PRESCHOOL TEACHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ATTACHMENT MODELS OVER TIME

by

Doris Marie Martin

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Family and Child Development
(Child Development Option)

APPROVED:

Victoria R. Fu, Chair

Mark J. Benson

Janet K. Sawyers

David J. Parks

Michael J. Sporakowski

July, 1991
Blacksburg, Virginia
PRESCHOOL TEACHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ATTACHMENT MODELS OVER TIME

by

Doris Marie Martin

Committee Chair: Victoria R. Fu

Family and Child Development

(ABSTRACT)

This exploratory study examined the nature of the relationships between two preschool teachers and four of the children in their care. Of particular interest was the influence of primary attachment models or mental representations of each individual, on the interactions between teachers and children. Data on the teacher-child interactions were gathered through classroom observations and in depth interviews. Parents of the children were interviewed to obtain information on the children's primary attachment models. Findings support the conclusion that early attachment models were influential in defining current teacher-child relationships. These findings have implications for the training of teachers and for further research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

Rhythm is the tacit realization of what is within one's own self and the flow of life to others. It is an intuitive synthesis of movement that opens pathways to meaning and connectedness in relationships. (Moustakas, 1985, p. 5)

... When caregivers elicit and respond to these [infant] behaviors in a timely and appropriate fashion—that is, when they imbue them with meaning—the infant becomes part of an organized dyadic system (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986, p. 51).

This exploratory study of teacher-child relationships employed the concept of attachment as a life-long influence that is genetically based and operant in all human beings across the life span (Weiss, 1986). More specifically this study examined the attachment histories of each of four children and two teachers and the influence of their earlier relationships on their current relationships in a child day care classroom. The ongoing influence of early and continuing attachment patterns on subsequent attachments is represented internally as a working mental model (Bowlby, 1986).

In the formation of the earliest of relationships it is the adult who in interaction with the infant co-creates or assigns meaning to the child's representation of caregiver. At the same time, their relationship provides the context for the child's construction of a
corresponding model of self (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). The child's representation of self and her caregiver is carried forward into other relationships through learned expectations and rules that guide interactions with others.

One of the "others" in the young child's life is the caregiver or teacher who supervises the development of the child in the parent's absence. The child care teacher is becoming a significant person in the lives of increasing numbers of preschool children as more and more women take their places in the work force. Young children are spending as many as 50 hours a week under the care and supervision of the child care teacher; yet, this is a relationship about which we know very little. By increasing our understanding of the dynamics of the teacher-child relationship, we can better develop and support teacher training that can significantly impact the quality of caregiving.

The purpose of this study was to explore the influences of individual relationship histories of preschool teachers and children, on their subsequent relationships. The focus of this study was the relationship between two child day care teachers and four of the 3 to 4 year old children in their care. The influencing variables of child day care, as the context for these teacher-child relationships, were also examined.

Theoretical orientation. The primary theory on which this study rests is that of attachment. Attachment refers to the intent of an individual to seek the proximity of the caregiver especially in
situations of stress. Attachment theory was developed during the greater part of this century through the work of British psychologist, John Bowlby (Bretherton, 1985). Research in attachment was advanced by the work of Mary Ainsworth through her laboratory experiments which provided a classification system of mother-infant attachment relationships.

The study of relationships, (Hartup, 1989, Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986), and the ecological theory of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) provided the theoretical orientation for carrying this study forward. These tenets along with the theoretical concepts of attachment are explored in more detail in the later part of this chapter.

**Research design.** A qualitative design was used in this study in keeping with its exploratory nature, that is, the quest for understanding the meaning of relationships across family and day care systems and across development. Data regarding the teachers' histories were collected through in-depth interviews. The children's histories were collected through in-depth interviews with their parents and through observations of the children and parents in their homes. Data concerning the teacher-child relationships were collected during extensive observations in their classroom and from interviews with the teachers.

Interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Observations were recorded in a pattern that alternated observation with note taking. The data was analyzed in search of themes that
supported or refuted the coherence of the relationship histories with that of the behavior observed in the teacher-child relationships. This chapter continues with a review of the literature related to the concepts and themes introduced above. Topics addressed in the literature review include, relationships and development, attachment, the role of the teacher, the role of the child and the ecological model of development. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the study’s significance.

Relationships and development. The formation of a new relationship is in part the product of the influence of early relationships on the individuals involved. "One's orientation concerning others, one's expectations concerning their availability and likely responses, and what in general terms, one can do (or cannot do) to increase the likelihood of familiar responses are strongly shaped by early relationships" (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986, p. 68). Hartup (1986, pp. 2-3) presents four assumptions for consideration in studying relationships from a developmental perspective. First, relationships are describable with reference to their content, qualities, structure and patterning. Second, relationships are dynamic events which fluctuate over time. Third, individuals change over time. Motives, affects, and cognitions have "growth functions." And fourth, relationships are simultaneously both dependent and independent variables in all social experience. Sroufe and Fleeson (1988) suggest three additional assumptions. First, relationships are wholes and that they form a coherent totality
despite the diversity of their characteristics. As such they cannot be reduced to characteristics of participating members. Second, relationships exhibit coherence, continuity and predictability within the context of change and growth. And third, individuals develop representations of relationships which are then carried forward into new relationships.

Using these assumptions as a basis, the teacher-child relationship will be examined from the perspectives of the ecological development of relationships within the family systems, from the perspective of attachment theory, and concepts of early childhood teacher and child roles in relationship. Hinde and Stevenson-Hinde (1987) define a relationship as the interactions of two individuals affecting current and subsequent interactions over time. The nature of an interaction depends on the individuals involved and their expectations and feelings about the relationship in which the particular interaction occurs. The dialectic of the individuals reflects only part of the complexity of the study of relationships. Each of the above variables influences and is further influenced by the social group, social norms and the socio-cultural structure (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1987).

Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde (1986) suggest eight dimensions that may be useful in understanding the dynamics of relationships. The categories are:

Content of relationship: What people do together.
Diversity of interactions: Range or variety of interactions between individuals.
Quality of interactions: Sensitivity of response to each other.
Reciprocity vs. Complementarity: Doing the same behavior, (each one smiles) vs. doing different, yet related behavior (the child cries, the mother comforts).
Intimacy: The extent of self-revelation to the other.
Interpersonal perception: Role taking and empathy for the other.
Commitment: Acceptance of indefinite continuance of the relationship and or efforts to ensure its continuance. (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986, p. 28-31).

Not all of the eight categories will be useful or relevant in describing all relationships all the time. The "quality of the interactions" is relevant to relationships of all kinds, but is particularly relevant to the caregiver-child relationship. In caregiver-child relationships the quality of the relationship, is highly dependent on the sensitivity or "interpersonal perception" of the adult member in responding to the child. Reciprocity is characteristic of relationships between peers whereas complementarity is more typically characteristic of relationships where there is a disparity between the individuals as in an adult-child relationship.

Hartup (1989) has identified two types of relationships: vertical and horizontal which can be used to further illustrate complementarity and reciprocity. A vertical relationship is a
relationship between individuals of different developmental levels, represented by different behavioral functions of the two individuals. This type of relationship is characteristic of the child's first relationship, most often with the mother. The adult, seen by the child as the stronger and wiser, usually provides nurturance for and control of the child (Hartup, 1989). Similarly, Ainsworth (1989) describes the adult behavior toward the child as providing security and protection. The child's relative dependence in this vertical relationship is evident in the child's complementary behaviors of compliance and "appeals for succorance" (Hartup, 1989). These early vertical relationships significantly influence the child's subsequent vertical and horizontal (peer) relationships as well as other areas of development (Hartup, 1989).

Psychosocial theorist Erik Erikson (1963) has identified the first of eight developmental tasks as that of developing trust. Trust in the adult figure is essential to the development of a secure relationship. Within the context of a secure relationship, the developing child negotiates, the second task of autonomy. The child trusts that her interactions with her caregivers will be complementary. Her autonomy reinforces that trust through an increased skill and ability to initiate such interactions. The parent-child relationship is the primary context for the development of trust; however, it is not the only one. Secondary relationships with significant adults such as teachers, can also serve to enhance the child's sense of trust. For the child whose sense of trust is not well
developed within the parental or primary caregiver relationship, perhaps the early childhood teacher-child relationship offers a potential alternative.

**Attachment**

Specific research on the affectional relationship of infants to caregivers and caregivers to infants has tended to focus on only one member of this vertical relationship at a time. Traditionally the adult's tendency to maintain proximity to the infant is referred to as bonding (Snow, 1989), whereas the infant's behavior of seeking the adult in times of stress is referred to as attachment (Bowlby, 1987). Despite the research on maternal-infant bonding little is known about the process or maintenance of parental bonding (Ainsworth, 1989). Maternal-infant bonding stimulated by direct skin contact immediately following the birth of the infant has long range positive effects on the child's development. Delayed contact between mothers and infants does not produce the same level of bonding as does the immediate contact (Klaus & Kennell, 1982). This difference in timing suggests a sensitive or critical period for the development of bonding. However, deprived of early contact, many mothers and infants do form bonds. Similarly, fathers also bond with their children. Bonds established after the critical period seem to depend on shared experience through caregiving to stimulate the bonding response (Ainsworth, 1989).

The criteria for bonding suggested by Klaus and Kennel (1982) are essentially the same as the maternal behaviors found to
contribute to secure attachments. In the classical sense, attachment refers strictly to the child’s behavior toward the attachment figure, and is not necessarily characteristic of the relationship. Conversely the same is true for the concept of bonding. Bonding refers to the adult’s response to the child and does not refer to the relationship per se. In affectional bonds of attachment and bonding, there is "a need to maintain proximity, distress upon explicable separation, pleasure or joy upon reunion, and grief at loss (Ainsworth, 1989, p. 711). Whether these behaviors toward the objects of bonding and attachment actually represent the range of behavior possibilities in developing humans is unclear. The human ability to produce representational models may produce bonding and attachment behaviors which we, as of yet, have not identified. In viewing relationships it appears that bonding and attachment are not only complementary responses but may be essentially a single characteristic of a vertical relationship involving children and adults. Establishment of an affectional relationship with resulting bonding and attachment is a characteristic of the interactions between two people and is thus a property of the dyad, not the individual (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986).

Attachment theory is particularly important to the study of the preschool teacher-child relationship for two reasons. First, the infant’s earliest attachment is to the primary caregiver, usually the mother, whose role and responsibility in caring for the young child is to a large extent the same as the role of the early childhood teacher.
Secondly, attachment, the infant tendency to maintain proximity to the caregiver in times of distress, is a critical variable in the child's overall development.

Attachment theory was formulated by John Bowlby (1982) in explanation of the wide-spread ill effects experienced by young children in institutional care. Borrowing from ethology, control systems theory, cognitive theory, and psychoanalytic theory, attachment refers specifically to the child's seeking the proximity of the attachment figure in times of stress or threat of danger (Bowlby, 1987; Schmale, Rechter, & Goode, 1987). Bowlby's ethological position holds that the infant's tendency to seek the mother during times of fear or stress is essentially a survival behavior. Though based primarily on psychoanalytic object theory, attachment behavior is seen as distinct and separate from hunger and sexual drives. Attachment as defined here does not include other characteristics of the relationship such as play, though play may be present and may even contribute to the attachment. Bretherton (1985) suggests that research into other aspects of the attachment relationship might reveal a qualitative consistency within the relationship.

Bowlby's work became the theoretical foundation for the research of Mary Ainsworth whose famed strange situation, laboratory experiments have been used extensively to classify infants as securely or insecurely attached (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978; Portnoy & Simmons, 1978). The title "strange
situation" refers to the subjection of the child to the presence of a stranger, the leave-taking of the attachment figure and her subsequent reunion with the child all occurring in the laboratory setting. The child's responses to these situations provides the basis for the attachment classifications of: avoidant (A) secure (B) resistant (C) (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Characteristically infants classified as secure have experienced consistent and responsive behavior from their caregivers in meeting their needs, thus establishing within them a sense of confidence and trust that the caregivers will continue to meet their needs (Ainsworth, 1986). Consequently, these children respond by crying or fretting at the mother's leaving. Based on past experiences these children use their crying to alert the mother of their distress and trust that the mothers' arousal will bring about their return. Securely attached children respond to their mothers' return by seeking contact and or expressing pleasure upon their return.

The caregiver's behavior toward insecurely attached infants is often unpredictable and may include ignoring and overtly rejecting the infants, needs and distress. Some of these infants are not distressed by the mothers' leaving and react to her in the same way they react to a stranger leaving them alone. Insecure children may avoid or actively reject their caregivers upon reunion (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

Characteristically the secure infant uses the caregiver as a secure base from which to explore his environment. Caruso (1989)
views exploration and attachment as an interdependent system. "Infant's play, exploration of objects and people, general activity, and affective expression are enhanced when the attachment figure is present or within contact by the infant" (Caruso, 1989, p.121). The exploratory behavior of the secure infant is also indicative of the child's growing autonomy or control.

Insecure infants, on the other hand, are more reluctant to leave their mothers' sides, not trusting that they will be there for them if they leave. For insecurely attached children the development of trust and autonomy are thwarted. Longitudinal studies of the attachment-exploration system have found important relationships between early attachment patterns and later social and cognitive development (Caruso, 1989). Links between individual attachment differences and later socio-emotional functioning, according to Sroufe and Fleeson (1986), emerge largely because they are measures of the infant-caregiver relationship, not just the individual.

The *internal working model*, Bowlby's metaphor for how individual attachment patterns are constructed and maintained, (Bretherton & Waters, 1985) is established through the interactions of the caregiver and infant. The child's subsequent working model of the caregiver or attachment figure is the pattern used by the child in initiating and responding in other relationships (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). The internal working model reflects both members of the dyad in a complementary fashion. The responsive and sensitive caregiver reinforces the child's model of herself as an
individual worthy of care and attention. The child's model of self and of the adult caregiver is reinforced by her experience of consistent care. This child is secure in her attachment relationship (Bretherton, Ridgeway and Cassidy, 1987). In contrast, the negative or inconsistent interactions of the insecure child and parent reinforce the child's image that "I am not worthy of positive attention from the adult attachment figure" (Bretherton, Ridgeway, & Cassidy, 1987). The internal working model is especially useful because it explains both healthy and pathological relationships included in the range of models that individuals construct.

Sroufe (1983) listed preschool behaviors identified as relevant to maladaptive and healthy patterns of attachment. The avoidant patterns include behaviors such as bullying other children, blaming others, playing solitarily, and staring into space. The resistant patterns included restlessness, short attention span, impulsive, easily upset by failure, gives up easy, clings to adult, and lacks initiative. Preschool children classified as secure were found to be more ego-resilient, higher in positive affect, and more socially competent with peers and teachers (Sroufe, 1983).

The internal working model, as its name implies, is not immutable, but changes and is adjusted to fit the individual's experiences. Caregiver-child interaction patterns serve to intensify, maintain or even alter the existing internal working model. Internal working models serve to increase the predictability of interactions and thus guide the individual's behavior to maximize his
effectiveness in interactions. The internal working model may be reflected in different responses to different caregivers such as mother and father (Main & Weston, 1981). For the child who finds the response of a caregiver to be psychologically painful, defensive mechanisms may interfere with the development of appropriate models (Bretherton, Ridgeway, & Cassidy, 1987). Regardless of the appropriateness of the model it evolves to serve a function that is "beneficial" in the particular situation. Inadequate models "interfere" with effective coping and with development. The differences in internal working models reflect their flexibility and the interactional nature of attachment and the development of relationships in general.

A recent emphasis in the attachment research has been to examine the intergenerational influence of attachment. This aspect of attachment research addresses Hinde's issue of network influences on relationships (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986). The influencing network for the child is the family system with individual members forming parts of still larger networks. The internal working model or mental representation is the mechanism that carries the influence from one generation to another or from one network to another (Bretherton et al., 1987; Main & Kaplan, 1985). This intergenerational continuity in the quality of parental behavior is explicit in Bowlby's theory (Ricks, 1985). The parenting style adopted by an individual at any given time is influenced by the availability of emotional support and the form of caregiving
received by the individual as a child (Bowlby, 1988). "Thus the inheritance of mental health and of mental ill health through the medium of family micro-culture is certainly no less important, and may well be more important, than is their inheritance through the medium of genes" (Bowlby, p. 217 as cited in Bretherton, 1987).

To study internal working models beyond infancy requires methodologies other than the Strange Situation procedure which is valid only with children up through 20 months of age (Bretherton et al., 1985). The Berkeley Longitudinal Study classified infant children as secure or insecure at 12 and 18 months. At 6 years of age the children were again classified using pictures of separation and reunion scenes to evoke verbal responses indicative of their attachment. In addition parents were interviewed for parental recollections of their own childhood attachment figures. Parents of children classified as insecure claimed not to remember attachment figures, devalued or dismissed their importance, or were able to remember specific conflict-ridden experiences but were unable to integrate them into a coherent picture. In contrast, parents of children classified as secure were at ease in talking about attachment figures and valued both attachment and autonomy (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985).

To date, most attachment studies involving children in day care have focused on comparing the attachment of infants cared for by their mothers with those receiving care by someone outside the family (Moskowitz, Schwarz & Corsini, 1977; Portney &
Simmons, 1978; Belsky, 1988). There is general agreement that day care-reared children were just as attached to their parents as home-reared children (McCartney & Galanopoulos, 1988). Other studies of children in day care have found that children’s quality of attachment to parents was a predictor of their adjustment and adaptability to preschool.

Ainsworth (1982) describes the range of attachment relationships in hierarchical terms. The child’s primary attachment is to the parent, or parent figure. Secondary or substitute caregivers, such as teachers, are thought to take on a lesser role. Responding to research by Cummings (1980) who compared infant responses to their mothers with infant responses to their substitute caregivers, Ainsworth writes, "Although children seemed to accept substitute caregivers in the day care setting, it is not clear that they became attached to specific day caregivers" (1982, p. 21). My own personal experience and observation with children and teachers in day care settings indicate that many children do indeed form secure and comfortable attachment relationships with their specific teachers. The quality of their greetings and their acceptance of solace only by specific caregivers is indicative of specific attachments. What is not clear, is the way in which the children’s various attachment figures influence their internal working models. As an attachment figure, teachers may provide children with the security they cannot find with their own parents, and as such, deserve our further attention (Ainsworth, 1989).
In summary of attachment literature, two key points are reiterated. First, the impact of the child's early relationship experience through the development of the internal working model is believed to provide the underlying foundation from which the child develops other relationships, including eventually his/her own children. Each individual brings to a relationship different expectations for interactions based on his/her own internal working model and personal relationship history. Second, relationships are dynamic. Their complexity requires a thorough and encompassing approach to their understanding. To date attachment research has focused on the infant's attachment to the parent. A few studies have attended to the adult's bonding to the child and few studies have focused on the relationship itself. This study seeks to examine and explore the reciprocal and complementary interactions of teachers and children in relationship through an exploration of intergenerational transmission of attachment models.

The Role of the Teacher

"Teacher" as used in this study is the person whose responsibility it is to provide care for preschool children in a child day care setting. In day care, persons with direct responsibility for the care of young children are sometimes called "caregivers." In studies of attachment, the parent is also frequently referred to as "caregiver." For the sake of distinction, the terms "parent" and "teacher" will be used to distinguish the respective roles of these two caregivers. Primary caregiver and secondary caregiver will also be
used to refer to a parent and a teacher, respectively. The primary caregiver can be either the mother or father or the person acting as parent. The mother is most often the primary caregiver. The label of "teacher" is perhaps an unfortunate one for describing the non-parental role of supervising young children because it evokes a more familiar image of teacher as one who is charged with the authority to dispense knowledge. The responsibilities and role of the teacher vary according to the developmental needs of the children. The developmental dependency of the young child requires that the responsible teacher meet all of the child's immediate needs including physical, emotional/social and cognitive ones. The needs of young children are weighted toward the social-emotional, and physical as compared to the more cognitive and social needs of the middle-aged child. Relative to children's needs, the role of preschool teacher is more closely aligned with the role of parent as caregiver than it is to the traditional role of teacher as educator (Feeney, Christiansen & Moravcik, 1987). This is not to say that the preschool teacher, or the parent for that matter, does not also educate, but rather that a significant portion of her interactions with children are appropriately focused on caregiving, not teaching in the more formal sense. The younger the child the more complementary are the interactions between the child and her caregiver.

Katz (1980) differentiates between the role of early childhood teacher and the role of the parent. Focusing on the manner of personal involvement, not the actual tasks performed, Katz's seven
dimensions include scope of functions, intensity of affect, attachment, rationality, spontaneity, partiality, and scope of responsibility. The scope of function is greater for the parent than the teacher. Whether directly or indirectly, the parent is always responsible for the child. Even while the child is under the care of the teacher, the parent is responsible for the choice of teacher through her decision to use the particular child care services. For the teacher, responsibility for the child is limited to a certain number of hours each day and for a set period (e.g., one year). According to Katz (1980) the nature of the adult-child relationship is influenced by the continuous or permanent nature of the parent-child relationship as compared to the limited and temporary teacher-child relationship.

Regarding the dimension of relationships, the distinctions between the parent and teacher roles are less clear. Hess, Price, Dickson, & Conroy (1981) and Katz (1980) report that parent-child and teacher-child relationships differ in emotional quality and intensity. According to Hess (et al., 1980) distinctions between teacher and parent goals and expectations account for three major differences. First, the training and experience for the role is greater for the teacher. Secondly, the setting of the institution is oriented to the group whereas the home is oriented more toward the individual. Thirdly, the personal relationship between parent and child is more intense and of longer duration. Katz characterizes the parent-child relationship as one of "attachment" and the teacher-child relationship as "detachment." Katz cautions that if parents were to approach their
children with detachment instead of attachment, the child might interpret this stance as indifference. If this is so, how does the child interpret the teacher's detachment as positive for their relationship? The adult's conscious perspective on the duration of the parent-child relationship and its subsequent effect on the intensity of that relationship is incomprehensible to the young child. The child's relationship to his teacher may represent a very significant portion of a young child's total relationship experiences.

