Working with Children, Families and Communities

[Name of the Writer]

[Name of the Supervisor]

[Course]

Introduction

Day (2010) recognized children's' attachment requirements in day care settings. Children can have access to more time in Early Years education if they have identified Special Educational Needs (SEN), or if their parents pay additional fees to the provider. Provision is also available for vulnerable children and children with SEN identified by their local authority, to start early education from the age of two years. The present study tries to comprehend the part of the Key Person Approach as an intervention for creating attachment with children Early Years settings.

The government of UK puts a high esteem on the early training of children, as exhibited by the impetuses for guardians to enlist their children in a preschool or nursery. This is upheld by a longitudinal study into the significance of early instruction (Sylva et al., 2004). This study reported that children who went to preschool experienced advantages in their improvement contrasted with the individuals who did not go to, and that the nature of the intuitive associations with staff affected results. It is worth noting here that since this report, the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) has seen revisions (the current version was published in March 2012 to take effect from September 2012).

The Key Person Approach (KPA) take a gander at the hypothetical underpinnings and current direction, it is critical to characterize what is implied by the expression "Key Person Approach". The KPA is to build constructive associations with specific children, and work intimately with the groups of those kids. The expression "Key Worker" alludes to a part which

includes speaking with various experts to guarantee a more systemic, key level inside nurseries

(Elfer et al., 2012). The KPA is the main point of this study.

Socio-Political Constructs

In recent decades, research and practice has established in early childhood (0-3 years) as

one of the multidisciplinary areas that most impact has had in the generation of public policies in

various countries (Beeber et al., 2007). These policies have opted to turn in the design and

implementation of various types of Early Childhood Intervention, which despite showing a wide

variability, share the common objective of supporting the social, cognitive, physical and mental

development of infants and preschool children through health services, education and / or social

care offered to them and their families (Love et al., 2006; Gray & McCormick, 2005; Shonkoff

& Phillips, 2005).

Availability and accessibility to early care and education services provided by the state

are influenced by three factors: coverage policies and access to quality services; maternity

policies and paternity leave, and cultural family traditions (Byron, 2015).

UK had with a disjointed care for the child in early childhood system; however, in recent

years have promulgated a series of regulations and laws where the first childhood becomes the

responsibility of the education sector. The aim is to integrate the care and education dimensions

(Byron, 2015). The policy document laid the foundation for the early childhood policy from birth

to nine years, and both Care Act (2006) Plan unified policy attention to the children under the

Sure Start Unit within the new Department of Children as School and Family.

In the UK it has been raised to create a parent Charter, a document that describes the

minimum level of support that parents should expect local authorities. Also the use of an

individual record for each child development suggests from birth to eleven years it remains with parents. Finally it also proposes to work with Key Persons' support to parents from schools to improve attendance and behavior or give advice. They have made available financial resources for series of pilots to identify the most appropriate local strategies that seek a greater parental involvement.

Acknowledgment of the effect of early connections on results for children as they create is settled as noted by Thompson (2008). Thompson (2008) takes a gander at elements most straightforwardly connected with attachment theory, for instance; relationship working, enthusiastic direction and social-intellectual capacities. The conclusion is that the writing keeps on supporting the contention that children named as 'securely attached' encounter more positive results in numerous regions. Thompson (2008) noticed that the explanations for this are not clear, however he attracts regard for the writing which recommends affectability is an essential component. This might be entirely pertinent to comprehension the connections between Key Persons and children in Early Years settings, as the Key Person's affectability to the kid's needs might be principal to the elements of their relationship.

Whether in recognition of the potential benefits, or due to increasing financial need for both parents to be in employment, the Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey (Office of National Statistics, 2010) recorded that the number of providers offering full day care in England has increased by 77 per cent since 2001. This has occurred alongside a reduction of 39 per cent in sessional care (where a session is up to 4 hours). This reduction appears to be due to this increase in full day care, where parents are demanding more hours. This is supported by evidence showing that 18 per cent of full day care providers had changed from offering sessional care, with the majority reporting that this was due to parental demand. Of course, it is difficult to

infer a causal factor for the increase in parental demand, as the statistics for employment in households with dependent children remain fairly static in recent years. These statistics are general though, and do not really provide an indication of the situation for households with children below five.

Attachment Theory seems to have had a fairly huge effect on current direction, approaches and hone with children (Slater, 2007). It is additionally indispensable to the work of offices, for example, Sure Start and social consideration. Keeping in mind the end goal to comprehend what a few specialists may definitely know, it appears to be critical to survey a portion of the direction that the legislature accommodates early training settings.

