by the police?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Didn't the rabbit eat the carrot?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The boy was not chased by the girl.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The boy and the girl picked the flowers.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wasn't the ice cream bought by the girl?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has the mouse been chased by the cat?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If the hat is too big, the man won't buy it.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The ball was not thrown by the boy or the girl.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The man who painted the railings was very kind.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The dog chased the ball, and the cat didn't follow.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The girl did not like the boy who lived down the street.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The big, brown dog chased the red ball.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The man stopped to pick up some milk even though he was late for work.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The trumpets and violins were played by the musicians.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If she would have baked some biscuits, they would have been eaten.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The boy sent a letter to the lady who moved away last year.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The children cut and pasted the pictures and hung them on the wall.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The woman has read the twelve big, heavy, brown books.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The man who sits on the bench next to the oak tree is our mayor.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. After the family had finished dinner, they decided to go for a ride in the country.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The boy who didn't turn up for practice wasn't allowed to play in the team until a week later.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The postman sorted, labelled, bundled, and delivered the magazines.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The man in the house next door promised to water our flowers during our holiday.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sentence Assembly

**Ages 5-7** Supplementary subtest  
**Ages 8+** Required to compute Expressive Language score and CELF-R Total Language score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual 2</td>
<td>One repetition allowed</td>
<td>4 consecutive zero scores (errors or no responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check the blank next to the pupil's responses. The pupil must give 2 of the sentence responses listed for an item to be scored as correct. Circle 1 for a correct response, 0 for an incorrect response, and NR for no response. If the pupil gives a response not listed, record it in the space provided.

**Demonstration:**
1. The boy is tall.  
   a) The boy is tall.  
   b) Is the boy tall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial 1:</th>
<th>Trial 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kicked</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the girl</td>
<td>in the chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the boy</td>
<td>the kitten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |
| c)    | c)    |
| d)    | d)    |

| 9.    | 10.    |
| bone  | bone   |
| lost  | lost   |
| is    | isn't  |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |

| 11.    | 12.    |
| fence | on the table |
| fall   | ball |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |

| and   | is painting |
| is falling | is cutting |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |
| c)    | c)    |
| d)    | d)    |

| 15.    | 16.    |
| car   | the lamp |
| I     | the woman |
| dad bought | the table |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |
| c)    | c)    |
| d)    | d)    |

| 17.    | 18.    |
| is    | I     |
| the boy | the girl |
| to win | going |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |

| 19.    | 20.    |
| team  | the girl |
| going to join | lost |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |

| 21.    | 22.    |
| lamp  | the woman |
| put   | didn't |
| a)    | a)    |
| b)    | b)    |
**Sentence Assembly Continued**

7. the **played** sister **and** the **brother** piano **and** the **guitar**
   - a) The brother and sister played the piano and the guitar.
   - b) The sister and brother played the piano and the guitar.
   - c) The sister and brother played the guitar and the piano.
   - d) The brother and sister played the guitar and the piano.

8. the girl **send** boy **a letter did**
   - a) The girl did send the boy a letter.
   - b) Did the girl send the boy a letter?
   - c) The boy did send the girl a letter.
   - d) Did the boy send the girl a letter?

9. it **it want expensive even though is**
   - a) Even though it is expensive, I want it.
   - b) I want it even though it is expensive.

10. the man **was lost by** the **boy**
    - a) The man was met by the boy whose dog was lost.
    - b) The boy was met by the man whose dog was lost.
    - c) The man whose dog was lost was met by the boy.
    - d) The boy whose dog was lost was met by the man.

**Semantic Relationships**

**Trial 1:** A man is bigger than

a) a house  c) a spoon
b) a coin   d) a plane

1. Footballs are bigger than
   - a) bicycles  c) apples
   - b) pencils   d) cars

2. Birds are faster than
   - a) tortoises c) rockets
   - b) kites    d) planes

3. Books are heavier than
   - a) TVs c) chairs
   - b) feathers d) letters

**Trial 2:** Jim was hit by Fred. John was hit by Frank. Who was hit?

a) Jim  c) Fred
b) John d) Frank

4. Hours are longer than
   - a) minutes c) seconds
   - b) days    d) mornings

5. Rooms are smaller than
   - a) flowers c) tables
   - b) buildings d) houses

Score
Appendix 11.
THE CHILD BEHAVIOUR CHECKLIST

Child I.D. Number __________ Date of birth __________ Date of administration __________

Below is a list of items that describe children. For each item that describes your child now or within the past 6 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true of your child. Circle 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of your child. If the item is not true of your child, circle the 0. Please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to your child.

0 = Not True (as far as you know) 1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True 2 = Very True or Often True