Descriptions of an effective early childhood teacher nearly always include personal attributes such as warmth, acceptance, and nurturance. Teachers report that knowing each child and developing a positive relationship with each is at the heart of teaching success (Almy, 1975). "The teacher accepts him as he is, with his differences and uniqueness, his individual background and personal capacities" (Ridgeway, 1976, p.13). Similarly Almy reports, "His teacher must match her pace and her expectations to his level of performance and bear with him as he moves ahead" (1975, p. 27). Ridgeway (1976) suggest that a teacher's acceptance and responsiveness to the young child contributes to the child's healthy self-esteem. The importance of the teacher's pacing herself to individual children presents an interesting parallel to maternal behaviors of pacing and responsiveness believed to foster secure infant attachments (Ainsworth, 1982). In both the teacher and parent roles the adult's responsiveness and sensitivity to the child is believed to have a significant and positive influence on the child's development.
In a recent study of day care home providers and parents, Nelson (1989) found that women care providers often referred to the children in their care as being like their own children. "He was like my own because I had him from seven in the morning till six-thirty, seven at night Monday through Friday, and some Saturdays. And its like this kid is my own. This is the kid I was second Momma to."

Throughout a wide range of working contexts this sentiment is shared by many teachers in child care settings of all types. Day care teachers report that the most satisfying aspect of their jobs is their relationships with the children (Fogel, 1980; Ridgeway, 1976). Despite the distinctions made between parents and teachers, certain similarities of the affective relationship seem to persist.

The presence or absence of an affectional teacher-child bond is not likely to be regulated by definition of the teacher role. Neither can an adult's care, commitment or depth of affectional bond that can accompany parent-child relationships as well as even the temporary teacher-child relationship, be explained as being inherent in the role. The act of caregiving in intimate contexts over a wide range of activities whether by teacher of parent, is a likely contributor to the formation of adult-child bonding (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1987). Teachers as caregivers, like parents, approach relationships from the influence of their own family networks and their own experiences of interactions with caregivers. One study (Sagi, Lamb, Lewkowicz, Dvir, & Estes, 1985), supporting Ainsworth's contention that the adults more so than children "drive" the relationship, found a high
consistency in the quality of attachments to individual caregivers. In other words, the same children were more likely to form attachments with some caregivers than with other caregivers whose actual responsibilities for the children were the same. The teacher's ability to create secure teacher-child relationships reflects her sense of herself as a person and her sense of self in the role of teacher. A better understanding of both teacher and child processes in the development of a relationship can be useful in promoting stronger affective relationships between teachers and children (Houston, 1978).

Various teacher-related issues such as child-staff ratio, teacher education and training, and teacher continuity and job satisfaction have been used to measure the quality of care (Burchinal, Lee, & Ramey, 1989; McNairy, 1988). Still other research has focused on single traits in relationships such as affection or touching (Hyson, Whitehead, & Prudhoe, 1988; Twardosz, Botkin, Cunningham, Weddle, Sollie, & Shreve, 1987). Measures of overall program quality and single traits of teaching may or may not be directly relevant to the quality of the relationships established between the teacher and the children in her care. However, for young children dependent on adult nurturance, the teacher-child relationship impacts how the child experiences day care or early childhood education, and even more importantly, how he experiences himself in an early childhood context.
The influence of parent-child relationship on the development of children has been substantiated by extensive research findings (Nezworski, Tolan & Belsky, 1988; Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). The similarities between the roles of parent and early teacher suggest that the teacher-child relationship may also be a considerable influence on the developing child.

The Role of the Child

Parental influence over the parent-child relationship has long been accepted, but the child's contributions to and influence on the parent-child relationship has been acknowledged only more recently (Anthony, 1983). Maccoby (1983) outlines seven areas of development that have profound effects on parenting and subsequently on the child's personality: physical and locomotion growth, social-cognitive understanding, conception of self, cognitive executive processes, and autonomy. Changes in development signal changes in the nature of the caregiver-child relationships. The role of the child in this study is in part determined by the level of his or her development.

Preschool children by contrast with toddlers have significantly improved their locomotion skills, physical coordination and manual dexterity. By 3-4 years old, children's developing fine motor control permits them to exercise greater independence in caring for most of their own needs regarding dressing and toileting. Other new skills made possible by increasing fine motor control include drawing, painting and the manipulation of construction toys. Preschool
children's increased size and strength decreases their physical dependence on adult caregivers. Opportunity to practice new skills not only increases children's independence, but it also provides a sense of achievement and fosters self-confidence (Fogel & Melson, 1988).

According to Piaget three and four-year-old children, who are in the preoperational stage, are egocentric and are unable to conserve because their thinking is perceptually bound. They cannot, for example, reason that the beaker that appears to hold more liquid actually has the same amount as the beaker that appears to have less (Flavell, 1985). This same quality of centration, or egocentrism, is said to inhibit the preschool child's ability to understand another's perspective when different from her/his own. Evidence is mounting, however, that the development of role-taking in the social realm, precedes perspective-taking ability in the physical domain (Flavell, 1988).

The child as this age is increasingly able to represent concepts mentally and symbolically allowing her to distinguish between pretend and real in both the social and physical realms. By age three most children have a sense of an inner self that cannot be seen directly by others (Fogel & Melson, 1988). The 3 and 4-year-old's concepts of self are pliable and often contradictory, but their ability to assess one's own abilities and attributes improves throughout preschool (Fogel & Melson, 1988). Impulse control plays an ever increasing role in the child's ability to be self-regulated as compared
to being "other regulated" (Flavell, 1988). Language can now be used effectively to communicate needs and to express feelings and concrete ideas. Developing language skills allows the adult to intervene less concretely and to rely more on verbal instructions in the guidance of the child (Hartup, 1989).

The child's increasing ability to reason and use language, accompanied by the physical skills of locomotion and manipulation, alter the nature of the parent-child relationship (Hartup, 1989). The decrease in dependence on adults is usually accompanied by an increase in interaction with peers. Despite the move toward increased independence, young preschool children remain dependent on adults for support in nearly every area of their lives. Influenced by changes in development yet operating somewhat independently is the influence of the child's temperament on the parent-child relationship. For example, maternal perceptions of difficult temperaments in children correspond to an increased risk of maternal depression. The evidence indicates that depression symptoms appear to follow the difficult relationship, not to precede it (Hartup, 1986). Furthermore, relationships with other siblings may not present the same characteristics of the mother's relationship as do her relationships with the "difficult" child (Chess & Thomas, 1984).

A child's ability and willingness to respond appropriately increases the likelihood of continued and appropriate parent-child interaction. High risk babies with immature development may not
be able to provide the social reinforcement to their caregiver that healthy babies do (Snow, 1989). The lack of visual tracking, smiling and cooing in response to parental social overtures may serve to weaken rather than strengthen, the emerging parental bond. Some high risk infants have crying pitches or patterns that are particularly aversive and are correlated with increased child abuse (Zeskind, 1983). The infant's early influences on the parent-child relationship are the result of developmental limitations or needs, not purposeful behavior. However interaction patterns begun in infancy are likely to continue their influence beyond infant innocence.

The developmental changes that occur within the young child over the time of the development of the relationship with the parent stand in contrast to the few changes that may occur in the adult over the same period. Initially the adult "drives" the relationship (Hartup, 1989), but over the course of development the child's ability to also "drive" the relationship gradually increases. With an increased sense of self and others, increased physical mobility, and language, the child's actions become more deliberate and more conscious, and provide an ever-increasing range of social behaviors at his disposal.

Within the context of the child day care environment, the child is confronted with a usually unfamiliar adult caregiver providing for needs that otherwise would likely be performed by a parent. Development and individual abilities will dictate the range of possible responses to the new caregiver. In addition, the child's individual temperament as reflected in the child's experience in
relationships with her primary caregiver(s) will influence her response to the unfamiliar adult. And finally, the child and the new adult in interaction with each other will continuously influence and be influenced by the other as they co-determine their relationship. Early relationships serve as flexible templates or models in the construction of future relationships (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). The older the child, the more experiences she has had which may have reinforced the patterns of interactions with her primary caregiver.

These patterns of interactions or "internal working models" though influential across generations are affected by intervening relationships that may strengthen or challenge the existing model. In other words, the relationship with the day care teacher may serve to strengthen the existing model or to provide an alternative model. The child's understanding of her "child" role and the complementary adult roles of "parent" and "teacher" become meaningful to the child within the context of relationships with specific individuals. The young child's naivete regarding role expectations are reflected in spontaneous interactions which are sometimes contrary to the prescribed "social" rules. The similarities of the "mother" and early "teacher" roles, and the child's naivete regarding social roles, suggest that the child will adopt the patterns established with the mother for her initial interacting with her first, usually female, teacher. The child's first sense of self is defined in reference to her primary caregiver, and it is this sense of "self" that enters into interactions with others.
Unlike the roles of "teacher" or "parent," the role of "child" is not one that the child consciously chooses. Only gradually with a growing awareness of self through relationships, does the child's behavior begin to reflect her particular understanding of adult roles and that of her own complementary, child role. The child does influence her own evolving concept of self as viewed in the context of relationships, but it is the adult, the individual with the most power, who largely determines the child's expectations of and responses in relationships (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Ecological Model

The ecological model of Bronfenbrenner (1979) provides a framework for studying the development of the teacher-child relationship within the context of the particular family, school, and cultural systems. A central premise of the ecological model "is the progressive accommodation between a growing organism and its immediate environment and the way in which this relationship is mediated by forces emanating from remote regions in the larger physical and social milieu" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 17). The ecological model incorporates the force of settings participated in and their linkage to events that occur outside the person's experience but which affect the individual. The systems experienced directly by the child, i.e., the self, family, and day care, comprise the Microsystems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). These complex systems cannot be studied in their entirety (McCartney & Galanopoulos, 1988) therefore questions pertinent to the research topic, to relationships and to
attachment more specifically, must be addressed for each of these systems.

Ultimately questions must be "sought with an eye to the interactions between the family and the child care system" (McCartney & Galanopoulos, 1988). How are these systems influenced by one another? How does each influence the relationship and how does the relationship influence them? The interrelationships of the Microsystems are encompassed by the broader mesosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In this study, the parent-child relationships of both the teacher and the child (family Microsystems) will be examined relative to their connections to the teacher-child relationship contained in the day care microsystem. For example how does a teacher's experience in relationship with her own mother or primary caregiver (family microsystem) influence the subsequent relationships that the teacher establishes with the children she teaches (day care microsystem). Thus, this study seeks to explore the development of relationships relative to both family and day care Microsystems and the linkage between them.

The family Microsystems of the earlier generations of the teacher and the child's parents are not part of the child's immediate environment. These earlier generations systems or indirect systems are referred to as the exosystem. In order to demonstrate how the exosystem context influences development, Bronfenbrenner (1979) identifies two steps:
1. The connecting of events in the external setting to processes occurring in the developing person's microsystem.

2. The linking of the microsystem processes to developmental changes in a person within that setting. (p. 237)

Bronfenbrenner (1979) states that influence on the developing organism may "reverberate in distant quarters" or in other words may have consequences quite removed from the immediate system. "In prior investigations little systemic attention has been given to the nature and complexity of interpersonal structures either as manifestations of the development of the person engaging in these subsystems or as indicators of the development potential of the setting in which they occur" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 204). The primary focus of this study is the interactions of the teacher-child relationship in a natural setting. However, the overlapping family and school system-settings that envelope this relationship provide the context for the development of the individuals as well as for the development of their relationship. Each individual's relationship history provides an influence on the primary relationship that "reverberates in distant quarters" or relationships of later or earlier generations. According to Sroufe and Fleeson,

...relationships are not constructed afresh, nor are new relationships based on the simple transfer of particular responses from old relationships. Instead, it is assumed that previous relationships exert their influence through the attitudes, expectations, and understanding of roles that they
leave with the individual. Each relationship may be unique, but relationships are also lawfully determined by the relational histories of the individuals. (1986, p. 53)

The very nature of relationships, their ties to history and their dependence on the immediate context for meaning, seems to demand an ecological perspective for their valid study and understanding.

**Significance**

... But for children who are used to thinking of themselves as stupid or not worth talking to or deserving rape or Beatings, a good teacher can provide an astonishing revelation. A good teacher can give a child at least a chance to feel, "She thinks I'm worth something. Maybe I am. (Kidder, 1989, p. 313)

Teachers can and do have profound influences on children by providing alternative models of relationships from those to which a child is accustomed to in his or her family. The teacher can also serve to support the development of healthy adult-child relationships by reinforcing a positively directed working model. The particular quality of the teacher-child relationship is a critical variable of that influence. If we understand the process of how the teacher-child relationships develop, we will be better able to design training and education models that support the development of positive teacher-child relationships and provide alternatives to models that are destructive and have outlived their original defensive purpose.

To date most research on the adult-child relationship has focused on mother-infant attachment. "What is extraordinary, ... is that there
has been so little research into the role of substitute caregivers as possible attachment figures in the caregiving setting itself and how such relationships compare with or supplement attachment to parents" (Ainsworth, 1982). The existence of attachment relationships into adulthood is acknowledged (Weiss, 1986), but the lack of measurements and the absence of identified behaviors representing attachment across development has limited most attachment research to children under two. Most studies of adult-child attachment and bonding relationships have been concerned with the behavior of either member of the dyad, not the relationship as a whole. This study has explored and attempted to expand our understanding of the caregiver-child relationships, more specifically the teacher-child relationship, through interviews and observations in home and school settings. Possible contributions of this study include descriptions of: (a) characteristics of attachment and bonding relationships from the perspective of dyadic interactions; (b) the nature of the child's relationship to secondary caregivers; and (c) intergenerational influences of internal working models on relationships linking family and child care systems.

The findings of this study may have implications for society's political and economic policies that govern our child care practices. Currently certain "personality" traits and relationship skills are acknowledged informally as necessary characteristics of competent teachers, but they have only recently been recognized as viable components of early childhood teacher training (Bowman, 1989; Katz
& Rathe, 1985). Increased understanding of the dynamics of the teacher-child relationship can be used to support the implementation of personal skills development and relationship training for teachers. This study involving the development of teacher-child relationships also has implications for the establishment of other adult-child relationships. New adult-child relationships frequently result when parents find new partners, when children are adopted and when children are placed in foster care. In day care, the primary caregiver, or parent, is supplemented by a secondary caregiver or teacher. However in some remarriages, adoptions and foster care situations, the primary caregiver, or parent, may actually be supplanted.

Research in child development has followed the positivist scientific traditions almost exclusively despite calls for research that preserves interactional sequences observed in naturally occurring settings (Ainsworth, 1982; Bretherton, 1985; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Caruso, 1989). Ainsworth (1982) posits that shifts in attachment patterns, as a result of development, are likely, but that the continuity is unlikely to be discovered if the focus is on discrete behavioral measures. This study of day care teacher-child relationships is a response to appeals for preserving interaction patterns of relationships in context by incorporating the interactional elements of the relationship that are both developmental and ecological in nature.
This chapter discussed the relevant literature pertaining to the study of relationships and development. The review of attachment that followed focused on literature that provides a means for examining relationships beyond the mother-child dyad. The role of teacher as caregiver and the role of the child as influenced by development were presented next. The chapter was concluded with a review of the ecological theory of human development and the significance of this study.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the nature of eight preschool teacher-child relationships as they were influenced by their individual attachment histories. Attachment histories were collected through in-depth interviews with the teachers and parents of the children and from observations of the children and their parents in their homes. The teacher-child relationships were examined through direct observation of interactions between the teachers and children in their classroom and through data collected in the teacher interviews. This chapter includes discussions of the theoretical and research models and the research questions that guided this study, descriptions of the participants and their selection, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Theoretical Perspective

The theory of symbolic interactionism, along with ecological theory, provided the research perspective for this study of relationships. The theory of symbolic interactionism is based on three premises:

1. Social events are phenomena that are bracketed out from a stream of phenomena and hence are relevant because the individual has chosen them. They do not have intrinsic value, but are based on the meaning(s) ascribed to them;

2. Meanings of relationships are socially constructed through interactions in context, and;
3. Meanings of relationships are dynamic, that is, they are created through continuous reinterpretation of the relationships that are comprised of interactions (Blumer, 1969; Collins, 1988). Understanding the meaning of relationships through interactions requires gaining the participants' perspectives. Any attempt to gain the participants' perspectives requires that the study consider the myriad layers of variables found within the ecological context. The acquisition of roles in relationship to attachment figures and the development of individual identities emerge in interaction with others (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1987).

Research Model

Questions of meaning and understanding are best answered using a qualitative model (Firestone, 1987; Smith, 1984). The qualitative model was particularly viable in seeking to understand the meaning of relationships through the participant's own frame of reference. The purpose of a qualitative method "is to provide rich, descriptive data about the contexts, activities, and beliefs of the participants . . ." (Goetze and LeCompte, 1984, p.17). The primary qualitative methodologies of participant observation and in-depth interview supported the participants' telling of their own stories. The research sought through "thick description", to provide a slice of life that preserved the particulars of diversity, not abstract generalizations of the group (Allen & Gilgun, 1987). These and other characteristics and assumptions made the qualitative or interpretive
model a particular relevant model for use in this study of relationships.

Relationships are intricate and abstract phenomena that are complexly influenced by the context in which they occur. "Any research that takes the researchers out of the naturalistic setting may negate those forces and hence obscure its own understanding" (Wilson, 1977 cited in Guba, 1978, p. 253). By observing in the natural setting, the context, including the physical setting, the psychological environment, and the clustering of interactions facilitate the study of relationships (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1987). "Both researchers and funding agencies are strongly urged to turn their attention both to naturalistic observation and to the latent content of verbal behavior in discourse and the use of interview on studies of various kinds of affectional bonds" (Ainsworth, 1989, p. 715). Furthermore the qualitative paradigm acknowledges, as inherent in the context, the presence and influence of the researcher.

An underlying assumption of the qualitative or interpretivist paradigm is that of multiple realities (Smith, 1984). Thus, relationships are always viewed from at least two perspectives. No two individuals are likely to experience or interpret a relationship in the same way. Each brings her own interpretation and selects and imparts importance to that which she chooses. The purpose of qualitative research is the discovery of patterns in the phenomena, not necessarily their verification (Lincoln & Guba, 1978).
Compatible with the concept of many truths is the view of the researcher and respondent as interrelated and each influencing and being influenced by the other. There is no discrete distance in which the researcher can remain independent of the respondent (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). The qualitative researcher makes her position or bias explicit thus validating the perspective from which she stands to view or more accurately interact with the researched. In this instance, my extensive experiences as preschool teacher provided the perspective of an insider. This perspective enhanced my ability to interpret the richness of the teacher's experiences through the perspective of my own similar experiences (McCracken, 1988). My knowledge and familiarity with children and teachers also aided my ability to see nuances of interaction perhaps not visible to the observer less experienced in the field.

This study was further guided by the ethical consideration that the researched (the participants) and not just the researcher must stand to benefit from the research process as well as from the potential impact of research findings (Patton, 1980). In this study the long term effects of the research, through its potential to influence policy, may have an impact upon the individuals, but the immediate impact of my participation was of even greater concern. For the children, I became an additional adult available in meeting their needs. The teachers experienced the process in two ways: First, I provided an additional "pair of hands" to help in the myriad chores of the preschool teacher. Secondly, the teachers were
encouraged to reflect on their teaching experience juxtaposed with reflection on their own early experiences. It was hoped that such reflection may have prompted greater conscious awareness of their own behaviors in relationship leading to increased personal power and satisfaction with self. Discussions and observations with all participants were conducted with the underlying belief that the responsibilities of the researcher are first to the rights and welfare of the participants and secondly to the collection of data.

The well-being of the participants was further supported by my open and clear disclosure of the intent of the study, relying on the clarity of design and the project's meaning to enlist and sustain their cooperation. The distinctions between the researched and researcher become blurred at times as the researcher participated in the lives of the researched (Lubeck, 1985) and as interviewees, caught up in the personal significance of an in-depth interview, provided unsolicited data out of their own interest and awareness of the research questions.

Research Questions

This study was originally guided by the purpose and central question, what is the nature of the preschool teacher-child relationship? The exploratory nature of this study did not permit a totally predictable path, nor did it anticipate verification of specific hypotheses, but rather left open the possibility of discovery through the ongoing collection and analysis of the data (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). For this reason the questions were revised during the study.
to better reflect the flow of data. This in turn also provided for analysis that more nearly paralleled the current goals of attachment research related to teachers and children.

Specific research questions were initially stated as:

1. What is the nature of the child's role in initiating and maintaining interactions;

2. What is the nature of teacher's role in initiating and maintaining interactions;

3. What are the patterns and characteristics of teacher-child relationships, and

4. What are the roles of the teacher's and the child's internal working models in the shaping of the teacher-child relationship?

The revised questions are:

1. How do early primary relationships of the individuals influence the relationships between preschool teachers and children?

2. What are the significant factors that influence the nature of the preschool teacher-child relationship within the specific context of child day care?

3. What is the nature of the teacher-child relationships targeted in this study? These questions were drawn from concepts of relationships (Hartup, 1989), and attachment theory and research (Ainsworth, 1978; Bowlby 1987; Sroufe, 1983).

The Participants

The main participants of this study were two preschool teachers and 4 of the 24 children in their classroom. The other 20
children in the classroom were secondary participants in that they were a direct part of the system in which the observations took place and were sometimes involved in the recorded interactions of the main participants. Participating with somewhat less involvement were the eight parents of the children. Though three adult teachers were assigned to this class of 24 children, one teacher resigned several weeks into the study and was not replaced in time to consider the new teachers' participation.

Written consent to participate was requested and received from the parents of all 24 children and from the teachers. Accompanying the request for their consent was a letter describing the purpose of the study and my role as researcher in the classroom. A second consent agreement detailing additional involvement was requested and received from the four focus children's parents. During my first visit to the class I informed the children that I would like to come to their classroom for the purpose of better understanding their class and eventually writing a story about them. I asked for their verbal consent to my participation in their classroom and received it (Fine & Sandstrom, 1988). Confidentiality was assured and maintained for all participants, especially and including children, whose rights and privileges are so readily and easily transgressed (Kelly-Byrne, 1989). Individuals were assigned code names and certain details of their life situations, as reported, were altered to protect their anonymity.