Bakermans-Kranenburg et al (2008) conducted a study with mothers of lower middle class previously classified with insecure attachment representations (according to results of the Adult Attachment Interview). This study compared two types of attachment interventions, being the first aimed at improving maternal sensitivity by written on sensitive parenting and video-feedback information, while the second intervention focused on improving attachment representations of the mother through additional discussions its history of early attachment. The video-feedback used in both interventions included the following elements: (a) learn to recognize the contact-seeking behavior and exploration of the baby; (B) develop a better perception of the signs and subtle expressions of the baby; (C) relevance to respond appropriately and promptly to the keys of the baby and (d) improving affective atonement and exchange of emotions between mother and son (a). Both interventions were conducted in four home visits between 7 and 10 months old baby. In the post-test at 13 months of life of the infant, the results showed significant improvements (effect size of .87) in maternal sensitivity in both interventions, compared to the control group.

Authors like Espe-Sherwindt (2008) suggest how we can distinguish in Early, between service approach focused on the child in other ways of carrying out the practice; especially when the practices of professionals can be described along a continuum, from KPA, to family-centred approach. The Department for Education describes the Key Person's role as:

- The Key Person helps the child to get comfortable with the setting and to feel certain and safe inside it;

- Key Person builds up a real bond with children and offers a settled, cosy relationship;

- When children feel upbeat and secure along these lines they are sure to investigate and to experiment with new things.

<div align="center">Intervention</div>

Early Childhood Intervention programs are based on assumptions regarding firmly established critical impact of early life for all posterior human development (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2005). However, it has not been easy to transfer the accumulated knowledge of child development in Early Childhood Intervention programs to achieve successful results in the previously explicit goals. The development of such programs in various parts of world has been plagued by methodological problems and ill-defined designs (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2005), guided by ideological principles rather than by foundations anchored in theory and research, with the result that often taken public policy decisions rather on the basis of anecdotal experiences on the substrate of evidence-based practices (Olds et al., 2007).

According to O'Connor & Zeanah (2003), attachment interventions have three common characteristics: (a) focus on the person-child interaction; (b) generally they are designed for infants and toddlers; (c) and most interventions focus on the dyad and assume that the main

variable to change is the lack of sensitivity of the parent. According to Bakermans-Kranenburg et al (2005) intervention programs are in compliance with theoretical and empirical diverse and even divergent respect to the parameters that influence child development and the variables that should focus on intervention fundamentals, which translates into objectives, methods of intervention and different frequencies and intensities.

In a review and meta-analysis on 15 preventive interventions involving the measurement of child disorganized attachment as evaluation of results (Bakermans-Kranenburg et al., 2005), it was found that effective interventions starting at 6 months old baby (and not before). In addition, the findings of this study show that interventions were focused only on maternal sensitivity which were significantly more effective in reducing disorganized attachment than those who also worked parental support and mental representations of attachment.

Attachment Interventions have focused primarily on stimulating parental sensitivity in strengthening mentalizing ability of caregivers and providing social support to parents. As cross member, could be understood that such interventions are aimed at promoting greater understanding and visualization of the unique characteristics of the child (a) needs, which in turn would impact on the relationship link between them, may change more or less as the type of attachment observed.

Early Childhood Intervention programs have shown positive results when it comes to experiences developed under strict control conditions, generally linked to university projects. For example, Gray & McCormick (2005), examined the impact of nine such programs of high level and quality, which in turn had been evaluated rigorously through experimental studies, finding that groups intervention performed better than control groups, including: (a) cognitive, emotional

and educational gains for the child; (b) improvements in relationships and interactions between parents and children; and (c) long-term benefits for child, such as greater participation in the labour market, less dependence concerning the system of social welfare, more income in adulthood and a reduction in criminal behavior. However, the results become much less stimulating experiences when investigations are reviewed developed in the context of implementation in the "real world" (Olds et al., 2007).

The knowledge accumulated to date has shown that clarity of design, quality of services offered, the level of competence and fidelity equipment of these program design also as ensuring the involvement and user participation, are key variables in the results obtained by the early intervention programs, regardless of their focus of action (Olds et al., 2007; Love et al., 2006; Gray & McCormick, 2005).