0 1 2 1. Acts too young for his/her age 0 1 2 30. Fears going to school
0 1 2 2. Allergy (describe) 0 1 2 31. Feels he/she might think or do something bad
0 1 2 3. Argues a lot 0 1 2 32. Feels he/she has to be perfect
0 1 2 4. Asthma 0 1 2 33. Feels or complains that no one loves him/her
0 1 2 5. Behaves like opposite sex 0 1 2 34. Feels others are out to get him/her
0 1 2 6. Bowel movements outside toilet 0 1 2 35. Feels worthless or inferior
0 1 2 7. Bragging, boasting 0 1 2 36. Gets hurt a lot, accident-prone
0 1 2 8. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long 0 1 2 37. Gets in many fights
0 1 2 9. Can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts: obsessions (describe) 0 1 2 38. Gets teased a lot
0 1 2 10. Can't sit still, restless, or hyperactive 0 1 2 39. Hangs around with children who get in trouble
0 1 2 11. Clings to adults or too dependent 0 1 2 40. Hears things that aren't there (describe)
0 1 2 12. Complains of loneliness 0 1 2 41. Impulsive or acts without thinking
0 1 2 13. Confused or seems to be in a fog 0 1 2 42. Likes to be alone
0 1 2 14. Cries a lot 0 1 2 43. Lying or cheating
0 1 2 15. Cruel to animals 0 1 2 44. Bites fingernails
0 1 2 16. Cruelty, bullying or meanness to others 0 1 2 45. Nervous, high-strung, or tense
0 1 2 17. Day-dreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts 0 1 2 46. Nervous movements or twitching (describe)
0 1 2 18. Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide 0 1 2 47. Nightmares
0 1 2 19. Demands a lot of attention 0 1 2 48. Not liked by other children
0 1 2 20. Destroys his/her own things 0 1 2 49. Constipated, doesn't move bowels
0 1 2 21. Destroys things belonging to his/her family to other or other children 0 1 2 50. Too fearful or anxious
0 1 2 22. Disobedient at home 0 1 2 51. Feels dizzy
0 1 2 23. Disobedient at school 0 1 2 52. Feels too guilty
0 1 2 24. Doesn't eat well 0 1 2 53. Overeating
0 1 2 25. Doesn't get along with other children 0 1 2 54. Overtired
0 1 2 26. Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving 0 1 2 55. Overweight
0 1 2 27. Easily jealous 0 1 2 56. Physical problems without known medical (a) Aches or pains
0 1 2 28. Eats or drinks things that are not food (describe) 0 1 2 57. Physical problems with eyes
0 1 2 29. Fears certain animals, situations, or places, other than school (describe)  a) Aches or pains
0 1 2 30. Fears certain animals, situations, or places, other than school (describe)  b) Headaches
0 1 2 31. Fears he/she might think or do something bad  c) Nausea, feels sick
0 1 2 32. Feels he/she has to be perfect  d) Problems with eyes
0 1 2 33. Feels or complains that no one loves him/her  e) __________
0 1 2 34. Feels others are out to get him/her  f) __________
0 1 2 35. Feels worthless or inferior  _______
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>e) Rashes or other skin problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>f) Stomach aches or cramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>g) Vomiting or throwing up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>h) Other (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>57. Physically attacks people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>58. Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>59. Plays with own sex parts in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>60. Plays with own sex parts too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>61. Poor school work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>62. Poorly co-ordinated or clumsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>63. Prefers playing with older children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>64. Prefers playing with younger children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>65. Refuses to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>66. Repeats certain acts over and over: compulsions (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>67. Runs away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>68. Screams a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>69. Secretive, keeps things to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>70. Sees things that aren’t there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>71. Self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>72. Sets fires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>73. Sexual problems (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>74. Showing off and clowning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>75. Shy or timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>76. Sleeps less than most children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>77. Sleeps more than most children during the day and/or night (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>78. Smears or plays with bowel movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>79. Speech problem (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>80. Stares blankly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>81. Steals at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>82. Steals outside the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>83. Stores up things he/she doesn’t need (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>84. Strange behaviour describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>85. Strange ideas (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>86. Stubborn, sulen, or irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>87. Sudden changes in mood or feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>88. Sulks a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>89. Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>90. Swearing or obscene language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>91. Talks about killing self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>92. Talks or walks in sleep (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>93. Talks too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>94. Teases a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>95. Temper tantrums or hot temper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>96. Thinks about sex too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>97. Threatens people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>98. Thumb-sucking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>99. Too concerned with neatness or cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>100. Trouble sleeping (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>101. Truancy, skips school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>102. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>103. Unhappy, sad or depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>104. Unusually loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>105. Uses alcohol or drugs (describe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>106. Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>107. Wets self during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>108. Wets the bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>109. Whining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>110. Wishes to be of opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>111. Withdrewn, doesn’t get involved with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>112. Worrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>113. Please write in any problems your child was not listed above:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12

Protocol for the Separation Anxiety Test

Introduction

"This study is aimed at finding out how children feel about their parents and family life in general. I have a number of pictures which show a child about the same age as you in different situations which happen nowadays in a lot of families. Maybe these situations have happened to you, maybe not. Regardless of whether or not the same thing has happened to you, I would like you to tell me how you think the child in the picture might feel about the situation and what he/she would do following the situation, or what he/she should do next. This is not a test there are no right or wrong answers. I want your opinion about the child in the picture."

Titles of the Photographs

1) The boy/girl is going away on a school trip for two weeks. Here he/she is saying goodbye to his/her mum and dad.
2) Mum is going shopping and the boy/girl is staying at home alone.
3) Mum is going into hospital.
4) Mum and dad are going out for the evening.
5) Dad is leaving home after an argument.
6) The boy/girl is in town with his/her dad. Dad says "Go and spend your pocket money, I'll wait here."
7) It is the boy’s/girl’s first day at a new school.
8) The boy’s girl’s dad is going away to work.
9) Mum and dad are going away for a few days and the boy/girl is staying with his/her uncle.

Administration

1. Read the title exactly off the back of the photograph and place the picture in front of the child. Do not embellish on the title or give any further explanation of what is going on in the picture. If the child asks for more information then just say that it is up to them and they can make up any scenario they want for what is happening.
2. Ask the child what the child in the photograph is feeling about the situation.
3. Try to elicit a justification, if not already given, for the feeling given by the child.
4. Ask the child what the child in the picture might do next.
5. Move on to the next photograph.