Participant Selection
The particular child day care center site was chosen on the basis of the director's expressed willingness to support the research effort, for having a classroom of 3-year-olds and for its geographic convenience. In addition, the day care center was chosen because its philosophy, based on my experience, was not unlike other programs around the country. Potentially similar data could have been collected at any number of other child day care programs. More detailed descriptions of the program and the participants are provided in the results section. Initially the director of the program, serving as gate-keeper, screened the teachers for their ability and willingness to openly express themselves and for their desire to contribute to the research topic (Kurz, 1983). I then described to the teachers their roles and my own involvement in their classroom. Both teachers readily agreed to participate in the study and welcomed my involvement as a participant observer in their classroom.

The four focus children were selected on the basis that they represented different patterns of interactions with their teachers. By recording children's interactions with their teachers and their interactions initiated with me, I identified four children whose interaction with the teachers where characteristically different from each other. Sroufe (1983) described typical behavior patterns of insecurely attached children, avoidant and resistant, and typical behaviors of securely attached children. The avoidant patterns of children's behavior included bullying other children, blaming others,
playing solitarily, and staring into space. Resistant children were described as restless, impulsive, easily upset by failure, giving up easy, clinging to adult, and lacking initiative. Patterns of secure children included confident expectations of the adult, self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and affective positive interactions. Using the above behaviors as a general guide, I tentatively identified three maladaptive patterns of interaction and one healthy or secure pattern. The maladaptive behaviors observed at that point were not sufficient to specifically classify any of the children as avoidant or resistant. The teachers were asked to verify that the specific behaviors which I had observed were not atypical for the specific child.

Although my initial intent was to observe 3-year-olds, many of the children in the class had already had their fourth birthday. To increase the pool of possible focus children the decision was made to include children who had just turned 4 years old within a month of the start of the study, with the assumption that their development was still within the range of that needed for the study. Of the remaining 18 children, 4 additional children were eliminated because they attended irregularly or only part of the day. The teachers were asked the likelihood of the selected children's parents' willingness to consent to being interviewed. The selection process took place over the first two weeks of observations. All of the parents of the first four focus children selected, agreed to participate.
Three and four year-old children were selected for several reasons: first, they characteristically possess the level of language and social skills that could supply important details to aid in the analysis of their interactions with adults and peers; second, despite growing independence, they remain dependent on the adult for meeting many physical and emotional needs thereby increasing the likelihood of a sufficient number of adults-child interactions; and third, most attachment studies have focused on children under 2 years old. In seeking to extend our knowledge of attachment behavior in children's relationships with parents and teachers it seemed appropriate that the next level of attachment development continue to be explored through this study.

Data Collection Procedures

Two principle avenues for collecting qualitative data are participant observation and in-depth interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). These two methods used across several data sources served to triangulate the data (Mathison, 1988) or in other words provided validity to the interpretation by having support for the findings coming through multiple means and methods and perspectives. In addition to written observations and interviews, my informal reactions and questions concerning the research process were recorded throughout the project in a field journal. In participant observation and in the in-depth interview, the researcher functions as the data collection instrument (Strauss, 1988). The data collection included 20 observations in the classroom, 3 interviews
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with each of the two teachers, a home visit/observation with each of the four families and individual interviews with each of the eight parents (see Figure 1).

**Participant Observation.** Kurz (1983) describes participant observation as being especially useful where one is interested in understanding the perspective of group members. "No other method can provide the detailed understanding that comes from directly observing people and listening to what they have to say" (Bogdan & Taylor, 1984, p. 79). "The participant observer is able to "secure her data within the mediums, symbols, and experiential worlds which have meaning to her respondents" (Vidich, 1955). In addition to observing others, the role of the participant observer allowed me as researcher to use my own experiences in the data collection.

My role as participant observer in the day care classroom most nearly resembled that of "teacher." However, in order to maximize my opportunity for observation of the teachers and children and to minimize the impact of my presence, I restricted most of my interactions to those initiated by the children (Fine & Sandstrom, 1987; Lubeck, 1985). These child initiations included any one or a combination of visual, verbal or physical contacts. My responses to a child's initiative was to mirror her, or in other words, to match the level of my response to the level of her initiative. For the most part, this self-imposed restriction provided for natural interactions without adult domination of them. Exceptions to this occurred when supervision of a child was called for and when other adults were not
available. This "teacher" role also served the purpose of putting the children and teachers at ease, because it was one with which they were familiar.

Another exception to my non-directed involvement with the children occurred near the end of the study when each of the four focus children were asked to go with me to a separate room to be "interviewed" using a set of family dolls, story books, markers and paper. Along with projective activities, the children were asked to select the adult, either a teacher or a parent, whom they preferred to participate with them during a specific activity. These activities included a range of play activities to caretaking activities that might take place either at home or at the day care center.

Field notes, except for very brief reminders were written outside the classroom. Lubeck (1985) reported that her note-taking made the teachers uneasy and served to separate her from the group. By participating, I was able to establish a rapport and a sense of confidence in the teachers that would have been difficult by observation alone. The participation allowed the teachers to identify with me as teacher and as such provided a common or shared set of experiences upon which to begin the interviews. The practice of not recording in the room, while promoting spontaneity and naturalness for the teachers, limited the recording of verbatim dialogues.

Having spent three months with this group of children and adults, I had grown fond of them and perhaps they too had grown accustomed to my being there. Kelly-Byrne (1989) emphasizes the
importance of bringing closure to the researcher-participant relationship especially involving children who lack the perspective to understand time as related to the pragmatics of adult research schedules. At my last visit, in appreciation for their participation, I presented and read a children's story chronicling their class events and my involvement with them over the last several months. Though not the only "story" to be written about the children, it fulfilled my promise to them and satisfied it on a level which I hoped they would understand.

The observations were scheduled and rotated such that the full range of activities throughout the day were included in approximately 3 visits per week (i.e., 7:30 - 10:30, 10:30 - 1:30 and 2:30 - 5:30). If Monday was a 7:30 visit one week, the next week I would begin at 10:30 and so on. This schedule also provided the opportunity to observe each teacher working in the classroom without the other. The 1:30 to 2:30 period was omitted from observations because most of the children were asleep during that period. Typically observations lasted 3 hours with brief breaks for note taking occurring approximately every 30 minutes. Classroom observations took place over a three month period and were gradually faded out during the last month.

Other observations included a visit with each of the four children to observe family interactions in their homes. As observer I sought to minimize my interactions with the child or a parent that would restrict or exclude their interactions with other family
members. These visits were all arranged during the evening when both parents and the child were present. Visits, approximately 45 minutes in length, were scheduled after I had spent at least 2 months in the child care center allowing the children and parents to become familiar with me. Visits to the homes began during the third month as visits to the classroom were being phased out.

Details and descriptions of the observations and experiences were written immediately after each observation period to provide as faithful a record as possible. Peer reviewers in child development and early childhood education reviewed portions of the field notes to assure their relevance to the research purposes or to suggest reconsideration of the questions. In addition to reading field notes peer reviewers served as sounding boards and a "clearing committee" in order to maintain the effectiveness of the observing "instrument."

**In-depth Interviews.** In-depth interviews with teachers and parents were used to explore the current teacher-child relationship as well as early parent-child relationships of both the teachers and the children's parents. The interview, one of the most powerful methods of collecting qualitative data, "gives us the opportunity to step into the mind of another person, to see and experience the world as they do themselves" (McCracken, 1988, p. 9). According to Bogdan and Taylor (1984) the in-depth interview is modeled after conversations between equals rather than a strict question and answer approach. The researcher seeks to make connections with
the respondent and is thereby able to elicit rich and detailed information (McCracken, 1988). The in-depth interview is most useful in illuminating subjective human experiences (Bogdan & Taylor, 1984).

Except for the two central instructions, "tell me about your relationship with [child's name]" and "tell me about your relationships with your family from as far back as you can remember," the interviews were unstructured and opened-ended. Following closely the material presented by the interviewee, questions were used to probe for more detail and for clarification. No individual expressed reluctance to being audio taped, nor did anyone refuse to respond to any of my questions.

Three interviews with each teacher were conducted after most of the classroom observations had been collected. By this time considerable rapport had developed between the teachers and myself. Teacher interviews began with the teachers being asked to discuss the four target children and then moved to discussions of their own early attachment experiences up through and including her own current relationships with their families. The teacher interviews were conducted during the teachers' lunch breaks and were approximately 45-60 minutes in length. The interviews were audio-taped.

Interviews with the parents were conducted at the parents' convenience in variety of settings including an office, their homes (other family members were not at home), and restaurants. The
interviews began with a discussion centering around the child and proceeded to questions involving the parents' early family experiences. Due to a malfunctioning tape, one parent interview was not recorded. The problem was discovered immediately afterward and the interview was reconstructed from handwritten notes and from memory. Parent interviews ranged from 45-90 minutes in length with most lasting about 60 minutes, the amount of time they had been told to expect.

Data Analysis

The data analysis involved an ongoing interpretive process in search of categories, themes, patterns and explanations which made sense of the data (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The first analysis occurred in the bracketing of behaviors, observed and recorded, that led to the selection of the 4 focus children. The observational data were collected in handwritten form and analyzed without rewriting. The interaction behaviors of the children were compared to previously operationalized categories and clinical reports of children's secure and insecure attachments (Main et al., 1985; Sroufe, 1983). As a starting point for identifying secure and insecure behaviors of 3 and 4-year-olds, the data were examined using the broadly defined attachment categories of secure, resistant and avoidant (Ainsworth et al., 1978). On one level, ongoing analysis occurred during the observations as theory-based decisions were made to attend to certain behaviors and to ignore others. After the four focus children had been identified, children's interaction
behaviors were interpreted systematically as being coherent or incoherent with their initial categorization (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1988). As new data were collected and incorporated with previously collected data, the interpretations were revised as needed to reflect the additional information. The data, like the relationships it described, truly represented more than the sum of the parts.

From the point of the selection of the children, the major analysis was focused on the data collected in the interviews with the teachers. The interview data was interpreted as supporting or deviating from the ongoing observations in the classroom. The concept of supporting was defined as that which demonstrated coherence (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1988). These two perspectives, the interviews and the observations, produced still a third perspective created by their intersection. These points of intersection substantiated themes and patterns of relationship behavior which roughly defined the teachers' representational model of self in relationships or as described in attachment theory, the internal working model (Bowlby, 1973). Similarly data from visits in the homes, from the interviews with parents and the classroom observations provided other triangulation. The analysis of these data also produced points of intersection that rounded out the stories of the children as told by the parents and as observed in the lives of the children both at home and at school. At the first level analysis of the data proceeded along two separate lines, one focusing on the
teachers' relationship history and other focusing on the children's relationship histories as each related to observed behavior.

The analysis of data was an ongoing process that began with the first observations and concluded when all of the data were reviewed in tandem in an attempt to make sense of or to discover the meaning of the observed interactions across the perspectives of the various individuals. The transcripts and recorded observations were read repeatedly, each time looking for connections between the experiences within the single transcript as well as across the transcripts. For example, in the parent interviews I looked for and noted references to experiences that were represented by both the mother and the father, whether supportive or contradictory of each other. This same procedure was applied to the comparison of the parent interview data with the observation data of the child both at home and at school. The interpreted patterns and paths of attachment were continuously examined in light of existing research (Main et al., 1985).

The final analysis sought to offer explanations for interaction patterns that demonstrated coherence across all sets of data. Using Bowlby's representational model as the standard, the data were interpreted in different directions. One, I examined the observed teacher-child interactions and looked for clues in their relationship histories that provided a theoretical "fit." And two, I examined the relationship histories, isolated key behaviors based on domains of relationships (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1988), and searched for
verification of their importance in the observed interactions. This same procedure was applied laterally as well. Children's patterns were compared across children, teachers' across teachers, and parents' across parents. Other explanations were sought for the data that did not appear to "fit" or lacked coherence with another set of data. These exceptions were treated as behavior representing or defining the outer bounds of this study. Behaviors that did not "fit" may provide direction for another analysis and indicate the need for a more exhaustive data collection. In the dot-to-dot metaphor these "odd pieces" of data represent the complexities of human relationships and perhaps also the limitations of the theory.

This analysis reflects the research and literature on relationships and attachment theory as viewed through ecological or systems development and as it was guided by the research questions. It is hoped that this exploratory and interpretive study of teachers and children will encourage further study of the relationships between teachers and children.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

The manner in which two individuals approach and form relationships is highly dependent upon the patterns of their earliest and primary relationships usually that of mother and child (Bowlby, 1988). This study of teacher-child relationships begins in the past with the telling of the individual's relationship experiences within their own families. The patterns formed during these earliest relationships are the flexible templates that serve as a guide for behavior in and expectations of future relationships (Sroufe, 1988). These patterns or *internal working models* (Bowlby, 1980) are tempered by subsequent experiences that support or detract from the originating model(s). Within a single relationship, their patterns of interactions are determined by the circumstantial contexts, the individuals' relationship histories and the relationship itself. For example, maturation will effect different behaviors over time in one or both individuals and subsequent changes in the nature of the relationship. However, despite the changes in behavior, certain expectations or patterns of initiating or responding in the relationship will likely remain a stable and persistent influence on the ongoing relationship as well as in other new and continuing relationships.

Through the reorganization of individual models, intergenerational cycles may be broken (Bretherton et al., 1985),
however, because the working model is unconscious it serves as a
default model when alternative responses are not clearly dictated
(Bowlby, 1973). Working models of relationship behavior, like the
family tree, have their roots in the past and are most often
underground or unconscious.

In this study, the teacher-child relationships are examined
from the perspectives of both the teachers and the children. The
teachers' individual stories are followed by the stories of the four
children which are based primarily on the accounts of the children's
parents. At the child day care center the two teachers' meet and
form relationships with the four children. These eight teacher-child
relationships are viewed from the perspective of the attachment
theory (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973; Bretherton et al., 1985)
as it is woven between and across generations and families. The
tapestries of these relationships as all relationships are uniquely
exquisite and endlessly complex.

In the interviews conducted with the teachers and the parents
of the children, two main perspectives were collected; first, the
adults' retrospective telling of highlights and details of their early
relationships with their parents and secondly, their description from
their more highly developed adult perspective of that same
relationship as they currently experience and perceive it. Bowlby's
working model concept is used in the interpretation of interactions as
a global construct held by the individual. Since it is the individual's
perception of this primary relationship that constitutes the internal
working model, the relationship as seen by half of the dyad is sufficient for our purpose here, that is, to trace the threads of individual attachments across generations eventually culminating in the teacher-child relationship.

A few interviews cannot adequately describe all the intricacies and changes in the relationships that emerge over time between adult individuals and their parents. Like the dot-to-dot picture in which one discerns the outline of an object before all of the dots are connected, so too are the pictures that emerged of the parent-child relationships in this study. Each additional "dot" of information that is connected, brings the picture of the relationship into clearer focus despite the limitations. This descriptive account of two teachers in relationship with four children is divided into three main sections: the teachers' relationships with their families, the children's relationships with their families, and finally the relationships of the two teachers and four children within the context of a child day care class.

The Teachers' Family Relationship Histories

The first section in this chapter presents the stories of the teachers' relationships with their immediate families, especially their mothers and fathers, from childhood up to the present. In-depth interviews were the sources for each of the teachers' stories as related in their own words to provide the reader the opportunity to experience the world as nearly as possible as the teachers do themselves (McCracken, 1988). The lives and experiences of these
two women connect when they begin teaching in the same child day care classroom. First is Mandy's story, followed by Eve's.

**Mandy**

Mandy described herself as being "kinda shy," "easy to get along with", and "a worrier." She did not like to bother other people about her problems preferring to keep them to herself and to figure them out by herself. She recalled events of the past with certainty and stated her opinions with minimal equivocation. Her awareness of her own behavior seemed to come impart through self-examination but primarily from what others, especially her mother, had said of her. Mandy recognized that her own childhood experiences had influenced her current beliefs about teaching.

Mandy decided to become a teacher after she enrolled in child care classes in high school and consequently chose education as her college major following a job as a cashier. After two and a half years of college Mandy decided to take a full time teaching job. "I was tired of school, I needed money, and I wanted to see if I would really like teaching before I went ahead and finished." Mandy has taught 3-year-olds since beginning her first and current teaching position at the Good Beginnings Day Care Center three years ago. For Mandy, part of her goal as a teacher was to give to children what she had not always received from her own early caregivers, "I can remember my elementary teachers and some of them were great. One of them I still talk to." Of her earlier sitters Mandy reflects, "I've always felt, 'do they like me?' I think it's important that the child not be there
just to play, but to know that the teacher or someone cares about them." Mandy described early caregivers who really cared about her as ones who, "just sat down and talked to me, took me some place that I've asked to go or just to color with me, something like that." From the time she was six weeks old until she entered school, Mandy was cared for by "private sitters" in their own homes. Similar arrangements were made for after school and during the summers until Mandy was 12 years old. Here is Mandy's story in her own words as told at age 25.

Mandy's early care experiences.

My mom knew them through mutual friends, you know, who baby sit and things like that. Maybe I had one sitter during the school year and then a different one during the summers. And I guess I had four or five different sitters. Now with private sitters, I didn't want Mom to go to work. I don't ever remember crying. I just never said anything to Mom, really. I've always tried to figure out and work things out for myself.

When I was in school and stuff, I always figured it out on my own and when my brother was old enough I helped my brother with his homework and stuff like that. It wasn't that she [Mom] didn't want to spend more time with me, I just did it on my own. I kind of still, I guess, I still do things on my own--not to ask other people to do it for me. Mom, not that my mom was bad or anything, but my mom and dad both worked
and I just really didn't ask her. She told me that she regrets having to have had a sitter.

After a series of sitters, one brief episode in day care when Mandy was 4 years old, led to Mandy being cared for by her Aunt. My mom and dad have both always worked. I remember crying. I did not want to stay there, so they took me out and I stayed with my aunt and I stayed with a private sitter up until I was 12. We had problems before my aunt. I had neighbors [as sitters] and things like that and I wasn't really close to any of them. I can remember them, but I wasn't close to them. There were some sitters, that I felt didn't really care. They were just there. I cannot say to make money--then I didn't know. But they really didn't play with me or anything like that, they just sort of set me in front of the TV and here's your lunch. That was it.

When she [Mom] would leave me with my aunt, it was someone I knew, someone in my family, you know, and I got to see people I already knew. . . . I didn't have to worry about meeting a new person. That aunt was someone to talk to in my family that I didn't have to worry about telling a stranger. When I first started staying with my aunt I was real close to her, I would spend the night or weekend with her.

When I was 12 we moved to where we live now. We got on the bus and we got off the bus at home and during the summers we just stayed by ourselves at home. I didn't really
have any friends--like neighborhoods now where you just go out and play with your friends. I didn't live near any of my friends like that . . . . I did on occasion spend the night with some friends or have those friends spend the night with me, but it wasn't like I could go next door and play with them.

I played a lot with Barbie dolls. That was my big thing. I used to collect them. I did! I spent a fortune in Barbie dolls. It was either me and my brother, or I played by myself with my Barbie dolls. When we got older my mom and dad would play board games with us, Monopoly and things like that. But as far as when I was little, we just sort of played by ourselves. **Mandy and her mother.** When discussing her relationship with her mother Mandy said,

My mom knows everything about me. Every minute, everything I do, my mom knows it. My mom was always 'Mom' for me. My aunt was there. She wouldn't fill in, I was just, I don't know how to put it, she didn't fill in--I still told my mom more than I told my aunt in secrets. If it was about my family or something I had done, it was always my mom.

We're pretty much alike. She tries to work out her problems herself and she is kinda quiet. My Mom's the same way I am about meeting new people. She doesn't--she won't take the initiative. They have to approach her. I'm still like that but I'm kinda coming out of it. I think that I'm a friendly person, I can get along, but I'm not the type of person that can
approach somebody. If they approach me, then that is fine, but I'm not the type of person to go up and talk to a stranger. I guess I'm kinda shy. In a group of people that I don't know, I'm always like, should I go and talk to them or do they not like me? If you don't like me then you don't want to see me. I want to be more outgoing. I want to be able to approach people in the right way and not make them feel like I'm pushing them either. It's going to take some time but, I'm going to try.

Mandy and her father. Mandy described her relationship to her father by contrasting their relationship to that of her and her mother.

I'm much closer to my Mom than I am to my Dad. I would tell my Mom or ask my Mom something before I would ask my Dad. She would always say, go ask your Dad so I would end up asking him anyway. I remember one incident--my mom always told me that when I was born my Dad was always taking me everywhere with him. Everywhere he went. I was his first and I was his daughter and I went everywhere with Dad. And then finally my brother came along and my brother was old enough to go with my Dad--and I can kinda remember it--but mom was telling me--I sort of remember it--that one day he was going to play golf and he was going to take my brother and not me and he left me at home and I was real upset because that was the first time he had ever taken him. Usually it was me that was
going with him. Now it's my brother. And I guess that kind of
had--I remember my Dad--"this is for men." He would say this
is no place for a little girl. I think it was probably just an
excuse.

I can remember being upset when Dad didn't take me.
But then I started doing other things and even now, people tell
me how proud my Dad is of me and everything because I'm the
only one in his family who has ever gone to college and stuff
like that. I know he is proud of me.

Mandy's description of herself.
I guess I do things on my own [so as] not to ask other people to
do things for me. I feel bad--I still do--about asking other
people to do things for me. I don't want them to have to do it.
I'd rather do it on my own if I can. I wanted to live on my
own, too. I moved out and I moved back home in about 6
months. I could do it, but I didn't have any other money and
my Dad was like, come on back home and save your money, so
I went back home. I missed--I guess I missed being at home
with Mom and Dad and I knew I was out on my own, but it was
kinda fun too, thinking that I was all grown up and I could do
this. It was different too knowing that when you got home that
Mom and Dad weren't in the same house, and whereas now
when I go home I know that Mom and Dad are going to be
there if I need something or if something happens. And if I
need to call, then they would be there.
Commentary. Mandy described her relationship to her parents by comparing her relationship with her father and mother. When she needed something she says that she would always go to Mom first even though Mom would defer decisions to her husband forcing Mandy to approach him as well. "I'm much closer to my mother. I would tell her all my little secrets." In contrast, discussion about Dad focused on an early experience in which Dad chose her brother over Mandy to accompany him in playing golf. As the first child Mandy had been the one to go with him, "He took me everywhere." Now instead of taking both children, Mandy was told that she could not go because she was "a little girl." She admitted that it still hurt some, then quickly added, "But he is proud of me because I am the first one in his family to go to college."