Importantly, most Early Childhood Intervention programs have shown significant and lasting effects which are very expensive, associating this cost to the intensity required to overcome disadvantage conditions intended to supply. Therefore, it is necessary to accumulate evidence regarding whether it is possible to achieve efficiency under more "weak" variants of Early Childhood Intervention programs models, especially in countries that does not have the financial resources of a developed country for implementation of their policies in childhood.

Children were reported to have freedom in being able to form positive relationships with any of the adults in the setting. At the level of the child, this provides evidence that working with the child's Key Person alone may not be as beneficial as working with a number of adults in the setting. This has implications for the attachment needs of the children, as it can be difficult for staff to remain aware of a child's emotional needs in a group situation (Ahnert et al., 2006). This

may be even more so if there is ambiguity over who is monitoring a particular child, something which could be possible if they spend proportionately more time with another adult. Identifying if the child prefers the company of another adult over their Key Person may be useful in gathering information and developing appropriate support. Educational Psychologists (EPs) are engaging in preschool work could also ensure that interventions and strategies are useful both at home and in the setting, given the level of parental partnership indicated by participants in this research.

At the level of the setting, EPs could work with staff to develop training programmes which recognise and add context to the practical experiences that Key Persons value. Key Persons seem familiar with attachment theory, but perhaps workshops on building positive relationships and the applications of attachment theory might be a useful resource to Key Persons. This would support Randall's (2010) aims outlined in the introduction. EPs could also work with settings to develop robust methods of evaluating the Key Person role which could be context specific and review aspects of their relationships with their Key Children.

In spite of this diversity, it is possible to argue that within programs that seek to foster a secure attachment or improve existing style attachment, can differentiate three main lines of action: (1) interventions aimed at stimulating sensitivity or behavioural response of KP; (2) programs that focus on the representations operational internal KP attachment or models; (3) and interventions that attempt to stimulate or provide social support to parents (O'Connor & Zeanah, 2003).

It should be noted that the methodology of interventions whose main objective is to increase sensitivity ranging from teaching observational skills to make them better perceivers,

regarding relevant issues in the development of the child or model the desired behaviors, and positively reinforce behaviors adequate sensitivity and responsiveness, for example, by using video-feedback (Bakermans-Kranenburg et al., 2005).

Voice of the Child

In the United Kingdom (England and Wales), the Law on Care for children (Childcare Act 2006) requires Parents are involved in planning, development, implementation and evaluation of educational services. In England educational programs for children attach great importance to the involvement of parents by providing support and facilitating access to training. Parents play an important role in the functioning of the local programs and partnerships are composed of parents and members of the community equally. In the UK (Scotland), it is required to establish effective ways of collaboration and maintain regular communication with parents (Evangelou et al., 2009). The education authorities have a duty to encourage the involvement of parents in schools publicly funded, even in the field of early childhood education.

Interventions developed from the conceptual framework of attachment theory (KPA) for addressing a number of themes present in infants and children who have suffered various violations and trauma in their life history. This, as one of the areas most damaged by receiving abuse, sexual abuse or neglect in early childhood is precisely attachment, resulting in turn affected all processes bio-psychosocial development that relate to the type of attachment gestated in that stage. Therefore, if one seeks to redress the consequences of such violations and / or prevent the development of further damage to these children, the fundamentals and methodologies of interventions exposed, both psychosocial and therapeutic, are of prime

importance for public policy, social organizations for managers and professionals and operators of related services.

Grieg et al (2010) survey a sample of Key Persons (KPs) on their practice in relation to attachment theory. They found that all respondents agreed that dealing with attachment difficulties should be part of the KP's remit. This appears contrary to Slater's (2007) claim that many KPs remain "sceptical" to the relevance of attachment theory in practice. Whilst it is clear that Grieg et al (2010) provide the more current view on this, it must also be recognised that their sample may not be representative of all practitioners, with the possibility that a substantial number still question the worth of the theory.

Randall (2010) emphasises the role of the KP in supporting the development of secure attachments in children. She suggests that the main areas for KP involvement lie in training opportunities which aim to develop practitioner's skills. Specifically, a focus on developing strategies, the implications of attachment theory on practice, and developing practitioner's reflective abilities, are highlighted. However, it still appears to convey a predominantly deficit model, which assumes most of the work to be done is to support children presenting with difficulties. If we are to consider the many levels on which the EP can work (Cameron, 2006), "dealing with attachment difficulties" could potentially be a proactive approach as well as a reactive approach. We have established earlier that the research indicates the importance of early attachments (Thompson, 2008).

