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Institutionalized versus Community Children
Classifications of attachment

* Community
  * 76.7% secure
  * 3.6% avoidant
  * 0.0% resistant
  * 19.7% disorganized
  * 0.0% unclassifiable

* Institution
  * 16.8% secure
  * 4.7% avoidant
  * 0.0% resistant
  * 65.4% disorganized
  * 13.1% unclassifiable
Degree to which attachment has developed

* 5 -- ABCD patterns of attachment
* 4 -- Patterns of attachment with behavioral anomalies
* 3 -- Clear preference but passive
* 2 -- Preference discernible
* 1 -- No attachment behaviors evident
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>Unclassifiable=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>Secure=7, Avoidant=3, Disorganized=11, Unclassifiable=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>Secure=7, Disorganized=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>Secure=3, Disorganized=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Secure=1, Disorganized=2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eliciting positive affect
Differences between IG & NIG at Baseline (Entry into the Study)

- \(F(1,181) = 13.00, p = .000\)
- \(F(1,182) = 5.22, p < .05\)

**Standardized Lab-Tab Score**

- Positive Affect
- Negative Affect
- Attention

\( (F(1,181) = 13.00, p = .000) \)
\( (F(1,182) = 5.22, p < .05) \)
Foster care

* Explicitly encouraged foster parents to attach
* Frequent contact by BEIP social workers
* 87% placement stability through 54 months of age
* Higher caregiving quality at 30 and 42 months based on observational ratings
Results of intervention:
Secure attachment at 42 months

CAUG < FCG = NIG
## Security Score by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Score</th>
<th>CAUG</th>
<th>FCG</th>
<th>NIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Score</td>
<td>3.11  (1.32)</td>
<td>4.65  (1.66)</td>
<td>5.48  (1.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F(2,173) = 35.05, \ p = 0.000
\]

CAUG < FCG < NIG
## Timing of placement and security of attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (mos)</th>
<th>Younger than</th>
<th>Older than</th>
<th>$X^2(1)$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preschool Classifications of Attachment

Secure vs. Insecure
- Avoidant
- Dependent
- Disorganized
- Controlling
- Insecure Other

Typical vs. Atypical
- Secure
- Avoidant
- Dependent
- Disorganized
- Controlling
- Insecure Other
Timing and Typical vs. Not Atypical

- FCG < 22 mo
- FCG > 22 mo

Atypical
Typical
Effects of foster care on expression of positive emotion

![Graph showing the effects of foster care on expression of positive emotion.]
RAD Emotionally Withdrawn/Inhibited

![Graph showing changes in RAD Emotionally Withdrawn/Inhibited over Assessment Age]

- Care as Usual
- Foster Care
- Never Institutionalized

Assessment Age:
- Baseline
- 30 months
- 42 months
- 54 months
- 8 years
RAD Indiscriminate/Disinhibited

![Graph showing data points for RAD Indiscriminate/Disinhibited over different assessment ages. The graph compares different types of care and shows trends over time.]

- Care as Usual
- Foster Care
- Never Institutionalized

Assessment Age:
- Baseline
- 30 months
- 42 months
- 54 months
- 8 years
Effects on Timing of Placement on Indiscriminate Behavior
Caregiver/mother and child answer door (pre-arranged).

RA: “Come with me, I have something to show you.”

Walk out the door and around the corner to find RA from previous home visit.
Stranger at the door by group

54 months

- Institution
- Foster Care
- Community

- Stayed
- Left
**Effects of intervention on psychiatric disorders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAUG</th>
<th>FCG</th>
<th>NIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any axis I disorder</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any emotional disorder</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
<td>(N=13)</td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any behavioral disorder</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=15)</td>
<td>(N=15)</td>
<td>(N=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing Foster Care Intervention Mechanism

Attachment Security

Intervention FCG vs. CAUG

Anxiety Depression
Mediation Analyses: Psychopathology

- 30 mo. Caregiving Quality
- 42 mo. Security of Attachment
- 54 mo. Internalizing Externalizing RAD Inhibited RAD Disinhibited Impairment
Social skills and peer interaction at 8 years
Peer interaction at 8 years

* Tell us about yourself
  * Friends, hobbies, fun things to do, pets
  * Do you want to ask [Other Child] any questions?

* Share toy with peer
  * Lego
  * NTC puzzle
  * Jenga

* Brainstorming about top 3 things to do for fun
* Pacalici
Inappropriate/Awkward Social Behavior

- Fidgeting, touching other child, lack of social referencing, across all six tasks
- CAUG displayed significantly more socially awkward behavior during their dyad interactions at age 8 across all tasks ($F = 4.52, p = .036$)
Negative Social Behavior

- Aggression and negative affect, across all six tasks
- CAUG displayed significantly more negative behavior during their dyad interactions at age 8 across all tasks ($F = 4.07, p = .046$)
FCG vs. CAUG
Differences in Social Skills

![Bar chart showing differences in social skills between FCG and CAUG based on parent and teacher reports.](image)
Thanks!