Mandy used "closeness" to describe her relationships with her parents as well as other childhood caregivers which included her aunt. She defined "closeness" in relationships by what she revealed to the other person. By virtue of their being family, and therefore familiar, aunts were told more than non-family sitters. The closest aunt would be told "more than I would tell my other aunts." But mother who was closest of all, "knew everything." Ironically, Mandy who claimed to reveal all to her mother and who had lots of aunts to whom she "told things", said of herself, "I guess I just don't want to worry anybody with my problems so I just kind of keep them inside of me and work them out myself." Mandy, the little girl, not wanting to "bother" her mother, never revealed to her mother the discomfort
and disappointment she experienced with sitters whom she did not know and who "didn't really care." Mandy seemed to take comfort in the knowledge that her mother regretted having to have had a sitter for Mandy when she was young. As an adult in formal operations thinking, Mandy could now rationalize her mother's need to work and to leave Mandy with a sitter. The experiences of childhood can be understood by the adult in ways not possible for the child (Main et al., 1985). Mandy appeared unaware of the contradiction between "Mom knowing everything" and their common but individual trait, according to Mandy, of keeping "things to ourselves." For Mandy, closeness was the telling of secrets, with limitations on requests to others and on the sharing of problems.

Mandy described her parents as willing to give her anything she needed, if she only asked for it. Asking for it however, was counter to Mandy's position of being independent or as she put it, "I don't like to ask other people for anything." Even though she felt that her mother did not give her enough time when she was young, she excused her mother because of her mother's need to work. Mandy assumed responsibility for her mother's limited attention by saying that she, Mandy, had not asked her mother for help. The child compensated for her mother's lack of time for her by not asking and thus not expecting a response. Mandy adapted by not asking, and by "figuring it out" for herself.

Mandy's early experiences of being responsible for herself and for her younger brother fostered a sense of independence. Mandy's
brief 6 month stay in an apartment was to prove to herself that she could do it. Once proven she gladly accepted her father's invitation to, "save your money and come back home." Mandy was not apologetic about giving up on her apartment despite her emphasis on doing things for herself. In this incident Dad offered his support and instructed her to move back home. Dad's offer precluded the risk of being rejected by having to ask for help. "I could be out if I wanted to be," but the comfort of living at home in the secure company of her parents outweighed the benefits of continued independent living. Mandy's sense of independence came not entirely from a sense of her own abilities however. She reported, "I'll struggle to do it myself rather than burden anyone else with my problems because I can't be sure they will consider me worthy of their time." It seemed that Mandy's sense of doing for herself was fed by her lack of confidence in other's perception of her as worthy.

Mandy's unwillingness to ask others for help is related to her fear of approaching strangers and to her questioning whether people will like her. As a child being cared for by aunts, Mandy assumed their acceptance of her by virtue of their being family and thus familiar. "In a group of people that I don't know, I'm always like, should I go and talk to them or do they not like me. If you don't like me then you don't want to see me." Mandy presumed that others may reject her and thus she waited for them to initiate interactions. When others did initiate contact Mandy was provided with the affirmation that they considered her worthy of their time. Her
reluctance in initiating social interactions and in asking for help, the
"shyness" modeled by her mother, the early years of doing for
herself, and her father's rejection of his "little girl," suggest an
underlying model of "I'm not worthy". "I'm kinda shy and I worry a
lot, but basically I get along with everybody. While this insecurity
was a present and persistent theme in Mandy's interactions, so too
was her sense of herself as one who gets along with everybody,
including both of her parents currently. As an adult Mandy seemed
confident of her parent's opinion of her as a person of worth. She
enjoyed living with them and said, "If I need something, or if
something happens, if I need to call, then they are there." Early
experiences that prohibited Mandy from being totally secure in her
relationships seem to be moderated by family life that became
increasingly secure as Mandy grew older and was able to understand
her parent's limitations. Though the old patterns persisted Mandy
recognized her own responsibility and ability to make changes, "I
want to be more outgoing. I want to be able to approach people in
the right way. . . . It's going to take some time."

**Eve**

In the interviews Eve talked openly and freely about her
family and her work. She seemed to relish the opportunity to be
listened to. She made frequent reference to herself as a big talker
and talked in great detail with little or no prodding, often going in
directions only vaguely related to the interview questions. Eve
become so absorbed in the telling of her own story that she
completely lost track of the time. Concerned that the interviews not interfere with Eve's scheduled return to work (by her choice the interviews took place over her lunch hour) I accepted the responsibility of telling her when our time was up.

Eve's family moved every four years until they settled in their current location when Eve was in sixth grade. Eve has a brother who is 10 years older, 2 older sisters and 1 younger sister. All of her sibling are unmarried and all live at home except her oldest sister who lives nearby. Her mother works two jobs and her father was retired on disability. Here is Eve's story as told at age 21.

Eve and her mother. Eve was not certain, but believed that her mother began working part time when Eve was 5 or 6 years old. Her mother was, however, always there when Eve and her sisters got home from school. Eve described her relationship with her mother.

I think we have a close relationship. We were in arguments all last week, but I think it's a close relationship. Like on Sunday's she works in the morning and I know she's tired, so I cook dinner for her. I feel like she has done so much for me, so maybe I should try to do something for her. I don't know, I wish we were closer, but I think with her working and me working--most of the time [when] she comes home I'm in bed or babysitting or something like that. But I think we're close. Mama says that if she stays home there's nothing for her to do, so now she has 2 jobs. She feels like she has too much energy
just to stay home because all those years she had all of us in the house and we're gone. Most of the time she is not there.

Eve and her father.

I'm not saying I'm a lot closer, but I am closer to Daddy. For some reason I just feel closer to Daddy. I don't know what it is. He tells me more. Like when we went to get my car two years ago he told me that he felt like of all the kids, I would keep my car the best. I remember him telling me that. It meant a lot to me. I think he told only me that. I don't know, you would think he would be close to my brother, but he's not.

I am just like the Dixon side of the family. Just like my father. I can ignore people when I want to -- mostly stubborn. Dad's whole side of the family is stubborn. My mother keeps asking me to let Bonnie borrow the car. She [Bonnie] doesn't understand the value of keeping up and washing the car. I'm just like, No! [Quoting her mother], "Well, it's just like you to be so stubborn." And I'm like, I'm sorry, but that's my car. She [Mother] says, you're just like you're father, stubborn.

My father is not stubborn in the way that I am, but I'm stubborn and it shows as stubbornness. Mama doesn't see it as two kinds of stubborn. He was like, save enough money and then we'll go to buy you a car. He kept saying, "I'm not going, I'm not going." Mama says he's just so stubborn. He finally gave in because I asked him.
Eve's mother had gone with her to help her choose a car and they needed Dad to go and sign the papers. Dad finally conceded.

Eve continues,

I don't know. I don't know why I feel closer--I think I feel closer to my father because everyone is always telling me I'm pure Dixon--I look just like his sister. I act just like my grandmother, I'm stubborn and all this other stuff. I think that is why I am close to my father. I know I'm stubborn. It's like, okay. I've been told that I always acted like him. I don't know if that just set in. I don't know. I would say he is closer to me. He is there every day when I come home from break, and he is there when I get home from work.

Eve and her siblings. When Eve was 4-years-old her youngest sister was born and Eve started kindergarten a month later. "She ruined it for me" she says, laughing.

There has always been this little rivalry, you know--I can't get it out--between me and her. When we were little and we'd get into a fight and she would hit me and it hurt and I'd go to hit her back and my mother would say, she is too little, you can't hit her back. Now that we're older she [the mother] thinks I should be more mature since I'm older. She [Eve's sister] is planning on going to the beach and my mother would never have let me go to the beach at 16-years-old with my friends. You kind of like resent that a little--I can't say a lot.
In contrast Eve described her oldest sister who is 4 years older, as the one who looked out for her when she was young. She made sure I was in the place where I was supposed to be, you know. I'm not going to say second Mom, but it was always Sharon. I thought Sharon was so much older than me that I had to listen to her, you know. She was so much older. And then Laura was only 2 years older and it was always me and Laura running around together. Then I kinda had to listen to Sharon.

All of us are living at home except Sharon and she has an apartment nearby, but it's as if she is at home. I can see now that both of my older sisters are my best friends. I can do anything with them. I can tell them anything. I knew we had to grow up for that to happen. I hope that will happen with Bonnie [the 16-year-old sister], and Mom will get out of that stage of working two jobs and we'll be close. Like we're going on vacation in May and it's just me and my older two sisters and my cousin. We go every place together. I don't know, it makes me feel better because you know you can trust them, and if you come up short, they're going to be there. My mother likes it because if we are all together. How much trouble can we get into? We do, [laughing] but you know, it makes her feel good. We know we have each other to watch each other.

Of the siblings still at home Eve believes that they are all closer to her mother than to her father. "I know Bonnie is closer to my
Mom. Laura is closer--Laura at first was closer to my Dad until she started getting older, she started getting closer with Mom. My brother is closer to my Mom. My mother treats him like a baby--the first born, only boy baby." Within her family Eve experiences a wide range of relationships. Eve's perceptions of her siblings relationships to her parents are a point of comparison for Eve's own experiences with her parents.

**Family interactions.** Eve felt that she was loved by her parents and gave as evidence:

Mom and Daddy never really did anything but they'd surprise us and take us to the zoo or shopping or just sit there and play with us or I remember one time Mom was teaching us how to sew on the sewing machine. Just little things. Not really big things, just little things. You know, not getting yelled at, not always getting in trouble.

Eve says of her parents, "we got off easy for some of the things we did." Then retracts,

With Dad we never did. With Mom, there were three of us. Getting grounded for some of the things we did was pretty easy. Daddy spanked us. Daddy was harsh, but his mom was that way. His father died when he was 13 and so, of course, his Mom had to be more strict on him. He probably had to take on more of a father role for his brothers and sisters. He could just give you a look and you'd stop because you knew not even to ask. I guess it was just the way they -- it wasn't harsh, it
wasn't like child abuse or anything like that, but we knew if we did something wrong and not to do it again!

Commentary. Throughout her interviews Eve qualified many of her statements with "I don't know," "I wouldn't say . . ." and "I think . . . ." Eve "thinks" that she is closer to her father than to her mother but is not really sure. These phrases are characteristic of Eve's discussions in general but were even more prominent when she described her relationships with her parents than when she described her relationships with her older sisters. Gilligan (1990) describes the use of "I don't know" in interviews with young women as indicative of an unwillingness to trust their own judgment and their own knowing. This phenomenon was found to increase steadily throughout the adolescent years before abating in adulthood. For Eve at age twenty-one confidence in her own knowing was lacking.

Four related and interacting factors seem to support Eve's perception of her parental relationships: time spent in their presence, her likeness to her father as perceived by her mother, her relationship to them as compared to her sibling's parent-child relationships and her rival relationship with her younger sister. Her perception of being "closer" to father seemed to be a comparison of her relative closeness to her mother rather than an actual sense of true "closeness" to father.

Eve's perceived relationships with her parents were partially explained by the amount of contact she had with each of them. Eve said of her mother who worked two jobs, "most of the time she is not
there." Eve viewed her mother's absence as contributing to their lack of closeness, "if Mom will get out of that stage of working two jobs, we'll be close." She perceived their relationship to be not as close as was her relationship with Dad with whom she had contact several times daily. "He is there when I come home at break and he is there everyday when I get home from work."

Also contributing to her sense of closeness was her identity with her father which was rooted in her temperamental and physical likeness to him and the Dixon or paternal side of the family. "I don't know why I feel closer--I think I feel closer to my father because everyone is always telling me I'm pure Dixon." Mother, especially reminded Eve of being like her Dad. When Eve refused to let her younger sister borrow her car, mother accused, 'You're just like your father, stubborn." Eve accepted the assessment, "It's like, okay. I've been told that I always acted like him," and then offered as an explanation of their relationship, "I think that is why I am closer to my father." She was like him, therefore they must be close. Being reminded by mother that she was like father in his negative qualities further suggests Eve's sense of separateness from her mother.

Eve related a single incidence which took place two years earlier as evidence of her father being "close" to her. "He told me that of all the children he thought that I would keep my car the best. I think he told only me that." Eve thinks he is closer to her than to the other children, but can not say so with assurance. Mother was the one who advocated for Eve to be allowed to get a car. Eve said,
"He was like, save enough money and then we'll go. . . . He kept saying, I'm not going, I'm not going. Mama says he's just so stubborn. He finally gave in because I asked him." Eve noted her own success in eventually getting Dad's consent after her mother's efforts had failed.

References to the tension and rivalry between Eve and her younger sister were frequent as Eve discussed her family. As a child, Eve's mother's admonitions seemed to support her sister, "You can't hit her, she's too little," and now that Eve was an adult, Mother admonished that Eve should respond more maturely since she was 4 years older than Bonnie. Eve said that she resented the privileges her younger sister had compared to what she was permitted to do at the same age. "You kind of resent that a little, I can't say a lot." Of their rivalry now Eve reported, "And I think it has gotten better. We do get into arguments, but it's more jokingly." According to Eve, Mom no longer has to deal with it much since she now has two jobs and is seldom home. When mother was not there, the original source of the rivalry was removed and the two argued, but more jokingly. Evidently mother was the arbitrator in the sibling disputes.

Though uncertain and unsatisfied with her relationship with her mother, Eve seemed confident of her "closeness" with her older sisters. She described her oldest sister as the one who looked out for her as a child and continued to do so now as her best friend. "I can do anything with them [her older sisters]. I can tell them anything. We go every place together." Her relationships with these two sisters
offered her a sense of closeness and security that seemed to be lacking in Eve's relationship with her parents. From Eve's perspective the other two siblings, her brother, the oldest, and her youngest sister, received preferential treatment from mother. Of her brother, she says, "My mother treats him like a baby," and Eve accuses her mother of giving her younger sister privileges she did not have at the same age. The oldest child and especially the youngest accentuate Eve's distance from her mother. Her siblings were close to Mom. Eve was not as close as her siblings were to Mom nor was she as close to Mom as she would like to have been. By comparing her sibling's relationships with Mother, to her own relationship with Mother, Eve's represented distance, not closeness.

Eve said that she knew her parents loved her and her siblings "when they did little things with us" and "when they didn't always yell at us." Not being yelled at by parents who were admittedly stern, provided relief. For Eve the parent who was "harsh" was the parent with whom she identified. Eve was struggling to find her place within her family. Adults who feel insecure in their relationships with their parents continue to do things to try to please them (Main et al., 1985). Eve prepared dinner for mother though her sisters who supposedly enjoyed a more favored status with mother refused to help.

As a 21 year-old Eve had not established intimate relationships with persons outside of her family. Neither parent represented for her a secure and clear haven; only her older sisters appeared to
provide relationships in which she could trust, "you know you can trust them and if you come up short, you know they will be there." Though she attended middle school, high school, and college in the same community her best friends were her sisters. The secure base provided in relationship to the primary caregiver encouraged growing independence and the development of relationships with persons outside the family (Hartup, 1989). The absence of such a base had restricted Eve's exploration of relationships to those of her family.

Eve was dependent on her family for shelter as well as for meeting her social and emotional needs. She gave as evidence of her family's caring for her, as their willingness to listen to her "talk about nothing." Throughout the interviews Eve talked readily, often straying from the topic and the interview questions. Her discussion seemed propelled from a deep need to be heard.

Eve's family provided a variety of relationship models. Her older sisters seemed to serve as buffers to Eve's less than secure mother-daughter relationship while the younger sister played the role of antagonist in that same relationship. With her older sisters she felt secure. With her youngest sister and older brother there was resentment and jealousy that seemed to coalesce around her mother. With her mother and younger sister there was frequent conflict often involving all three of them. With her father there was constancy, but with little affect or intimacy. Eve expressed trust in her older sisters, but in the most significant relationship of all, that
with her mother, the primary caregiver, she was unsatisfied and insecure. In a rather plaintive voice Eve says of her mother, "I wish we were closer." At an age when intimate relationships with peers and others outside the family have usually been developed and are being maintained (Hartup, 1986) Eve's attention was on the family and her concern for her mother who was "never there."

**The Teachers' Relationships with Their Parents: A Comparison of Themes**

Attachment theory provided the framework for the interpretation of these teachers' experiences with their parents from early childhood to the present. Specifically Bowlby's internal working model is the thread that ties one's earliest model for relationships to later development of those same relationships and to subsequent ones (1980). The work of Gilligan and colleagues provide evidence of the strength of the early mother-child relationship to assist or impede the daughters later development of relationships (Gilligan, Lyons & Hanmer, 1990). The desire for security in the primary caregiver relationship does not end at toddlerhood or at the onset of puberty but is evident across the life span (Weiss, 1986). Young women with ambivalent or insecure attachments with their mothers continued to seek ways to maintain and improve their relationships (Saltzman, 1990). Similarly, parents of insecure children were found to be "preoccupied with dependency on their own parents and continued actively in attempts to please them" (Main et al., 1985, p. 91). Attachment behaviors that once had a vital
role in maintaining the relationship may have lost their actual usefulness but may be maintained unconsciously as part of a well-established mental model (Main et al., 1985).

**Proximity and presence.** Both Mandy and Eve had attended the local university while continuing to lived with their parents during the period. Except for Mandy's brief six-month experiment in her own apartment, neither had established permanent living arrangements independent of their families. Mandy described the security she felt having her parents in the same house, "I know that Mom and Dad are going to be there if I need something or if something happens." Eve's parents and siblings also contribute to her sense of security. Eve described her relationships with both parents in very specific concrete terms of their absolute physical presence with her. Her father was "always there" and her mother was "never there." Mandy and Eve were both dependent on their parents emotionally and socially and to a lesser degree, financially. As young adults, close proximity and availability to their primary caregivers was still desirable and perhaps even necessary to their being secure. In toddlerhood, independent exploration away from the attachment figure is one indication of security in the caregiver-child relationship (Ainsworth, 1978). Was Mandy's and Eve's concern with maintaining proximity to their parents indicative of an unconscious mental model in which physical separation still threatened the security of their relationships? In interviewing adolescent women concerning their relationships with their mothers,
Rich (1990) found mother's "being there" was a commonly held value related to closeness. Young women who perceived mother as "being there" were appreciative of their independence and were freer in exploring their identities as different from mother.

Secure adolescents can put energy into new attachments without fear of threatening their relationship with the primary caregiver (Saltzman, 1990). Neither Eve nor Mandy had successfully established primary attachments beyond their families. For Eve especially, her concern was still how to establish a secure relationship with her mother. Eve's older sisters were the ones she could "tell anything" to and were the ones that she could trust. According to Salzman insecure women work harder and give more thought to the mother-child relationship because of its relevance to them. They have not given up hope (Saltzman, 1990). Speaking of her mother, Eve said, "I wish we were closer." Mandy in contrast described her mother as being very close, the one to whom she could tell all. Mandy's "telling all" to her mother was similar to Eve's "telling all" to her sisters, but for Eve even two sisters could not replace a mother who was perceived to be "never there." The quality of a relationship is dependent in part on the number and quality of interactions Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986). For these young women, frequency and availability of contact as well as openness of communication were highly valued in their relationships with their mothers.
Identity with parent. Closeness to a parent for these two young women corresponded to their sense of identity with that parent. Mandy said that she was much closer to her mother than to her father. Of her mother she said, "We're pretty much alike." According to Mandy both of them were shy and do not like meeting new people. Mandy did not relate their similarity of behavior to their being close as does Eve with her father. Eve was told by her mother and others that she is like her father and his family both in appearance and in behavior. Eve guessed that she was like him "because everyone was always telling me that I am pure Dixon. . . . I don't know if that just set in." While attributing their closeness to their stubbornness on one hand, Eve also denied that they were alike, "My father is not stubborn in the way that I am. I'm stubborn and it shows as stubbornness. Mama doesn't see it as two kinds of stubbornness." Eve attempted to distinguish her own behavior from that of her father's but "Mama" refused to see them as different. Mandy made the identification of her own and her mother's common behavior and appears accepting of it. Eve however was likened to her father by others, especially by her mother. On one hand Eve attributed the "closeness" her relationship with her father to their being alike, but on the other hand, she explained that their common behavior was actually different, only mother saw it as the same. Eve's ambiguity was understandable if to her, being like someone was equated with closeness. In being like father, Eve cannot be like her mother, and can therefore not be close to her. What was not
directly expressed, but could be inferred from Eve's story was an atmosphere of underlying marital tension in which Eve, as the child who was most like father, was the target of her mother's displaced anger. Eve's telling of her story was consistent with the findings of (Main et al, 1985) who also found that insecure adults had difficulty speaking coherently about attachment relationships.

Not only did Mandy identify with the same sex parent, but she also identified with the parent who was her primary caregiver. Eve's ambiguous identity was with her father which was assigned to her by her mother, her primary caregiver, the parent to whom she most wanted to be close to. Though both women claimed to identify with and be closer to one parent than the other, the significant difference was the degree of security and satisfaction each experienced with that "closer" parent. Eve's closeness to her father was by default rather than characteristic of their interactions. Eve could recall only one interaction with her father as evidence of their closeness. Her conversation with her father that had occurred two years earlier, regarding the purchase of her car, was an attempt to make tangible, this "closeness" to her father. Her ambivalent "closeness" with father did not compensate for the closeness that she did not have with her mother. Mandy however seemed satisfied with her current relationships with both parents. Though not close in the telling of secrets to her father, she did have the assurance of his having told her to come back home when the experiment of living on her own meant barely getting by. She recalled his early rejection of her in
favor of her brother, but later focused on the knowledge that he was proud of her attendance at college, an accomplishment her brother did not achieve.

The internal working model though believed to be influential throughout the lifetime is not immutable (Bowlby, 1973). Cognition in formal operations provides the ability to consider the relationship metacognitively and the potential to make changes based on new understandings not possible in childhood. However since the internal working model guides behavior in primarily an unconscious way (Main et al., 1985) cognitive development does not necessitate changes in the model, it only makes change possible. Mandy reflected that her mother did not want to leave her as a child and regretted having had to do so. As a child, mother's motives and perspective provided little consolation, but as an adult Mandy could understand her mother's behavior and to some extent recognize how it had influenced her own behavior as well.