The quantitative increase in the exposure of children to KPA show improvements in the quality of the services offered over time may explain why the impact assessment revealed some negative effects of the program in the case of children and the most disadvantaged families and

why the second phase of the evaluation showed, however, beneficial effects for virtually all children and families (Melhuish et al, 2008).

Various assessments made this longitudinal study of children / as (since they were in kindergarten and throughout school) document that the home environment and parental involvement in their children's education are crucial to improving learning achievement of children. Parental involvement can be even more important than the educational level, occupation or parental income.

The study sought to analyse the effects the KPA has on children and their families. Overall assessment identified a positive impact of the KPAon children, as well as the development of children. An important finding is that the positive effects of KPA is universally distributed among the children and not concentrated in any particular subset. The study (Craig et al., 2008) revealed that parents of children showed negative parental attitudes. Also, the children had better social development, better independence and self-control, and showed a positive social attitude more often than the control group. It seems that the effects of positive social behavior due to good advice on how to educate children at home.

The main features will be summarized with respect to the operated population techniques used and results obtained in the interventions described above. It is important to clarify that these listings do not imply that one intervention is applied to all cases, use all the techniques and has demonstrated its effectiveness for all results reported. The aim of this analysis is only to illustrate the range of topics, tools and possibilities for intervention in addiction to date.

This aspect could be understood in the light of evidence showing that the process of change is more likely to observe in a behavioural dimension than in a representational

dimension; that is, it would be easier to change patterns of interaction, to change the style of attachment as such infants or internal operating models of caregivers. These considerations may be relevant to emphasize the importance of promoting sensible response caregivers (as) in psychosocial risk, for example, when making promotion in children's mental health, training staff direct treatment in residential systems or intervene with family caregivers specialized host, among other possibilities.

Studies show that the evaluation of the results of interventions in addiction show greater validity when measured with instruments for observing the quality of interaction, and not just instruments of self-report, which are subject the effects of social desirability. This is a challenge for the reality, since it is necessary to have observation instruments properly validated for the national reality and this area is still a nascent field development. Moreover, the evidence shows that are more effective brief interventions with a clear and narrow focus, above interventions broad approach and long-term (Broberg, 2000). Targeted interventions are essential to advance without misplacing the north in the multiplicity of problems that the environment of these children usually presents.

Conclusion

This research has implications for KPA practice at all levels. At the level of policy, this piece of research provides evidence Key Persons seem to value practical knowledge as opposed to theoretical knowledge. This means that it might be useful to focus on practical, reflective courses as means of delivering up-to-date research and guidance to staff. This might help ensure that they are able to access and apply it to practice more effectively. This could help the Key Person role become more consistent across settings, leading to less variation in the quality of

service being accessed by families. KPs could also work with training providers to review and develop course materials which build on the experiential aspects that Key Persons seem to value

The conclusion, built from the above discussion is to further serve the goal outlined in Randall's (2010) paper. This goal is to support the development of positive relationships between adults and children so as to promote the positive outcomes that have been identified by the literature. This research seeks to do this from a positive standpoint, not assuming the presence of a deficit. Subsequently, the exploration of current practice will seek to enhance practitioners' understanding of what is happening in Early Years settings and shed some light on the potential for EP involvement at a more systemic level.

For Educational Psychologists (EPs), knowing more about the role of the Key Person may serve to better facilitate collaborative work and early intervention for preschool children. Preschool work currently appears to be underdeveloped in many authorities, with schools receiving the bulk of EP time. A proactive and preventative approach may be to encourage the exploration of collaborative working models and increased preschool involvement, and this can begin with improving our understanding of the people and environments in which we seek to become more involved.

To effectively support the changes obtained by KPA and attachment workshops means the place of such interventions in the context of a comprehensive approach that also consider issues related to formal and informal network of the child (a), satisfaction of basic needs or relational resources that can be found in its significant environment, among many others. These issues have usually been handled by KP for the same program or therapists in coordination with other actors in the institutional network.

This conclusion is valid for the various situations that fall within the context of addressing attachment problems in infants and children with a history of psychotherapy, workshops and focus interventions are useful and effective, but not recommended based solely on the use of these resources to address relational and relational problems of children seriously violated their rights. It is necessary to coordinate these resources with more broad and stable systems over time monitoring, tracking and maintenance support progress, allowing in turn prevent or detect relapses needs of new interventions in a timely manner. This figure does not exist today as an alternative network of services available to social organizations working with children seriously breached and must be supplied by the well - intentioned but insufficient psychosocial teams own efforts.