Mandy and Eve both experienced conflicts with a parent when a younger sibling arrived. Eve's conflict experienced early on with her sister has continued into adulthood whereas Mandy's conflict with her father over her brother seemed to have been ameliorated over time and by her close relationship with mother. The circumstances of these two women cannot be equated but are perhaps analogous to their different ways of responding to conflicts in relationship. For Eve, her relationship with her younger sister would hopefully get better when her "sister grew up". Her
relationship with her mother would improve when her mother gets over her phase of "working two jobs. In each case Eve saw the possibilities for change as lying outside herself. Mandy discussed her failure to initiate social interactions as behavior which she would need to change and which in fact she had already begun to make progress. She credited her jobs and other experiences with supporting her desire to change, but ultimately she saw change as residing within herself.

Mandy and Eve both had working models for relationships that indicate some anxiousness and insecurity. Both were remaining close to their families and were maintaining those relationships perhaps at the expense of developing intimate peer and non-family relationships. Of the two women, Mandy was more conscious of her own behavior evidenced by her desire and belief that she could make changes. Eve's internal working model showed considerable consistency from early childhood to the present. It was consistent with the premise that "previous relationships exert their influence through the attitudes, expectations, and understanding of the roles that they leave with the individual" (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986, p. 53).

The Children's Family Relationship Histories

This second section of the results focuses on the parent-child relationship history of each of the four children. Individual interviews with each of the parents and observations of the children and their parents in their homes provided the material for the children's stories. The interviews with the parents extended from
their experiences of growing up in their own families to their current relationships with their parents and their ongoing relationship with their child. This portion of the study was focused on the dyadic relationships of mother and child, and father and child. Each of the four young children's relationships with their mother and their father will be examined.

The children, selected on the basis of their behavioral differences in the classroom, did in fact, share many common family characteristics. For three of the four parent couples had been married over ten years and gave birth only after many years of trying to conceive. Two of these mothers described their children being "miracles". The third mother and her spouse finally opted for adoption and were the only couple planning to have more than one child. The fourth couple had been married six years and were in their late twenties and had waited only two years between planning for a child and giving birth. All but one of the eight parents had siblings and grew up in a two-parent family.

Each of the families lived in a single family house in a modest suburban neighborhood. All eight of the parents either worked full time or maintained a full time schedule of work and school and had education beyond high school. All of the couples shared some responsibility for the primary care of their child including bringing or picking up their child at the day care, however all couples concurred that mother, rather than father, was the caregiver preferred by the child in times of stress. All families maintained
regular contact with the maternal and paternal grandparents and lived within several hours driving distance of them.

Lilly and Her Family

After ten unsuccessful years of trying to conceive a child, Mr. and Mrs. Lyles adopted Lilly at age six months. Lilly, a small but sturdy child with a ready smile for everyone was of Peruvian descent. The Lyles credited Lilly with having brought them immeasurable happiness. Their concern was that they would be able to support her innate traits and not unwittingly interfere with her growth through inappropriate parenting. Mrs. Lyle said, "We think we're a good crew and well matched. We have a lot of things in common and she and Larry--she's going to be a type A just like Larry, and a bit of a perfectionist. She's got his great sense of humor for a kid."

Mrs. Lyle's early family.

My father was a teacher. He did all the cooking, which is kind of a neat role model. I always thought--it was kind of natural for my father to be there in the afternoon after school. As I recall he was there most summers, especially when we were younger. He taught me how to read and just a lot of things. I remember how he always loved to talk to me. One summer he built a fence and I was his nail-hammerer. My early childhood was very normal carefree and happy. I liked school and got along well in school.
My mother started work when I was in first grade. When I was about sixteen my mother went--she has a problem with alcohol and it was a major trauma in my life and you could not pick worse years--it was really bad timing. . . . I was heavily involved in school, cheerleader, basketball and that kind of thing--getting out of the house and partly to work off frustration.

When I was eighteen I turned to outsiders. I moved out and my mother quit drinking the day after I moved out and she quit for ten years and then has had several relapses, but minor. She's done very well. She is extremely strong willed. A couple of years after I moved out I did some reading on alcoholism and understood a little more what she's gone through and I quit blaming her for it.

Their relationship has changed and reflects their current respect and admiration for each other. "We see them [referring to her parents who live about 120 miles away] about ten times a year. We usually stay with them when we go there. We talk on the telephone too. They feel like Larry [her husband] is as much a son as their two. It sure makes it nice."

Lilly and her mother. The youngest of four siblings Mrs. Lyle said that she was not accustomed to being around small children. "There weren't that many cousins--so I didn't baby sit. I was never around children that much." She described the initial experience of adopting Lilly as being rather frightening.
I was overwhelmed and in awe of her. She had been in airports or airplanes for over a day and she got off and she was -- we have her on video -- she was cooing and laughing and touching and all those things, just like, the way she is right now. I was concerned at first that people would wonder what this Caucasian women was doing with this brown-skinned child. But people were so good about it. They would say things like "nothing like Mommy," when Lilly would lay her head on my shoulder. I guess we looked very natural. Larry and she were like immediately--and I don't know, it took me a little while until I felt really comfortable with this baby. I was proud of her and the bonding took me a little while.

Mrs. Lyle spent six weeks at home with Lilly before going back to work. Leaving her for the first time was very difficult for both of them.

We had some bad separations -- she didn't like that at first. Probably something I would do differently with my next child is to introduce that baby sitter now and then. It's just such a horrible feeling and we felt maybe it was tied to her coming over and just beginning to feel comfortable. But once she got used to the sitter, she had a good time.

The sitters decision to stop keeping children resulted in Lilly's placement in a day care center at 1 year old. "Her first caregiver [at the day care] was really, really good. If you could clone someone to watch your child she would be it." However staff turnover meant
still another change. "The new teacher was inexperienced and Lilly just wasn't getting the attention that she needed so we moved Lilly to Happy Endings. When that center closed she started at Good Beginnings Day Care.

Picking her up around 3:30 each afternoon Mrs. Lyle worked only 32 hour a week for the express purpose of being able to spend time with Lilly. When Mrs. Lyle came to the day care center Lilly ran to her and they embraced. After telling her mother about what she had done, Lilly gathered up her things while her mother chatted with the teachers. Morning separations were usually fairly easy but during one observation Lilly ran to her Mother after she had said good bye and clung to her. Mandy said, "We're going to have fun today, I promise." Lilly seemed reassured and let go of her mother and her mother left promptly. Lilly stood by the teacher for few minutes and soon went off to join her peers. This episode occurred the day after Mrs. Lyle had returned from being out of town for two nights.

According to Mrs. Lyle she was the one Lilly came to when she was not feeling well or was tired. Mrs. Lyle felt that she was closer to Lilly than Lilly was to her father by virtue of spending more time with her. Mrs. Lyle encouraged Lilly to be independent and to do for herself when she could rather than relying on someone else. Reflecting on her own early experiences she described what she had learned from that experience and how she perceived it to be influencing her own parenting with Lilly.
I think I had some definite ideas of what I would not do to my child as far as being alcoholic and they [her parents] were never into abuse, it was more just neglect at times. Some of my over attention to her or my incessant one-on-one with her would almost be--trying to make up for what happened to me. She is doing really well with trying to entertain herself. I'm trying to wean myself away from her in a way--I don't think its really healthy for her to have to be entertained by me.

Mrs. Lyle added, "I have a tendency to be too lenient with Lilly." Mrs. Lyle compared how Lilly approached her as compared to how Lilly approached her husband. "When I'm out of town, she will go to bed for Larry just fine, but if we are both there she prefers me, sometimes she will even tell him good night as if to dismiss him so that I will have to tuck her in."

Mr. Lyle's early family. Mr. Lyle said that his mother was the one that he went to when he needed something as a child. Mr. Lyle was three and a half when the next younger sibling was born.

I think I was the apple of her eye and she spent a lot of time with me until the next one was born. After that it was catch as catch can. I probably didn't notice it as a child that my mother was really into taking care of children and providing for physical needs and that she didn't relate well to adults. My Dad died ten years ago and now my mother talks about selling her town house and coming to live with us temporarily, until she decides what she wants to do and where she wants to
be. I guess she sees us as stable, but I think she takes us for granted. You can't change somebody, especially when they are sixty-something years of age.

Both of us [referring to himself and his wife] have been put upon by trauma at some point in time and have withdrawn at times, probably. I know from childhood that when my dad had a drink -- he was an alcoholic -- I think it marked each of us in its own special way. Fortunately I was the oldest. I may have gotten beyond a lot of it. Some of the other ones didn't.

Mr. Lyle describes relationships with two of his siblings. He and the next child, his brother are close in age and share a close relationship because they have a lot of common experiences including choosing the same college and same career. However a younger sister was viewed as being even closer because "we get into a lot of the same things and share the same point of view. "She's the closest one. When you talk or see each other, you gush. We've got so much in common."

**Lilly and her father.**

I can't conceive of a relationship with a child that would be any better. I know she's -- I could use all kinds of descriptive adjectives to tell you what I think she is. She is happy, warm, and that's what we don't want to mess up. She's bright, possibly brilliant -- who knows? She is very friendly. In fact sometimes in shopping malls you have to say, "Now Lilly you just don't go up and grab someone by the pants leg. Not
everybody likes that." I think I would rather have her that way than to be afraid. When you trust and think positive, good things will happen.

We've wanted children for a long time -- We were together so long. It's [having Lilly] forced us to adapt, to change. Now more of your time is spent with the child than with each other. It's something that we've talked about lately that, "hey, we need to think about each other too." It's a big, big world. How much time do you commit to your job and how much do you put into your personal life and how much into your family life? I mean you've got those three areas, that are probably key and there are no right and wrong answers. It's like a constant tuning because what supports the weight and balance now, next week will be totally different. The answer to, I'll spend this much time with --. There is no such thing. I get upset with myself because I don't spend enough time with her, but when I hear statistics on fathers and their offspring, I spend a lot more time than most.

I think you have to balance how much you control verses letting them do their own thing. That's probably the hardest thing to do. I'm still learning. Sometimes I'm probably impatient, because when you know somebody's capable of behaving a certain way, you get frustrated when they don't act that way. She's only like, what 42 months old? She's just reacting to us. How far can I push it? It is frustrating and you
can get up in the morning and say why the hell do I have to go through this mess at 41. But, it's a challenge and you've got to learn to deal with it. You're growing too, as much as she is. Linda [Mrs. Lyle] will let things go until you have to do something. I go, you do it my way. So I'm more the one to who will discipline right of way, than cut slack. Linda will cut slack and then try to discipline (laughing). I've always been the one to get things out right away and Linda would rather hold up inside. [pause] It's working, there's probably a counterbalance there. I need to be a little more relaxed and a little more patient and Linda needs to work on picking up on things right away and not let them get out of control.

The Lyles at home. Lilly opened the door and welcomed me. "Come in. Take your shoes off." Mrs. Lyle interjected, "She doesn't have to take her shoes off." Lilly added, "May I take your coat?" Lilly allowed her mother to hang my coat but insisted on putting it on the hanger herself. Mrs. Lyle explained that Lilly did not like to wear shoes and assumed that others didn't also. "Sit in the sofa," Lilly said, directing me to it, "It's real soft." The Lyles exchanged amused glances at Lilly's accommodations. Lilly then invited me to see her room. Mother said that she thought that Lilly was seeing me as a baby sitter and thus her excitement about showing me her room. Both parents assisted Lilly in showing me around, allowing her to take the lead after I assured Mr. Lyle that this activity was indeed appropriate for my purposes. After the bedroom we followed her to
her "kitchen" in lower level family room. Once there she offered to make her parents and me some "coffee." Lilly asked her mother to go get some water for her. Mrs. Lyle reminded Lilly that she was capable of doing it for herself. After the second request, she matter-of-factly stated to Lilly that if she wanted it badly enough she could get it for herself. While Lilly continued to play contentedly in her "kitchen" at the other end of the room, the Lyle's and I engaged in general conversation about her adoption. Lilly then rejoined us, providing us with "coffee" made with water that she had indeed gotten for herself.

A plastic bat and a knotted-up sock were lying on the floor in the family room. Mr. Lyle had improvised when he discovered that a regular ball was too fast for Lilly. He commented that he thought that he had not been able to do at age three what he observed her being able to do (i.e. drawing faces with features, etc.). Mr. Lyle and Lilly rough housed on the floor with Lily giggling in delight. He reported that they also enjoy reading and watching TV together with him holding her in his lap. Toward the end of the visit approaching Lilly's bedtime, Lilly climbed up on the arm of the sofa beside her mother and leaned her head on her mother's shoulders. Mrs. Lyle responded by putting her arm around Lilly.

Commentary: Several of the most striking characteristics of Lilly's family was her parent's ease and coherence in discussing their past, the openness of their communication with one another, and their practice of self-reflection. Mrs. Lyle noted her limited
experience with small children prior to becoming a parent, perhaps as an explanation for the time it took her to feel comfortable with her adopted daughter in contrast to Mr. Lyle who was immediately comfortable with his new daughter. Both of the Lyles experienced living with an alcoholic parent of the same gender as themselves. Mrs. Lyle expressed the experience as a trauma in her teenage years but indicated that she had developed some personal understanding of her mother's problem and recognized her mother's positive support of her now. Being the oldest of seven children, Mr. Lyle seemed to feel less directly encumbered by his father's alcoholism than the problem experienced by some of his younger siblings. The Lyles individually talked of their parents' alcoholism and seemed to have a sense of how they had been affected, yet seemed confident that their own lives would not be dominated by that part of their past. Mr. Lyle's relationship with his mother was "frustrating," but he had developed close and supportive relationships with two of his siblings as well as having been "adopted" by his wife's parents.

The other area that stands out was their sensitivity to their daughter and the consideration that they have given their parenting roles. In both individual interviews frequent references were made to their partner corroborating what each had said about the other and evidencing considerable prior dialogue. The Lyles amiably shared the role of parenthood and reflected that each had a somewhat different approach to Lilly than did their partner. Each acknowledged ways that they could improve their parenting.
Since joining her adopted mother and father, Lilly had been cared for by over five different secondary caregivers in less than three years. Mr. Lyle commented on one of the changes, "That disturbed us because we were concerned about continuity and the change on her, new friends, new teachers. . . ." He continued, "I think that we'd know if something were affecting her progress. I think I'm pretty tuned in to how she feels, but if we noticed she had a problem, we'd have to rethink things. We'd have to find out what's causing it and change something in the school." Despite the "traumas" in the parents' own lives as children, and the disruptions in Lilly's caregiving, this family as a group and as individuals maintained an optimistic confidence evidencing the security that they each felt with one another. Lilly's outgoing and positive nature had been nurtured by the Lyles through their own conscious awareness of what was required of them as parents. Lilly eagerly welcomed me to her home but was equally comfortable playing alone while the adults talked. Mr. Lyle's philosophy seemed to summarize their relationships. "When you trust and you're positive like that, good things will happen."

Abby and Her Family

Abby and her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ames, shared a well-kept, modest suburban house but were selling it in preparation for moving into a condominium. Mrs. Ames explained the move as necessary to get Abby into a better school. Separately, Dad who was attending school as part of a major career change, explained that they were
moving because he no longer had time for the outdoor maintenance required by a house. Abby bore a strong resemblance to her father, sharing his slender build and fair complexion and light eyes. Mrs. Ames dark hair and eyes contrasted with her husband and child. Her rapid and expressive manner of speaking contrasted with her husband's and child's more subdued voices and slower paced speech. Abby had just turned 4 years old. Her parents were in their early forties.

Mrs. Ames' early family. Abby's mother described her own childhood as marked by constant fighting between her parents. Their big thing was when they were having one of their spats was that if we, as children got involved in it--because its very upsetting to a child when their parents fight, especially if father packs his bags which he did several times--and he was also good at threatening his life with a gun and I took the gun away from him several times--but their big thing was, this is none of your business. Well, I'm sorry, I disagree. When a child is in the house with parents who fight, then the parents make it their business.

She contrasted her own marriage relationship.

The other night I was tired and Al was tired and Abby was not being cooperative. We had words and he walked off but in five minutes he was back apologizing and we hugged and made up. Of course my parents have been married for 40-50 years or something like that, so obviously it wasn't real
serious or they learned to cope with each other. I think that has affected me and I don’t want her to go through that. I think she [Abby] has so much going for her.

I mean they were both wonderful parents, but they had this--Dad especially, and he's still like that, he's in his seventies and he is one of these people who grew up on his emotions and not ever thinking logically. He's so smart and he's wasted so much and it's sad. I think the reason I always went to my mother is because she was more firm--Dad's real square. Mom was always full of fun and teasing--and she could get angry and she could say some hurtful things--and she tried that until I had Abby. I remember one time when I was at home and Abby was misbehaving at the dinner table and she said, "What's wrong with that kid?" And I got furious and the next time I went down there I stayed with my brother instead of with my parents and its the first time I've ever done that. You'd be surprised how nice my mother is to me since then.

**Abby and her mother.** At the day care, Abby ran up to her mother and gave her a hug around the knees. Mother exclaimed that she was glad to see Abby. When I introduced myself and my purpose for being at the day care center, Mrs. Ames immediately exclaimed, "We think she's real special, don't we Abby? She's going to Harvard or Yale, aren't you?" to which Abby just smiled. When Abby was born Mrs. Ames spent six weeks at home with her before putting her in Good Beginnings Day Care.
That was the hardest thing I ever did. I cried. That has been the nice thing about Al taking her this year. There were days last year when she would cling to me and I would leave crying. For a 3-year-old that was normal and it would get to me because I didn't want to go to school. I would cry and I would pray, and I still pray that somehow God will see fit to let me stay home with her next year before she goes to school. For her age now, its not normal and I know it's an act. I always thought that when the time came to have a child that financially I would be able to stay home.

I think if I were home with her now I would probably be a better mother than I would have been when I first had her because I would know what it is like not to be able to be at home with her. I think that people who don't have babies don't know what it is like to go through years and years and think that you'll never ever be a mother and you want one so badly that every month you just cry. I can't explain the way that I felt the whole time that I was pregnant. I was the happiest I'd ever been until I had her.

Realizing what she had said she quickly added, "Now there are all kinds of happy times. But before that, my years were empty compared to the last five."

Mrs. Ames described some of the less than happy times of parenting Abby.
Sometimes if the outside world has come in and put a lot of pressure on me and if she is putting pressure on me too, then I get a spasm in my back. It started when I was nursing [her] and I still get it. It's stress and being the kind of person who would rather hold back than to express it. You know, like you're in the middle of trying to get the house straight and I'm putting all these things in the right places and Abby is pulling them out. Oh Abby, you can't do that! you've got to keep things put away! And she's going, why? . . . and you feel guilty and it starts hurting.

I'm a big disciplinarian because I know how children have to act in school to be successful. Being a teacher I know that if she does not go down the middle of the road and act the way she's supposed to act, that she will be disciplined and some of the teachers actually see that instead of seeing an intelligent, neat little kid -- see them as a horror and I don't want her to go through that. I think she has a lot of special traits and I hope that everybody else will see the same too. She's just so intelligent in terms of her memory and she picks up things that I would never know that she would pick up.

Mrs. Ames continues, enumerating examples of Abby's memory, her ability to sing on key and her ability to recognize letters of the alphabet. "And I'm not pushing that because she has another year before she starts kindergarten. I don't think that she
needs to be pushed. I think she's going to get it pretty much without pushing her."

I try to teach her that it's not what she says to me that's going to make me angry; it might be the way she says it. As long as -- if she doesn't like something, that's fine, but she has to say it with a certain amount of respect otherwise Mom's going to get angry over it. I can handle anything she says to me as long as she says it with love and respect. She can get accusative at times, "you do this!" Or the big thing lately, if you grab hold of her arm and pull her away from something or if you ask her and she doesn't do it and you pull her away, that she falls down on the floor and says, "you pushed me!" The big accusative statement, "YOU did this." That's her big thing lately. She's a fun kid, she really is.

Mrs. Ames has a friend with whom she meets weekly. "If I need her, I call her and if she needs me, she will call me." She described her friend's daughter as being her image of what she would like Abby to be when she gets older. "I taught her daughter and she is absolutely wonderful--real responsible, intelligent, really talented. I want Abby to be just like that, to be able to brush a way all the junk that teenagers get involved in or, you know, petty things that they talk about."

When I visited the Ames at their home, Mrs. Ames and Abby greeted me at the door and Abby reached up to give me a hug. Mrs. Ames told me that Abby was very excited that I was coming. Abby
led me to the family room in the lower level where we joined Mr. Ames. Abby invited me to play in her play room, to paint at her easel, to play with her race car set, to build with her construction set, and to watch her riding her wooden horse all in rapid succession. Mrs. Ames made comments while Mr. Ames stood by with an admiring smile. When Mrs. Ames spied Abby's silk flower headband lying on the play room floor, she demanded, "Where did I tell you this belongs?" Abby tucked her chin and softly responded, "Off the floor." Abby picked it up and laid it aside as her Mother began relating the story of Abby's flower girl performance, "I was singing and couldn't see her but they said she walked down the isle picking up one petal at a time and dropping it on the floor." She laughed heartily at recalling the event and described Abby's dress, how cute she looked and how proud Abby had made her.

Toward the end of my visit Abby picked up a tutu and a "magic" wand. Mrs. Ames suggested that they play Cinderella, assigning herself the role of the wicked stepmother. Abby as Cinderella responded immediately to the demands bellowed out by the wicked stepmother, "Sweep the hearth! Now get me some hot tea! No, Take this away! I said HOT tea! And bring me some sugar!" Abby meekly ran back and forth between the playroom and the adjoining family room where her mother was seated at the end opposite the play room. Mrs. Ames explained, "She is going to be what I couldn't. I can sing pretty good, and I can move, but I never had dance lessons." When I announced that it was time for me to
leave, Abby pouted in protest. Mother told her to give me a hug and I assured Abby that I would see her in a few more days at the day care center.

Mrs. Ames accompanied me upstairs to the door where she interrupted the farewell to ask me who I could recommend to test Abby's intelligence. She went on to give evidence of Abby's exceptional qualities saying that she really wanted to know whether Abby was "gifted and talented." Mrs. Ames also shared again that she had plans for Abby's college career which included Harvard or Yale.

At the day care center, I asked Abby to draw a picture of her family. She drew three figures beginning with the largest as Daddy, next in size, Mommy and the smallest she labeled herself. "I'm giving Daddy a big smile. Mommy gets a frown," and she drew a large turned down mouth. Without commenting she drew a rather flat line expression for herself. When I asked why Mommy was angry, she replied, "because I used crayons on the magic marker board."

Mr. Ames' early family.

My parents had a small clothing store and Mom and Dad stayed at the store. Mom kept the books, but she was always home when we were younger. As we got older they hired a woman to take care of us. She was pretty strict. We had to tow the line because we knew Mom and Dad would back her up. We
lived in a good neighborhood with lots of children around, so we had plenty of friends. I'd say we had a good childhood.

Mr. Ames went on to describe positive qualities of his parents that he hoped he could pass on to Abby. "I tried to take a little bit from both of my parents. They've been very good to me and my brother and they were very understanding parents. I try to take the understanding part in being able to talk with Abby."

He then told how his parents continued to support him in ways such as delivering mulch to make the house look better just before the realtor was coming to appraise it. "Little things like that, his idea. They came up and did that. They are terrific people. Besides Ann, Mom and Dad are my best friends in the sense that I can discuss anything with them. We're all very close."

**Abby and her father.** To Mr. Ames, Abby and Ann, his wife, were the two "most precious things in my life."

We'd wanted a child so long, we'd given up hope. We'd been married fourteen years. Then it took me a while to get used to it. Because it made such a drastic change in our life style. But it's been good.

I want Abby to be whatever she wants to be as long as she is happy. I just want her to have the opportunity to do whatever she wants to do and because she's a women, that they can't limit her. And I try to tell her -- she's always talking about different things she would like to do and I always try to say if you really want to, and I express wants because
some things you really have to work hard for. Women have really been held back a lot and they still are. I hope that by the time she's grown . . . if she wants to be a pilot, fine; if she wants to do something else, fine. I just want her to have the opportunity to do what ever she wants to do.

We have what I would consider some very good conversations. I love her imagination. Last night she went with me to pick up something at work and we were pretending that I was her older brother. One morning on the way to school she was talking about her "brother". He's a teenager. I said, well 'I have one of those.' So, you know, that is how the conversation can roll. I just love it, to see what direction she'll take me. I've always, I guess, thought of myself as being somewhat of a daydreamer. Four is the best age yet."

When asked if Abby talked about day care, he responded, "She doesn't talk much about it. She talks more about the children than the teachers and if she mentions a teacher it's, Mandy. I guess she's Abby's favorite." He preceded to tell about Abby's determination to finish a lollipop received at the doctors, before going into school.

I said, "Come on let's go in." She says, "I can't, Ms. Mandy will be mad if I bring candy into the classroom." "Oh, okay", I said, "I still have the wrapper in my pocket, I'll wrap it up and save it for you." I thought that was pretty neat that Ms. Mandy had made a rule about it and it hadn't even occurred to me.
Despite the delight that Mr. Ames derived from Abby's talking, there was a limit. "She talks incessantly. Sometimes you just feel like you just need to get away, you know? It's difficult. I usually try to get her laughing, especially if she is in a bad mood or tired. Just tease her. She's a big tease herself and she likes it." Mr. Ames went on to discuss how Abby's practice of taking a nap resulted in her staying up until 10:00 which interrupted his own schedule. Getting to bed after his usual 9:00 pm meant an interruption in his 4:30 am exercise schedule.

"I try to help with some of the responsibility. I know that at her age Mom is really the most important thing to her. And she would probably say that she loves Mom more than she loves me. But you know, I try to help out with her and just be with her." This year Mr. Ames takes her to school and usually his wife picks her up. One day he let Abby bring an old pocket calculator to school. Abby told me, "See you just press this little button and I can talk to my Daddy." She held the calculator most of the morning and became distressed at one point when she could not find it. Typically Abby gave him a hug and a kiss 'good-bye' and wondered into the room while he hung her wraps in her cubby.

Included among Abby's ample assortment of toys were a large selection of manipulative sets. In the interview Mr. Ames told me, "I've always considered myself to be fairly mechanically inclined and to be able to look at things and be able to imagine what they would look like. So I see a lot of mechanical ability in her, too, and a lot of
what I call common sense." After a race car track demonstration at the home visit, Abby opened a toy tool box and handed the screwdriver to her Dad explaining, "because that is what men do." He gently corrected her, "not necessarily so." Shaking his head in disbelief he asked, "Where do they get that so young?"

Commentary. Mrs. Ames described her own mother as "full of fun and teasing" who also "could get angry and say some hurtful things." Mrs. Ames described herself as being fun-loving like her mother. She commented that her parent's fighting had a detrimental affect on hers and her brother's images of themselves. She believed that her father had "wasted his life" because he lived by his emotions. Throughout her school years her mother was there for her in the sense that she was always at home. After telling about the problems with her parents Mrs. Ames ended with, "but they were wonderful people." Main et al., (1985) found incongruity in describing early relationships characteristic of parents of insecure infants. Mrs. Ames' current relationship with her parents seemed to mirror some of the conflictual nature of their past. Mrs. Ames had to "punish" her mother for her criticism of Abby by staying with her brother. When she was ill her inclination was to call her mother although she said that she could not be certain that she would get the support she needed.

Abby's teacher recalled that when Mrs. Ames used to bring Abby to the day care she sometimes stayed to play with Abby but on other days depending on her own schedule demands, she would
leave Abby immediately. Mrs. Ames' inconsistency and insensitivity to Abby as well as her own ambivalence about leaving Abby contributed to Abby's crying and clinging at separation. Mrs. Ames' sense of guilt over not staying home with Abby further added to the ambivalence in their relationship.

At the home visit, Mrs. Ames demonstrated the "strict disciplinarian" label which she gave herself. Her directives and questions to Abby were quick and sharp in tone. Mrs. Ames was at one moment stern then almost as if to cover the the harshness she sometimes followed abruptly with an entreaty of sweetness. The bellowing demands of the "wicked step mother" were to me as observer, uncomfortably like Mrs. Ames' demands and tone of voice used with Abby earlier in the visit when the flower head band was found lying on the floor. Mrs. Ames was at times playful and teasing with her daughter but it is not clear that what was "play" to the mother was also enjoyed as "play" to the child." Both teachers commented that Mrs. Ames had told Abby not to worry if another child accidentally broke or lost a toy that she had brought to school. Abby was told that she had more toys at home than the other children and that she was in fact better than they were. Though said in a teasing manner it was not perceived as teasing by the teachers and doubtless by the children either.

Mrs. Ames dictated the terms of the Cinderella drama just as she as the stepmother dominated Cinderella. The dramatization metaphorically represented Mrs. Ames' domination her daughter's
life. Mrs. Ames wanted Abby to be just like her friend's daughter as well as to become all the things that "I couldn't be." According to her plans, Abby will be gifted and talented, she will sing and dance, and she will go to an Ivy league school. Mrs. Ames did not think that Abby would need to be pushed, implying that if Abby needed "pushing" it would be provided. Abby appeared to be more important as an object of mother's dreams than a daughter with whom to enjoy day-to-day interactions.

Beginning in infancy, Mrs. Ames got back spasms when the pressures of parenting became too great. Mrs. Ames blamed herself for being the type that would "rather hold it in." Mrs. Ames warned that Abby must always speak to her with respect or risk her mother's anger. Abby's accusations of "You pushed me," and her drawing of her frowning mother suggested that Abby and her mother may already have begun on a course in which Abby's needs and Mother's expectations were at odds.

In contrast to Mother, Father just wanted Abby to be anything that she wanted to be and to not be limited by virtue of being a woman. Instead of specific roles or behaviors, his wish for her was happiness. Mr. Ames delighted in their conversations and shared fantasies. He demonstrated his sensitivity to Abby by saving her uneaten candy. The pretend communication link in the form of the old calculator provided assurance for Abby of Dad's availability. Mr. Ames admitted that the addition of Abby demanded changes in his schedule which were not always easy for him to accommodate. His
enjoyment of her talking was strained when she was tired and her talking became incessant. Mr. Ames response to her included diversion through "making her laugh" and appealing to her sense of humor. It is likely that Mrs. Ames who took more responsibility for Abby's daily care was the one who had to cope most often with the tired child.

Mr. Ames' recollection of childhood contrasted with Mrs. Ames' both in content and in the manner in which he related it. He described childhood as good and recalled both his parents' strengths and weaknesses highlighting the qualities that he tried to emulate in parenting Abby. The current relationship between his parents and his own family was supportive and harmonious.

Mr. and Mrs. Ames reporting of their relationships with Abby and their own families contrasted in style and content and was mirrored in their interactions with Abby. Mrs. Ames' agenda for Abby's life included specific behavior and actions some of which she candidly admitted were opportunities that she did not have for herself. Mr. Ames wanted Abby to be happy and that she not be denied opportunity based on her gender. Abby's parents each mentioned their spouse during the interview but did not allude to the apparent differences in their approach and style of child rearing. Each seemed to have her/his own agenda and did not give any indication of having discussed a mutual approach.

Brent and His Family
Brent and his parents lived in a contemporary style house which they had designed and built with Brent in mind. "The intercom system," mother pointed out, "allows us to hear Brent and talk to him while he is in his room and we are in the basement." Mr. Brown wanted me to see his son's toys as seeming evidence that he was indeed a good father. He, rather than Brent, told me about the water bed with a frame in the shape of a car complete with headlights (night lights) that Dad himself had struggled with in order to get them to work. Referring to Brent's many toys he facetiously said that social services might come and take Brent away because they were depriving him. Again indicating Brent's various toys he later referred to his earlier comment, "I was joking about social services," as if I might not know. Mr. Brown's interactions with his son were mostly an effort to get Brent to perform for me. "Show her how you can throw the basketball in the hoop." Mrs. Brown described at length how she periodically went through Brent's toys and sold them at yard sale. "I have to wait until Brent's not around or he wants to keep all of it."

Brent and his father. In the interview Mr. Brown spoke of being eager for Brent to grow up so that they could do "boy things" together, as compared to now when he was mainly his "mother's child."

He means a great deal to me and I think he will mean more and more as he gets older and older because we will be able to go places together and do more things with him. More things
that I didn't necessarily get to do with my parents. He's already done quite a few things that I didn't get to do. Like he's already been to the beach a few times and he's been to National Zoo and things like that. I've been to Europe and quite a few places and I want him to be able to do those things at an earlier age because I think it will be good for him.

He was unable to tell about day to day interactions with Brent except to say that they played ball downstairs and then began to describe where they had played.

We finished the basement after he was born and I did it with an eye for having a good place for him to be able to play where he can leave his toys. If he tore up anything, no big deal because all of the walls are made of sheet rock so if he knocks a hole in the wall--its no big deal. The carpeting is sort of indestructible . . . .

He continues after additional building details,

But the things we do together are baseball, basketball, play with his cars and trucks. He's got a lot of different toys, so we play cops and robbers, all different games like that. He's a lot of fun to have on hand, except when he gets in a bad mood or he gets tired or something and then he can get difficult.

Mr. Brown's early family. Mr. Brown described his own childhood as a normal and happy one in which he and his two older brothers played with the neighborhood kids and had the attention of four adults, his parents and an aunt and uncle who lived with them.
"I'm the baby of the family and unfortunately on certain occasions I'm still treated that way." He described how his father stopped him when they were working together a few weeks ago and said: "Tie your shoe, boy!" He described his relationship with his mother as being like buddies, "she can say anything to me and me to her, but with everybody else she has to watch what she says."

When asked to whom he went when he needed something as a child,

Oh, my Mom, always. If I had a problem she was the first one I would go to. My mom did a very good job as far as that goes. She always encouraged us to do things and to try things. My mom did most of the—if you had a question you usually went to her and Dad only got involved when there was something wrong or there was a real need for discipline or something like that. If Dad got involved you knew you were in real trouble. If you're doing something you better walk away clean because you're in trouble. . . . I wasn't afraid of him. I knew he loved me and I knew he would never do any thing to hurt me, but when you got a spanking from Dad you knew it. I mean you knew it for a while.

Mr. Brown implied that since he "did not turn out to be an axe murderer" the form of discipline he received was also appropriate for his son. "I think its good for kids to have discipline." Such discipline measures, however, were not the ideal according to Mrs. Brown.
Mrs. Brown's early family.

I was always responsible for my brothers, because I was the girl. My parents had this really big thing—they really made a difference between the boys and the girls. I did all the household chores and started dinner before my mom got home from work. I always helped my younger brother with his homework [and] things like making sure other children didn't come into the yard, if they weren't supposed to. I've always known how to—at age 6 I remember crawling across my Mom's bed and making it up in the morning. I had to crawl up on the bed to make it because I was so small, and [I remember] getting burned on the eyes of the stove because I couldn't reach across it far enough, and things like this. I was always responsible, I had a lot of chores.

My mother tends to have a red hot temper and I always decided in my mind that if I did something wrong my parents would disown me. My older brother moved in with a young lady and she got pregnant and they decided to get married and it was like there was nothing said about that. But my Dad kept telling me if that happens to you, you're disowned. It was like, I don't know, the girl for some reason had to be the—it was okay for the boy and not for the girl.

My dad said no girl of mine goes to the pool and takes off her clothes and parades around in skimpy little clothes. But my two brothers could go to the pool. It wasn't an unhappy
childhood. My parents gave us an allowance. I always felt like I didn't live out my childhood, sometimes I'd like to live my life again because I didn't get to do a lot of things other kids got to do.

Brent and his mother. Mrs. Brown said that Brent was a miracle.

I lost a baby at 4 months, three years ago. I was in an auto accident and was told that I could never carry a baby full term. So we said, well that is the way it is, we just won't have a child. So we waited and we thought about adopting and then I found out I was pregnant. It was kinda scary at first because we'd been married 13 years without a child and it was like, oh no, what do we do now? But it's like at his christening, I wrote some of it myself, it's like seeing the world all over again through his eyes. I really feel bad that I can't spend 24 hours a day with the little boy--just to sit and hold him. He's very, very special to me. I'm afraid that for some reason one morning I'm going to wake up and he's not going to be here, you know? It's like I constantly worry about somebody taking him.

We do a lot of things together. He's very loving. Everyday I try to tell him at least once a day that I love him and that he's very special to me. And in return he's adopted the same thing. Like yesterday I was kinda in a down mood and he says, "Mommy, I love you. Be happy." I said that
makes me feel a lot better. So we have a real special relationship. I breast fed him the first eight weeks. And at night—we had this big lazy-boy rocker I would prop myself up with pillows and put him up to me. I would just hold him all night long and my husband would find us there asleep in the morning. If something were to happen to him—I'd just, right now, it's awful to say, but I could do without my husband better than I could do without my baby, you know. I don't know what I'll do when Brent grows up and moves away. I'll be very lost. When he goes to his grandmother's house, it's so lonely and so quiet in the house, even if my husband is here because my husband is a couch potato. He loves to sit in front of the TV set. With Brent, we [she and Brent] don't do that.

I look forward to seeing him everyday, we talk, I mean we've always talked on a grown-up level. Brent, what did you do in school today? We'll talk about this and and we'll talk about that. He has this make believe friend named Mousy. It started about six or seven months ago. [This time corresponds with Brent's move into Eve and Mandy's class and the day care center's move to the new location]. And he told us yesterday that Mousy bought a new station wagon. We had just bought a new truck. I asked him where he got the money and he told me from his Daddy. And I asked him where his Daddy works and he said he doesn't work. Mousy drives a car and travels all over the world. Mousy gets to go in fire trucks, he [Brent] loves
fire trucks. I think he's thinking about what he would like to do. Then last night Mousy got called home for dinner. He comes up with some--sometimes he blames things on Mousy. There will be a mark on the wall and I'll go, "Oh, who marked the wall?" And he'll say, "Oh Mousy, you're going to get a spanking, you marked on the wall." At first I though it's not so good, but I talked with his pediatrician about it. And he says as long as he doesn't carry it too far, it's fine.

Sometimes I'll go along with it, like I'll say, Mousy's got to be careful because there's a police out today and if he's driving without a license, he'll get a ticket. And he says, oh, yes. We'll drive in the car and he'll say, I hear Mousy in the back. I'll say, really, where? There he is under the seat. My husband just sits there and rolls his eyes like, you know, and he said, I wonder sometimes if we should let it go? Is he telling a big story or a fib or should we let it go?' I said, I don't think he understands about lying or fibbing. He's just thinking of things. He's imagining things. My husband is black or white, no imagination whatsoever. Sometimes he will laugh at some of the things that Brent says, but most of the time he kind of looks over at me and rolls his eyes like, oh, here we go again. Once in a while I'll get Brent going on it just to see how far he'll take it. He'll go so far and then he'll stop. Or sometimes he'll tell me that he doesn't want to talk about it any more. I always try to come up with something different to do. We go
walking or sit out on the swing on the porch and talk, or we'll
go to the playground, go to his park, or go shopping.

The first year or so when Brent was very, very small, my
husband couldn't settle down to the idea of the role of
fatherhood and he still went places and did things with his
friends and a lot of times the baby and I were left to ourselves,
and so I think that's made us a lot closer than to his father.
Once when we were waiting for my husband, Brent said, let's
go without him, we can get a new Daddy.

Mrs. Brown attributed this remark and Brent's not wanting to stay
with his dad to be the result of her husband's strict discipline and his
lack of attention to Brent.

His idea of spending time with him is sitting in the basement
watching TV and Brent running around the room playing.
Sometimes he'll sit and hold him or they'll go out, but it's
almost like it's not as close contact. Since he's so young in our
neighbor [compared to the other children], Brent always wants
me to play with him. I'm very, very protective of him. He
screams--I run! I do not walk because I'm afraid something's
happened. And he always knows to come to me. Maybe I'm
too protective, especially when it comes to playing with other
children in the neighborhood.

She described a scene in which neighbor children were asking
Brent to come play with them. She told Brent he could not go and he
began to argue with her.
I said, no, Brent, you can't go. Brent screamed really loud and jerked his hand back when I reached for it. My husband is like, he's got to interact with other children. But I'm going like, well, they're bigger than he is and they may knock him down. I disagree sometimes with the way my husband handles discipline.

According to Mrs. Brown, her husband "came from a family where you got a belt when you misbehaved."

His way of handling it would be to just take Brent into the house and say you can just sit there until you stop crying, Then, "Sissy, Brent, stop crying! Stop whining!" And I'm saying, you're shouting at him and he's shouting at you, you're not getting anything settled. So we have that really bad sometimes because he doesn't agree. He says, you let him smooth you over too much. I don't know, I tend to spoil Brent, I mean literally. He'll say, are we going to the toy store again? I tend to spoil him. He wants to stop and get ice cream before dinner and sometimes we'll stop. To me its like he's going to grow up and be gone. What's a little breaking of the rules, just a little bit? My husband is the type, "No, no ice cream before dinner, no this, and no that." I think Brent knows if he goes to Mommy, she's going to say yes. Daddy may say no. I may spoil him to the point where it's going to be impossible to deal with, but he's just a child. I would rather live in a harmonious situation instead of a constant fight.
I was always told that I had to make good grades in school and I had to make something of myself. It's like now, even with everything I'm doing now, if I get a C on a test I get so depressed it's terrible because I expect better. It's like the house, if the house is not spic and span, and I was thinking now I've got to do the bills--I push myself to exhaustion. I'm going--and my husband says well let me do some of it, but I never feel confident that it will be done right. Some times he offers, other times when I want him to offer, he never offers. I feel like beating him in the head. Hey look, please, I need some help. Then I feel guilty if I ask him and I'm not spending enough time with Brent, and then I'm not spending enough time on school and if I miss a day at work, I'm not getting paid and I'm letting them down, and if I let the house go for one day, oh my gosh, I'm not being a good housekeeper, you know! I constantly worry about what the other person is going to say. I need to loose weight, I need to do something about my hair and like Brent threw that temper tantrum and the whole neighborhood knew it. And I was thinking, what did I do to make him do this? You know?

Sometimes it's like he and I are--we'll spend a lot of time alone and, you know, it's not that my husband's gone from the house but he will be downstairs in the den and it's almost like there is nobody else but Brent and myself. Things have just--my life is so busy now. . . . Sometimes I wish there were
someone. I mean even now, I have lots and lots of friends, but no one, like I think Brent and I have. I think Brent and I will—he will grow up to know not only am I his Mom, he can come to me. I was terrified to go to my Mom and Dad about things. With my husband he will be a little afraid to, a little afraid. But with me it will be more like Mom, and she's my friend and she'll be there for me. Which is what I would have liked to have had with my mom. My mom to this day is constantly asking me, she'll say, "Aren't you my friend, aren't you my friend?" I'll say, yes, but I still feel as if I can't spill everything out to my mom. And she's my mom, I wish I could.

Commentary. The common theme with both Browns in relationship to their son, Brent, was that they wanted to provide for him what they perceived to have been gaps in their own childhood experiences. Using nearly identical phrases they described mainly travel and entertainment activities which they either had done or were planning to do with Brent. Both independently commented on the pleasure of being able to see it through his [Brent's] eyes. The fact that Mrs. Brown spoke of having included this idea in the words of Brent's christening which she wrote parts of, suggests that the originator of the sentiment was more likely to have been hers than Mr. Browns. At the home visit each spent a great deal of time explaining and justifying material items in the house such as Brent's unusual water bed frame, his toys, and the intercom system. Mr. Brown described the special child-proof room and Mrs. Brown
detailed her system of regular yard sales designed to recycle some of Brent's abundant supply of toys. Their expressed desire to provide for Brent what they had not had for themselves, represented the only expressed goals shared by these parents.

Mrs. Brown depended on Brent for his companionship and for providing purpose for her life. She perceived Brent, at three and a half years old, as the one from whom she could receive sympathy when she was depressed and the one who was her best friend. She returned to school to earn a degree in case she ever had to support him alone as a result of divorce. She spoke of her dependence on Brent but did not voice any awareness of its inappropriateness. Despite a demanding work and study schedule she devoted quality time to Brent, as she called it, often at the expense of her own well-being and almost to the exclusion of her relationship with her husband and other people.