Finally, it should also be noted that other necessary requirement for the implementation of a KPA in Early Intervention approach is the development, professionals, a set of skills that go beyond the specific knowledge of the discipline and its abilities. We refer to the necessary development of personal qualities such as empathy, self-awareness, self-reflection, emotional self-control, sensitivity, authenticity, listening skills, facilitation capacity, and ability to communicate with others. These skills are necessary for both the development of a cooperative work in cross-disciplinary team and for the proper development of the required interactions with the child

It is not recommended to use models that are based mainly or solely in handling case, given its low proven effectiveness, but is encouraged mix with predesigned case management interventions, community health services, education and resolution of social issues, including: the intervention model arises multidimensional and multi addressing family specific, community aspects of institutional approach with various strategies and constant coordination with relevant

actors from other areas (clinics, schools, ministries, Municipalities, etc.). Also, currently it is progressing in the workshops design and support materials to develop home and psycho-educational interventions.

References

Bakermans-Kranenburg, M, van IJzendoorn, M. and Juffer, F., 2005. Disorganized Infant Attachment and Preventive Interventions: a Review and Meta-Analysis. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 26 (3), 191-216.

Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., Juffer, F. and van IJzendoorn, M., 2008. Interventions with video Discussions Feedback and Attachment: Type of Maternal Insecurity Does Make a Difference? *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 19 (2), 202-219.

Beeber, L., Chazan-Cohen, R., Squires, J., Jones, B., Boris, N., Heller, S. and Malik, N., 2007.

The Early Promotion and Intervention Research Consortium (E-PIRC): Five Approaches to Improving Infant/Toddler Mental Health in Early Head Start. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 28, 2, p. 130-150.

Byron, T., 2015. *Your Child, Your Way*. London, Penguin/Michael Joseph

Cameron, R. J., 2006. Educational psychology: the distinctive contribution. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 22(4), 289-304.

Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I. and Petticrew, M., 2008. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Bmj*, *337*, p.a1655.

Day, S., 2010. Listening to young children: An investigation of children's day care experiences in Children's Centres. *Education & Child Psychology*, 27(4), 45-55.

Elfer, P., Goldschmied, E. and Selleck, D., 2012. *Key Persons in Nurseries, Building Relationships for Quality Provision*. London: National Early Years Network.

Espe-Sherwindt, M., 2008. Family-centred practice: collaboration, competency and evidence. *Support for Learning*, 23 (3), 136–143.

Evangelou, M., Sylva, K., Edwards, T. and Smith, A., 2008. *Supporting Parents in Promoting Early Learning*. The Evaluation of the Early Learning Partnership Project. Research Report DCSF-RRO39. Department for Children, Schools and Families.

Gray, R. and McCormick, M.C., 2005. Early Childhood Intervention Programs in the US: Recent Advances and Future Recommendations. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26, 3, p. 259-275.

Greig, A., Munn, P. and Reynolds, S., 2010. Guest Editorial. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 27(3), 6-21.

Love, J., Banks, L., Raikes, H. and Chazan-Cohen, R., 2006. Head Start: What do we know about its effectiveness? What do we need to know? In McCartney, K. and Phillips, D. (Eds). *Blackwell Handbook of Early Childhood Development*. Ed. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford, United Kingdom

Melhuish, E., Belsky, J., Leyland, A.H., Barnes, J. and NESS, 2008. Effects of fully established Sure Start Local Programmes on 3-year-old children and their families living in England: a quasi-experimental observational study. *Lancet*, vol. 372, pp. 1641–7.

National Audit Office, 2006. *Sure Start Children′s Centres: Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General*. The Stationery Office: London.

O'Connor, T. and Zeanah, C., 2003. Attachment disorders: Assessment and treatment strategies Approaches. *Attachment & Human Development*, 5 (3), 223-244.

Olds, D.L., Sadler, L. and Kitzman, H., 2007. Programs for parents of infants and toddlers: recent evidence from randomized trials. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, vol. 48, pp. 355–91.

Randall, L., 2010. Secure attachment in the future: The role of educational psychology in making it happen. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 27(3), 87-99.

Shonkoff, J. and Phillips, D., 2005. *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Slater, R., 2007. Attachment: Theoretical development and critique. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 23(3), 205-219.

Thompson, R. A., 2008. Early attachment and later development. In Cassidy, J. and Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed., pp. 348–365). London: Guilford Press.