Mrs. Brown expressed the wish that her husband would do more with Brent but then often refused and even criticized his interactions when he did get involved with Brent. When she wanted him to take care of Brent, for example when she was trying to study, she felt that she had to demand it from her husband. Her drive for perfection and her unwillingness to delegate what she assumed were her responsibilities of housework, school, and her job, often conflicted or competed with her desire to be with Brent and fed her sense of guilt of not spending enough time with him. Her exclusive attention to Brent, though perhaps initially a response to her
husband's apparent lack of involvement with his young son, seemed to undermine any potential father-son relationship and to maintain her dissatisfaction of the marriage relationship.

Mrs. Brown related two separate incidents in which Brent tried to cheer her and her husband. Brent said to his father, "Daddy, come on be happy." And to his mother, "Why are you sad, Mommy? Smile for me." She described her overwhelming sense of responsibility as a young child which seems to have continued into adulthood. Discussing her early years she recalled her many chores and the restrictions she faced as a girl in comparison to her male siblings. Ambiguously she summarized her childhood as being happy and then immediately related that she felt that she had had no childhood. Main, et al, (1985) found this adult ambiguity common of parents whose young children were rated as insecure. Brent at age 3 and a half already seemed to parallel his mother's sense of responsibility, not for family chores, but for other family member's happiness.

Mr. Brown spoke longingly of the future when Brent would be old enough to do things with him and to do the many things that he himself did not get to do as a child. Mr. Brown had difficulty expressing any sense of intimacy or describing specific interactions with his son. As with his facetious statement about the department of social services taking Brent away, because of a lack toys, Mr. Brown responded by answering my questions but offered nothing more than what I asked. His enthusiasm over being Brent's father
was abstract and polite but at no time during the interview did he get lost in his telling of himself and Brent. The incidents he related were without detail as compared to the specific language he used in describing the goals that he had for Brent when he grows up. As if describing useful furniture, he said that his son was "nice to have around." By his own admission collaborated by Mrs. Brown's description, he does not currently take a very active role in the parenting of Brent. Whether the result of his own work schedule and lack of initiative, and or the exclusiveness of his wife's relationship with Brent and her disapproval of his parenting, Mr. Brown's behavior as father paralleled that of his own father who was only there to mete out discipline. He described the close relationship he has with his own mother perhaps not unlike what Brent enjoyed with his. He believed that as Brent grew older and the nature of their mutual activities would became more male-oriented and perhaps, though unexpressed, less in the domination of his mother. These anticipated activities with Brent also represented for Mr. Brown an opportunity to do "things that I didn't necessarily get to do with my parents." "He's important to me, but it's fun to be able to see it through his eyes."

Neither parent was satisfied with their own childhood and were determined that Brent would have what they didn't. For Dad the deficiencies can be made up by going places and experiencing new things, many of which will come later when Brent is older and they can do "boy things." For Mom the message was similar but
included the desire for continued strong emotional ties as well. Both parents experienced gaps in their own growing up but were determined that Brent will have it all, if possible. Their determination to give to Brent was not necessarily what Brent himself wanted and needed, but appeared to be based more on their reaction to their own unresolved childhood deficits.

Mrs. Brown's fierce determination to provide for Brent was not from a position of security but rather her own insecurity. She perceived that her own childhood did not provide her with what she needed as a child. The void that she experienced in childhood had become a guide for determining what she believed to be her child's needs. Through her relationship with her child she was attempting to meet her own current need for companionship. She acknowledged that she would be lost when he grew up and moved away. The parameters she set for their relationship, conversing with him as if he were a peer and expecting sympathy from him deviates from the appropriate vertical and more complementary relationship of a parent and child (Hartup, 1989). Her dependence on her son's companionship and the exclusion of the father further undermined the horizontal relationship of the father and mother as well as. Was the grandmother's plea for her daughter's friendship a portend of what might develop between Brent and his mother? Though Mrs. Brown chose not to reciprocate her mother' desire, she did state that she wished they could have been friends, but the time for a satisfying relationships with her mother was past. Her husband's
presence at home was to her the same as if she were alone in the house. Her son, Brent was her playmate, friend and only companion.

As a young child Brent was still satisfied to be in the companionship of his mother, although the desire to play with the neighborhood boys was already evident. His father was experienced as less responsive and more authoritarian than mother. Mother, in her objection to her husband's child rearing was his advocate and protector. Her "breaking of the rules," and her avoidance of conflict provided Brent a contrasting and permissive parental model. Developmentally Brent's desire and need for independence was growing rapidly and would continue to pose a potentially increasing conflict with his mother's meeting of her own needs.

**Gerald and His Family**

Mr. and Mrs. Graham were in their mid-thirties and were both part time students pursuing advanced degrees while employed at the nearby university. Both had had training and experience in education and teaching which influenced their relationships with Gerald and their expectations for Gerald and for themselves as his parents/teachers. The Grahams were the only black couple in the study and lived in a community that was predominantly white.

**Mrs. Graham's early family.**

I'm one of six children and we're all pretty close. My oldest sister is my model as a parent and a professional. I really respect what she has been able to do with her career and her family and so I go to her when ever I have a question about
parenting or anything. They live closest to us of any of the family. When I was younger I could always go to my Mom and I had an aunt who took care of me. I always felt that I had what I needed.

**Gerald and his mother.** Mrs. Graham described her relationship with her son as being very close. She recalled how her husband was concerned about her being able to bond to Gerald because "I was sick and couldn't be near him for twenty-four hours right after the birth. But I breast fed him and we bonded really well. We're the opposite personalities, but we're very close. He's just like his Daddy."

"We talk a lot and he wants me to be close to me." At the day care center Gerald lingered several minutes with his mother when they first arrived, wrapping himself in her skirt, then wondering off and returning before finally kissing her, or depending on whether he has gotten involved in an activity, simply waving goodbye. Gerald was usually the last child to arrive. According to Mrs. Graham this allowed her to have some time with him each morning. When she came to pick him up she sometimes spent time in the room just to observe or to let him finish a game and even begin a new one. Once when Gerald failed to get one of two prizes that the teachers had set up as a reward for the two children exhibiting the "best" behavior for the week, his mother supported him and soothed his sudden outburst of crying resulting from his disappointment. On the days when she was unable to pick him up, Mr. Graham came for Gerald.
Because of his schedule his pick-up time was usually a full two hours later than hers.

I feel almost smothered at times when he always wants to be right beside me, and I wonder when he's going to start preferring his Daddy. He likes me to put him to bed and to give him a bath, but he is fine when Gary does it. After his Dad comes back down stairs, he'll often think of some way of getting me to come up to him to say good night. He'll ask me to lay down beside him and go to sleep with him.

Mrs. Graham expressed that her first goal for Gerald was "to be happy."

I want him to have experiences in doing things. He wants to help and I'll let him help do things in the kitchen. He likes to get the mail and to bring it in the house. I let him put the key in the ignition. Now Gary would probably not let him do that. I'm more lenient than Gary. I think, well, he's only a child and I want him to enjoy life. He wants to drive but he understands that he can't do that until he gets older. Sometimes he tells me his little secrets and he'll say, don't tell Dad. I always tell him he should tell his father because I don't want him to be afraid of him. I remember that I was afraid to talk to my father when I was young. I always went to my mother.

I wish I could see him at school when he doesn't see me. I'm amazed at the questions that he asks and the things he comes up with sometimes. I don't remember asking those kinds of
things when I was a child. I think Gerald is bright, but of course he is my child. Gerald loves to learn and we think that is so very important.

Their interest in Gerald's education also related to the one criticism the Grahams had of the day care center.

The day care is all right but they are not doing nearly what they could be to teach Gerald. Playing outside is fine but Gerald is ready for academic studies. He can identify his numbers up to 100 and the other day he brought home a ditto sheet with the numbers up to ten. I think he is bored with that. We have talked to the director many times about our concerns, but we don't want to move him. He was close to his last teacher. She was really good but she left. Now he is closest to Mandy.

In addition to seeing herself as his teacher in an academic sense, she added, "I guess you would say that I am also his teacher of life." She wanted him to be able to express himself and to say what he "does and doesn't like." She described him as a picky eater and said that they give him choices about some things that he eats but that they might also say,

You need to eat some of this before you have more of that. He is clever. He tries to bargain with us and figure out ways to get what he wants and to feel like he is in charge. So, he announces the order in which he is going to eat his food. "I'm going to eat
my carrots, then my meat, then my milk." We can't argue with that.

During my visit to their home, Mrs. Graham played a number game which involved identifying number cards between 1 and 100. The four by six inch cards were laid face up on the family room floor. Mrs. Graham would call out a number at random and when he picked up the corresponding card she would verify his choice. Mr. Graham looked on attentively and occasionally challenged Gerald by pretending to locate the number before his son. Gerald responded to the competition with good natured excitement and by confidently telling his father, "No, you won't get it." Mrs. Graham calmly acknowledged each time Gerald made a correct choice. He made only three or four mistakes by transposing the numbers of cards that he was seeing upside down. Gerald's own sense of accomplishment was strong enough to sustain him to the end of the game when Mother said simply, "Very good, Gerald."

Gerald smiled broadly when I arrived at his house and immediately asked me if I would play games with him and his parents. Mother later explained, "It was very difficult at first. We had to tell him that no one will want to play with you if you get so upset. Now he has figured out a way to take control. He'll say, Daddy's going to win this time." We spent most of my visit sitting playing games on the floor. Though I sat between Gerald and his mother, it was not obvious during my visit that Gerald preferred his mother over his dad.
Mr. Graham’s early family.

Being the oldest I got lots of attention from adults, my grandmother, mother and aunt. My grandmother took care of me when I was young and my family set high educational standards for me. They wanted me to do well and rewarded me for doing well in school. They were very caring and, as a matter of fact, they substituted a great deal for the absence of my Dad.

Mr. Graham says he had no real model of how to be a father except that he determined to stick it out, unlike his own father who left the household. "I try to interface information from books with what I see going on, trying to watch for characteristics of a certain developmental stage. Those experiences have become very valuable now. You can call it hindsight if you want, but the things that I did not have, I want him to have."

Gerald and his father. During my visit Gerald was very restless and would grab his father or lounge on him which Dad tolerated passively. Gerald would lean against his father and collapse into his lap and once lost his balance and nearly fell into my lap. "Sometimes it's uncomfortable in that, I guess being somewhat of a traditional male, 'climb on your mom, that's fine,' that's kind of natural, but I don't shun him. Sometimes he'll hug me standing up and start climbing on me, that kind of thing. He wants to like talk, so you can't get away."
At one point during the games, Gerald got very excited and shouted his response. Dad reminded him that he needed to stay calm and Gerald responded by lowering his voice. Gerald shook his father's hand when Mr. Graham won one of the games. When it was time for me to leave Gerald asked when I was coming back. Dad went upstairs with Gerald to begin his bath while Mrs. Graham bade me goodbye.

Mr. Graham described Gerald's reaction to being taken to the day care center.
Sometimes he wants to go [to the day care] and sometimes he doesn't. Today he took his coat off and was gone in a minute. Other days its fifteen. He stays up [at night] and wants to talk about school. That's just the way he is. Questions, negotiations, promises for the next day. He will say, Who is going to take me? Who is going to pick me up? He wants us to split the times. Now this morning I took him and I will pick him up. He may say tonight, Who's going to pick me up tomorrow? He wants his mommy to pick him up. Mommy, if you do not have class, can you pick me up? If you do not have a meeting, will you take me?

When Mr. Graham came to pick up Gerald from school he talked briefly with him and in a rather matter-of-fact voice. He checked the nap chart and information board for parents. One evening Gerald asked his father if he could stay and listen to the rest of the story. Another child had just made the same request and his
mother sat down to wait. Mr. Graham said "No, its time to go."
Gerald complied without the slightest protest. Mr. Graham readily
gathered Gerald's belongings and they left promptly. At no time did
I observe Mr. Graham converse with Eve who was the teacher in
charge of the late shift which was Mr. Graham's time for picking up
Gerald, about two hours later in the day than the time that Mrs.
Graham usually picked him up.

Gerald is a very independent child. He likes to do things for
himself and a lot of times that doesn't come off at school. But
he's always willing to try things for himself. He picks up on
everything that I do. He wants the key so that he can open the
front door. He wants to pour his orange juice, "I won't spill it."
"Are you going to put any egg in the pancake?" He does not
miss a thing. So I have to be very careful of what I'm modeling
to him.

I'm more so the one who sets limitations on how far he
can go, not that my wife doesn't. So for the most part I'm
checking his demeanor or responses and trying to make sure
they are appropriate for the situation. It's not a right or wrong
kind of thing, it's just based on the situation. Sometimes he
may be very assertive to us and I will correct him. Sometimes
he will whine and I'll just tell him, tell us what you want, say
what you want to say and stop whining. When he's in time out
[at the day care center] and I come to pick him up, I will say,
why are you in time out? Last night, for example, he said that
one of the kids had hit him. I said well, you have hit him before too, right? "Yeh." So I said, It goes both ways. Just trying to show him that life is not centered around him even though he believes that it is. He has to learn to deal with people like he wants to be dealt with. Now maybe that's too early, and then again it's not. When we first got the games [referring to the lotto and board games played during the home visit] he couldn't stand them. And see he's developed--and okay, shake the winner's hand. He wouldn't have done that at Christmas when he got those games. And he would take your pieces and try to mess them up because he was too far behind.

I have high standards for him. Nobody else will. A lot is involved in that particularly, I'm sure you're aware of some of the experiences of black males and across the board, very few of us make it in this society. So, yes, I'm going to expect certain things because I know it's going to be required to be successful. And, again I try to pick my moments. I'm not trying to force anything on him that he's not ready for. He can articulate some things that baffle me --how is he putting this together? how does he deduct this having only seen it or experienced it one time? He comes to a conclusion and its right. I am just amazed, I'm very proud that he loves books. And he likes learning. I couldn't ask for any more right now. I don't want him to necessarily be an athlete, I just want him to have the skills that are going to be necessary to survive. And he's
showing signs. Of course, we've put a lot into that. He gets read to every night. His Mom will buy him two new books and he has to read two new books. He has those activity books, problem solving books and he absorbs that. He likes it. We'll read the book and for example, not complete the sentence just to check his memory and boom! He'll finish it. Just little games to help him learn.

When Mr. Graham asked me how Gerald was at the day care center, I explained my position of letting the children come to me and briefly described Gerald's first responses to me as contrasted with the later, more positive exchanges. Mr. Graham responded, He's been like that ever since he was two. Every time the teachers would change he would go through withdrawal. And it was [spoken as if from Gerald] "okay, you have to meet some kind of standards here before I start interacting with you." He is very structured. He was like that even with family. When we would visit, it was just Mommy and Daddy. At first he wouldn't have anything to do with them, but then when we started talking to grandma, aunts and uncles he would get excited.

But I guess I run into conflict because I don't want him to remain dependent. If I provide everything he might not develop his skills. Again, I'm always fine tuning. I'm very deliberate in the things that I do, too because I guess right now the bond between he and his mother is so strong that I'm
observing the changes he's going through. Right now, and I think this is very natural, for male children, he is very attached to his mother. [Laughing] I get some attention. I'm studying him while he is growing and step in, I guess, basically, like I said before he gets too out of line.

I try to encourage him to get along with all people because he's going to have to. There's going to be some ethnocentrism which I think is still good, but in the same sense, he's going to have to respect difference or diversity. He may not like it or accept it, but he's going to have to deal with it. From my experiences, my reading, my spiritual development -- I believe it's just the right thing to do. I mean, everybody should have their own space. You know, we can have cookouts, or I can have a cookout by myself [laughing] and you can have yours. I think it's important for all of us to get along together. And a lot of times that happens and a lot of times that doesn't.

Mr. Graham credited Gerald for contributing to the strength of their relationship.

He makes us close to him. I mean, it's come and get into this. It's like this is my time after dinner and prior to that, "come on, let's go play football, basketball." Sometimes he'll watch cartoons. That's interesting, too. He used to, after dinner, it was cartoon period. Now, its something else. He doesn't ask for cartoons as much. Which I kind of like because they always hit
somebody over the head. Matter of fact, if the wind holds up we're going to fly a kite tonight.

He makes me happy and I think that we make him happy. My life will never be the same. He's brought joy to my life. And I see it as really a privilege to be able to raise a child -- a healthy child, and we have that. My life will never be the same. I'm happy to be his father. I can remember when he was in utero and we used to talk to him and I'd put my head on my wife's stomach and say, Hey, how you doing? He would just kick. And he came out and he was just crying and the nurse gave him to me and he stopped crying. And it's just been uphill ever since.

**Commentary.** Mr. and Mrs. Graham had high expectations for Gerald. Mr. Graham explained his expectations as necessary for survival as a black male in this society. The Graham's shared value of education guided their emphasis on activities that they hoped would challenge and develop Gerald intellectually. They clearly see their roles as parents also incorporating the roles of teachers. Their dissatisfaction with the day care curriculum seemed to reinforce their conviction that if they didn't teach Gerald, perhaps no one would.

Both parents had a sense of how Gerald's particular temperament shaped their interactions with him. Mrs. Graham recognized Gerald's need for predictability and his need to be in control as being very much like that of her husband. She saw Gerald
as having a personality unlike her own, but that despite that, they were very close and that he liked to tell her his "little secrets." She was careful to instruct him to tell his Dad so that unlike herself, Gerald would not be afraid to talk to his father. Both parents recalled with amazement the questions that Gerald asked and the things that he said and saw them as being more remarkable than the behavior they recalled of themselves at a similar age.

Mrs. Graham described her own childhood as a happy secure one. She says simply, "I had what I needed." She could always talk to her mother and she was careful in guiding Gerald so that he does not fear his father as she once feared hers. Her family remained close and her confidant switched from her mother to that of her oldest sister. Mr. Graham recalled that in many ways, the many adults, who cared for him, his grandmother, his mother and his aunt, "substituted for the absence of my father." They had high academic expectations which he in turn was passing on to his son.

Mr. and Mrs. Graham had different approaches to parenting though each seemed to accept their somewhat different roles and in fact saw their own role as complementing the other. Mrs. Graham provided a balance to her husband’s emphasis on structure. He provided the limitations when he felt that Gerald was getting out of line. It is obvious that both parents took their roles very seriously and had spent time together in discussing their son’s experiences. At the end of the interview, projecting into the future, Mrs. Graham said
that eventually they want to move closer to the city where there was more going on. "I'm aware that he misses out on some activities."

Mr. Graham felt the need to teach Gerald the appropriate ways to act with other people and to get along with others. "He doesn't have to like everybody but he has to learn how to live with them." He described his wife's relationship as being closer to Gerald now and that he as father came second. He accepted that as being natural for a 4-year-old, but continued to observe and study Gerald, eager for the time when he would experience increased closeness in their father-son relationship.

Mr. Graham tolerated Gerald's physical contact during the games but admitted that he was not totally comfortable with Gerald's demonstrativeness. He described wrestling and playing football with him outside, contact legitimized by being labeled sport. He explained his reluctance to fully accept Gerald's affection by saying that he was a "traditional male" and that it was okay between mothers and sons. He was quick to add however that he did not "shun" Gerald, a near admission that perhaps it was behavior that he should consider reciprocating. Was his reluctance to be physically close with his young son due in part, whether consciously or unconsciously, to a belief that this behavior was antithetical to that which one needed in order to survive?

Mr. Graham was very "deliberate" and calculated about his contributions to Gerald. He believed that unless Gerald was taught at home, no one else would provide the training that he needed to
survive as a black male in this society. Mr. Graham was incorporating his vast experience with children, "I've been around them all my life," his formal training as an elementary teacher and the materials he had read and the training he himself received as a child to provide direction in how to rear his only child. He ended the interview by saying that his son had "brought joy to his life." Though not said in these words, by Mrs. Graham, I sensed that Gerald had brought joy to both of his parents.

Summary of the Children and Their Parents in Relationships

According to Bowlby (1973, 1980, 1988) individuals construct a representational model(s) of their attachment figures and a corresponding model of themselves. If the primary caregiver has been responsive to the child's needs, the child's model of her/himself is that I am worthy of having my needs met. Consequently that child will approach other relationships from that perspective, thus perpetuating within her/his own children that same or similar representation of self. The paths of the internal working or representational models present in one generation to their operation in a new individual in the next requires recognition of the complexity of factors that support or alter the working models. The exploration of two major themes identified in the parents' discussions of their family of origin as well as their immediate family contribute to our understanding of how individuals develop their working models. These two themes involving the internal working model include: one, the interruption or modification of intergenerational transmission
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and two, the continuation or stability of intergenerational transmission.

The first theme revolves around the parents' relationships within their own families and their expressed beliefs and intentions as parents of their own children. There was no apparent consistent direct line of past experience to present parenting. Some parents related traumatic events in their own lives yet appeared to be developing a caring and responsive relationship with their own children. Having at least one caregiver that provided responsive caring at critical times may mitigate against the development of an insecure model as provided by the relationship with the other. A second influence seemed to be the quality of the relationship between the child's parents.

The parents' practice and ability to reflect on their own experience and their practice and ability to communicate this awareness with their spouses are two intervening factors that serve to bring the individual's working model of relationships from the unconscious to the conscious level where it can serve to "break the intergenerational cycle." Lilly's parents both experienced what they themselves termed the trauma of having an alcoholic parent. Their individual and collective ability to reflect and to communicate their goals for Lilly seems to indicate a level of consciousness that provides alternative relationship models to those they may have experienced.
Both the stability and flexibility was influenced by the level of involvement of alternate caregivers. Traditionally mothers have been identified as the primary caregiver and it was on that assumption that most attachment research was based. In this study, all fathers believed that their wives had closer relationships with their children and were more involved in their children's daily care. Mothers' opinions corroborated the fathers' perceptions. The fathers concurred that at this young age their children preferred their mothers over their father as the one to perform routine care such as bathing and putting the children to bed. In other words, mothers were the children's primary caregiver, the parent with whom the strongest attachment was directed. The father or other secondary caregivers could either support the existing models or offer alternate models. Although traditionally one parent was identified as the primary attachment figure, the close involvement of both parents is likely to have a positive impact on the child's sense of self, by the simple additive factor of having more caregivers available to meet one's needs, to say nothing of the psychological benefits experienced by the parents who equitably share the responsibility of parenting.

Fathers saw their roles as increasing as the children grew older and in fact some fathers expressed experiencing some change in their relationships already. The children's decreased dependence on adults (mother) seemed to correspond with increased involvement on the part of these fathers as well as an anticipated or actual increase in their satisfaction with the father-child relationship.
Abby's father described age 4 as the best age yet. Brent's and Gerald's fathers, in particular anticipated greater involvement as their sons grew older. Brent's father looked forward to doing more "boy things" with his son. If father involvement and satisfaction actually increased as predicted, one would assume that the relationship itself would have increasing affect on the developing child's representational models.

Of the four couples, Brent's parents had the most disparate roles regarding parenting. Not only did they have very different levels of involvement, but they also did not accept each others parenting styles. Brent's parents responded to what they believed Brent needed based on their own deficit models. Brent's father had an exclusive relationship with his mother but was still a "boy" or the "baby" to his own father who had only gotten involved when there was disciplining to do. Brent's mother's sense of her son's needs was based on her wanting Brent to have what she did not have, "a childhood." At 3 years old Brent was probably getting most of his needs met. But as Brent's developmental need for independence increased so too would the conflict with his mother's need to protect him and assure him of the childhood she did not have.

Each couple varied as to how they approached the parenting of their child. Some couples such as Lilly's and Gerald's parents expressed similar goals even though their individual styles differed.
With Abby's and Brent's parents the mothers and fathers expressed different desires for their children as well as demonstrating different styles in achieving those goals. The parents' ability to be self-reflective of their own early experiences and the coherence or complementarity of each couple's parenting roles influenced their children's sense of security within their family.

Contextual Factors of Child Day Care Affecting the Teacher-Child Interactions

The dyadic interactions of the teachers and children each produced a new relationship which was influenced by factors above and beyond each of their relationship histories. To begin this section several factors that are seen as influential across all eight of these teacher-child relationships will be discussed, primarily having to do with the unique qualities of the this specific classroom and of child day care environment in general. Those factors have to do with the physical environment, broad program considerations, and the relationship between the teachers.

The Child Day Care Center

The day care center where the observations were made was a private-for-profit center which had been in operation for nearly 15 years. The center served approximately 75 children, infants through school-age from predominantly middle-class families. The director was a college graduate of a 4-year education program who took pride in offering a teacher-child ratio which was slightly below the state requirements. The center was adequately equipped in most areas
and was typical in its approach to child day care for the region. That is, the children, grouped by age, spent most of their time in their individual classrooms being supervised throughout the day in scheduled activities which included teacher-directed activities, free-play (children choose from a limited range of activities requiring minimal teacher participation), meals and snacks, a rest period, and active outdoor play. Some of the teachers have training beyond high school though many rely solely on learn-as-you-go experiences and occasional workshops. Most teachers receive little over minimum wage with a minimum of employee benefits.

Two months prior to the beginning of this study, the center and this classroom in particular underwent major changes. Two former classrooms, one with Eve as teacher and eight children, and the other with Mandy, her assistant teacher and sixteen children, were consolidated into one large classroom in the center's new location. Just 2 months prior to this move Eve and her class of 8 had moved intact from another nearby center that had suddenly closed. At the same time 4 of Mandy's original group of 16 had been replaced by 4 children from a younger classroom. The teachers and children were not only having to adjust to a new space but were also having to adjust to each other, new children, and new parents in a group that had significantly increased in size. These changes were initiated several weeks before the Thanksgiving and winter holidays, a time known for its additional stresses on both children and adults.
Two weeks after I began my observations the teacher who had been Mandy's assistant resigned and was replaced for two weeks by a temporary staff person. Finally a "permanent" replacement was hired and three months later for family reasons she too had submitted her resignation. Mandy, designated "lead" teacher of the newly formed classroom said, "I've worked here a little over 2 years and I've worked with over six different people not counting Eve."

Staff turnover is a common problem in child day care and one to which this center was certainly not immune. Apart from its affect on the children, teachers also have an adjustment to go through as they learn to know each other and begin to work together.

Classroom Contexts

The classroom in which I participated and observed was divided into two main sections separated by a middle area that included a bathroom area, an adult height counter with a sink, and children's cubbies. One side of the room contained low open shelves with a large variety manipulative toys, another taller shelving unit contained stacks of children's books, puzzles and some teacher supplies. A large closet, a sand table and a record player completed the furnishings of this section. In the other side of the room were three tables large enough to seat the whole group, a small shelf with markers and paper, and in one corner, a housekeeping center which included a cradle, a "refrigerator" and various other child-size cabinets.
In this classroom the individual classroom teachers had the responsibility to make the day-to-day decisions regarding the activities within the classroom. Occasional field trips or invited guests were arranged to provide educational stimulation. During my observations evidence of teacher-planned curriculum activities was sporadic. Most of the day children were permitted to choose their own activities within a range of possibilities prescribed by the teacher(s).

The daily class schedule revolved around several structured activities and outdoor play times. As they arrived the children entered a period of free play using primarily the manipulative toys and their various toys brought from home. Mandy who worked the earliest shift, sat at a table near the door recording when the children arrived. As other staff arrived they would gather in the same area conversing together until time for the whole group to gather together. Occasionally in the morning, Mandy made the housekeeping center available when a child requested it, admonishing, "You better clean it up afterwards." Less frequently the block shelves were opened for use. Similar periods of unstructured play with little teacher involvement throughout the day appeared to serve as "fillers" between the other more defined periods such as lunch, outdoor time, etc.

Morning circle or group time consisted of the teacher calling each child to choose a "helper" position for the day (i.e., snack helper, line leader, etc.). Occasionally there was singing or stories. Circle
time was followed by hand washing and snack which was eaten while the children stood at the tables. Chairs were available but were used only twice when parents had brought special snacks for birthday celebrations. The teachers served the simple snacks and then stood nearby conversing and occasionally settling disputes or reminding children to "eat," or "pick-up your trash."

During "small groups" which followed snack, the children were divided into three groups which rotated to the three teachers who each led a different activity. These activities almost always included a paper and marker/crayon/paint/paste task, and a variety of other activities such as measuring the children, interviewing them on a particular topic or a food preparation demonstration of which Eve was always in charge. These teacher-directed small group activity times were not part of the daily routine until the permanent replacement was hired. Mandy had commented that it wasn't worth planning when you didn't know who [staff] was going to be in the room. For the month prior to that, this time period was spent in additional free-play or with an occasional video or group game. After the small groups the children went outside until the cook announced that lunch had been served. The children were seated at one very long table in a separate room with an adult at either end.

Following lunch, the children returned to their room, toileted and lay down for rest time. This was a time when the teachers admonished the children to be quiet while they carried on their own frequently animated conversations. Children whose cots were placed
on the opposite side of the room were virtually ignored unless they were disruptive. All the children were expected to remain on their cots until 3:30 when the second teacher returned from her break. Many of the children were awake long before. Some seldom slept at all. Afternoon snack was served following rest time and weather permitting the children went outside for a second time. In the late afternoon when Eve was in charge, the children returned to the room where she narrowly restricted the range of activities and designated one side of the room as off-limits. Eve routinely denied children's requests for materials or activities that she had not originally made available. When markers or crayons were permitted the children were expected to stand at the tables. Ironically adults were permitted to use the child-sized chairs. Presumably, this practice avoided having to take time to stack the chairs.

**Mandy's and Eve's Relationship**

Mandy's and Eve's relationship was congenial and playful. One morning Mandy hid her purse and erased her name from the "in board" just as Eve was arriving to make Eve think that she would have the responsibility of the whole class. Though Mandy was designated "lead" teacher, her application of the role did not include supervision or leadership of the other teachers. Mandy was responsible for planning activities and in the classroom she was usually the one who lead group times and directed the daily schedule.
Otherwise, Mandy's and Eve's roles in the classroom were very similar and their relationship was characteristically peer-oriented. Mandy was very tolerant of Eve's clear preference of some tasks over others. Eve always chose to do the housekeeping chores leaving the heavier responsibility of the children to Mandy. Eve recognized that Mandy was more patient with the children than she was, but added that Mandy was too calm and Eve saw it as her role to "stir things up a bit." They exchanged personal information regularly throughout the day and seemed to genuinely enjoy each other's company.

Finally, in the last portion of this chapter, the teachers' and children's stories come together in the structure of the teacher-child relationship within the context of child day care. Observations of the teachers and children in their classroom provided data from which to examine these relationships. As participant observer in the classroom my perspective was enriched with my own interactions with both teachers and children.

The Teachers' Relationships with the Four Children

The quality of the relationships of these children and teachers is due in part to the influence of their individual attachment models, the influence of the nature of their ongoing interactions, and the influence of external factors of child day care. When selected for study the children appeared to have different patterns of relating to the teachers roughly paralleling behaviors of previously defined attachment categories of secure and insecure. The basis for selecting
the children was to identify a range of patterns of behavior, not to further define the categories.

The interpretation of interactions was aided by the attachment categories, but the categories themselves may not adequately represent the individuals. Indicative of either the limitations of interpretation or the category definitions, Sroufe (1983) labeled two children of a preschool class of fifteen as unstable, that is they changed categories, and four as "mixed." These "mixed" children were not consistently classified as secure or anxious. The division of secure, insecure or anxious, while representing two distinct adaptation patterns conceptually may in actuality be found as a range of adaptations. The emphasis of this study is to find themes that provide understanding of a particular relationship within the context of the individuals' relationship histories.

Following the same order in which the children's relationship histories were presented, each child's interactions with the two teachers' will be followed by a commentary to highlight the child's interactions in the classroom including interactions with me as participant observer. A summary of the interaction patterns of each of the teachers will conclude the section of teacher-child relationships.

The Teacher's Interactions With Lilly

The teachers told me that if they were to adopt a child, they would want her to be just like Lilly. Eve readily admitted that Lilly was her favorite. "I don't know, something about her just catches
your eye. I don't know if it's her laugh or her stories, you know. "Mandy says, "Lilly is a sweetheart."

Lilly was shorter than most of her classmates, but solidly built with black straight hair, dark shining eyes, and a flashing smile. At three and a half years old Lilly spoke confidently and clearly in a high pitched voice that was easily understood. In addition to her confidence, and skill at expressing herself, her articulation errors, common for her age, added a childish charm to her speech. Consistently friendly at home and at school Lilly interacted with adults and peers in an independent manner. When necessary, she did not hesitate to ask for an adult's assistance.

Lilly was selected as one of the four focus children because she, more than any other child, exemplified interaction behaviors of a securely attached child. Preschool children with secure histories typically had relationships with their teachers that were "warm, mutually respectful, agreeable, age-appropriate, and matter-of-fact (Sroufe and Fleeson, 1988). Children whose needs were met, were typically happy, enjoyed themselves, and responded with positive affect (Sroufe, 1983). According to Sroufe and Fleeson, "teachers exercised significantly less control over children with secure histories, they gave them (saw them as needing) significantly less nurturance, made significantly fewer allowances for inappropriate behavior and had significantly higher expectations for compliance" (1988, p. 35). Sroufe's and Fleeson's study of preschool teacher-child relationships and the characteristics of secure child's relationship
with the teachers is assuming certain characteristic of the teachers as well as the child. In their study the teachers were highly qualified and trained professionals. One would expect that the characteristics of the relationships would vary somewhat when teachers with different histories and levels of expertise were paired with secure children.

**Mandy and Lilly.** "I asked her Mom the other day if she ever woke up in a bad mood, because ever since I've known her, she's come in with a smile on her face, every day, every day. She's got a wonderful personality. She is cute as she can be and I love her to death." Mandy and Lilly have a mutually affectionate relationship. According to Mrs. Lyle when Lilly wants permission to do something she asks Mandy. She seemed to have learned that Mandy was more flexible and was more likely to respond positively to reasonable requests than was Eve.

Mandy said that she wished all the children were like Lilly. To her, Lilly was the child who got along well with both peers and teachers. And "her parents are so nice." Mandy had only been with Lilly since her and Eve's classes merged, but Lilly seemed to trust Mandy and interacted with her as often as she did Eve especially, as time went one. Mandy usually lead group times where Lilly initiated interactions by asking questions and by offering to share "stories." She often began, "Do you know what? . . . ." She was skillful at relating incidents and was therefore called on to share more at group time than most of the children. Lilly was usually able to listen
quietly when Mandy was talking and often raised her hand to get Mandy's attention. When Mandy asked questions about "rules" for going on a walk or for descriptions of the weather, Lilly was an eager volunteer.

Every morning Mandy read about half of the children's names from a card and then asked each child to choose a particular helper role. Mandy read Lilly's name, but because Lilly was talking, she did not hear it and was passed over. When Lilly realized what had happened she began to cry. Mandy said, "It's too bad, you weren't listening." Sometimes children were given a second chance to redeem themselves but not in this case. Mandy left Lilly sitting crying and while she joined the children eating snack on the other side of the room. Eventually Lilly joined the group.

At another snack time Lilly was one of the last children to be called to the snack table and fusses because the only kind of juice that was already poured at the table was not what she wanted. Mandy explained, "I usually make them--whatever they get and if you're the last one--that's one of the good things if you're quiet you get to get up and choose, or pour out what you don't want and get water or whatever. I gave in. I do that often with them though, not just her."

Lilly's social skills contributed to the teachers' affection for Lilly. Mandy seemed to respond to Lilly by expecting her to follow the rules as closely if not more closely than the other children, some of whom were seldom able to be quiet while waiting for their names
to be called for snack. "At nap time she's got a little stuffed rabbit that she's attached to. If you take that away from her she can let out a wail like you're killing her. She does her share of sticking out her tongue and stuff like that. I discipline her just like I do any of the other ones, but she is--she's as cute as she can be. I'm not saying she's my favorite, but she is cute. She can get to you with her eyes and her little smile."

Her smile can get to you. She can come up to you and give you this little hug and this little smile like, you are going to give me what I want. And sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. It comes up when I see her doing something. She'll come up and sit on your lap and want to hug you to make you not put her in time-out or something like that.

Mandy also described Lilly's practice of initiating conversation with her.

Lilly will come up and give you a hug spontaneously, not just when you're disciplining her. In the morning she will come up and sit and we'll just talk. She'll sit there and ask me questions or something. She tells me what she needs too, and if she gets hit hard enough for it to hurt, she would tell me that too.

One day Lilly began to scream while pulling a doll from another child. Mandy reminded Lilly, "Use your words." Lilly sobbed and shouted, "I had it first." The other child relinquished her claim on the doll and Lilly stopped crying. Mandy said, "I can get along with Lilly because she listens and she'll do the things that we need to do."
As with Eve, Lilly seemed to initiate more interactions with Mandy than Mandy did with her.

**Eve and Lilly.** Lilly and Eve have been paired as teacher and child since Lilly was moved into Eve's class at 30 months old. When the program of which they were a part, closed, Lilly with 7 other children moved with Eve to the present day care center where they were soon to became part of one large group of 24 children with 3 teachers. Eve smiled when she talked of Lilly. "She just holds a place in my heart. I mean all the kids do, but Lilly is different. Maybe because we have been together the longest and she is so warm." In addition to being Lilly's teacher, Eve babysat for Lilly in her home on several occasions though she was not the regular baby sitter. "When I come to her house, she's right there at the door. I can hear her inside, 'Mommy, I get it. I know it's Eve.'" Eve makes no apology for her preference for Lilly and suggested that it may have something to do with Lilly being of a different race than most of the other children and with her being adopted.

I think she's, well, she probably has been though a lot since she is adopted and all that other stuff, she's probably struggling. I mean, she doesn't realize it yet, but she'll have to realize how--her parents are really sweet. So I guess that helps. Half the children--some of the children in the center are the way that she should be, throwing tantrums and stuff like that, but it's like she knows that she is loved.
Eve admires Lilly's positive behavior. In Eve's mind, Lilly would have every reason to act otherwise. Eve refers to "all that other stuff" as the likely prejudice Lilly will face as a racial minority as well as having adopted parents of a different race than her own. Eve sees Lilly's "wonderful parents" as mediating the negative affect of what she will face growing up, "I mean she was a baby when she came here (to this country) and you think about all that stuff she's probably been though, ... and how she feels and how she is." Eve's own experience as a Black American affected her empathy for Lilly.

One day Eve was sitting on the carpet with Lilly on her lap and three other children beside her. Eve said,

She'll just plop on your lap and 'will you read this to me?" or something like that. Or 'can you play with me?' She is not like the other children, 'No I want such and such.' I like to read to her because she is not one of those kids that when you read they're looking all out in space. She listens.

When the story was finished Eve started to get up but Lilly hugged Eve around her neck laughing. Eve laughed too and told her, "Let go of me, Lilly," and Lilly released her hold and ran off." This interaction happened early in the study and was one of the few times that I saw Eve sit on the floor with the children.

Of the positive interactions between Lilly and Eve, Lilly initiated most of them. Lilly initiated positive interactions with many of the children as well as with the adults. Some of her interactions were brief but they illustrate Lilly's sensitivity to others
as well as her own positive sense of self. One morning Eve arrived
and Lilly ran up to her and said, "Good Morning." Eve returned the
greeting and moved away from Lilly to go hang up her coat. Eve
terminated the interaction, but Lilly appeared satisfied with the
response and turned to join her peers.

Eve says, "She knows how to manipulate me. Lilly's 'but, Miss
Eve,' . . . and I'll go, 'Well alright.' 'Anything you want.'" One cold
Friday afternoon Lilly did not want to go outside, but Mandy had
said that she had to go outside like everybody else. Eve was staying
inside to change the sheets on the cots, so Lilly clung to her leg and
said, "I want to stay with Miss Eve, please, I want to stay with Miss
Eve." Lilly started to cry and Eve picked her up and said "Okay, I'll
bring her out." Mandy calmly replied, "Eve, you're not helping."

"She's a sweet little girl but she has her moments." Those
moments that Eve referred to were the times when she tried to
change Lilly's behavior and Lilly refused to comply. At nap time
after one of "her moments," Lilly rejected Eve's attempt to pat her
back in favor of Mandy, "No, I want Mandy!" Eve said, "She gets mad
when I put her in time out, but she gets over it." Eve sometimes
defers to Mandy when she cannot get Lilly to comply.

When Eve occasionally led the group time, she acknowledged
Lilly's raised hand immediately. Eve said, "She can tell the best
stories." Lilly often raised her hand in response to teachers'
questions. Raising one's hand was a prerequisite for being called on.
However even when Lilly didn't raise her hand, Eve was likely to acknowledge her and to let her continue.

One afternoon toward the end of nap time, I had just arrived and Eve was the only adult in the classroom. Nearly half of the children were awake but were told to be quiet and to stay on their cots. One little girl was in time-out. Lilly and the little boy beside her were conversing, but would stop momentarily when Eve scolded them. Finally, after 30 minutes of having them ignore her, Eve threatened that she would take things from their cots if they did not lie still and be quiet. As could be expected the children being 3 and 4 years old and having rested for over 2 hours already, began to talk and play again. Eve then went from child to child gathering various toys, saying spitefully, "I warned you!" One child cried loudly in protest when she removed his favorite blanket. At this point, Lilly came over to Eve and asked very solemnly, "Are you going to take my bunny rabbit and my pillow?" Eve responded, "I will if I need to." Lilly then asked Eve, "Are you going to take them home with you?" Eve's reply was, "I might." A while later Eve walked around the group stating what she had confiscated from each child. She said, "I have Lilly's blanket, Jason's car, Kurt's blanket," and continued until she had named all the children from whom she had taken articles.

Eve and Lilly's interactions were characterized by Lilly initiating those with positive affect and Eve, those with negative affect. The negative affect interactions were centered around Eve's
attempt to restrict or modify Lilly's behavior. Many times Lilly was compliant with Eve's restraints. At other times, Lilly used her social skills, (i.e., her ability to manipulate Eve through her stories, her affection, and her appearance. Depending on Eve's overall mood and the particular circumstances she either gave in to Lilly's wishes or adamantly maintained her position. Over the course of the observations it appeared that Mandy was becoming a more frequent object of Lilly's social initiatives and that Eve was becoming less so. Two factors seemed to be contributing to the change. First, Lilly arrived in the morning before Eve did and thus was in the class when Mandy was the only adult; Lilly left early most afternoons and was usually gone by the time that Eve had the class to herself. Secondly, Lilly seemed to be learning that Mandy was more likely to assist her when she needed something, whereas Eve was either not attentive or she referred Lilly to Mandy to get what she needed.

Commentary. Within minutes of my very first visit to the class Lilly plopped herself into my lap, asked me my name and began showing me her doll. She then asked, "Will you keep my baby?" and ran off to continue playing with her peers in another area of the room. Lilly readily approached adults to give a hug, talk or make requests for them to get what she could not do for herself. Though she didn't hesitate to ask for help from adults, she seemed to rely less on adults than many of her classmates. She was physically active both inside and outside on the playground and confidently performed self-help tasks commonly performed by 4-year-olds.
One day on the playground Lilly approached me and asked if I would like to hear a story. I responded that I would and she began a nonsense story, then giggled with her three companions and the girls ran off together. One of Lilly's strongest attributes was her ability to engage others socially and to use her sense of humor to continue interactions. She was imaginative and liked to make up stories but would also relate and share stories of things she has experienced. Both teachers recalled their delight at hearing Lilly's stories. Along with her classmate Brent, Lilly had begun to tell stories at rest time while a teacher was patting her back. Lilly played with many other children, preferring her own gender like most other 3-year-olds, but played well with boys also. Lilly was enjoyed by her peers as well as the adults.

Lilly was generally cooperative but not always compliant. She would stoically resist when she felt she has been wronged. On my third visit I tried to quiet Lilly at nap time, while the director met with Mandy and Eve in her office. Lilly resisted my attempts to pat her back insisting that she be allowed to sit up on her cot so that she could see through the window to where Eve and Mandy were sitting. I interpreted her demands as a manipulative ploy and countered with firm words, telling her that she was expected to lie down. She began sobbing and I realized that I had misread her attachment for her familiar teachers as resistance to lying down. Manipulating me may have been a part, but even so it served to bring her into visual contact with her caregivers.
For our interview Lilly left the room very willingly with me and answered my questions as well as asked questions of her own. With her permission I recorded our conversation and played it back to her. She covered her mouth with her hand as she laughed at hearing herself singing "Twinkle, twinkle, little star." Lilly was attentive and very willing to do everything I suggested. She only resisted when I told her that we needed to go back to the room. She delayed us by asking to read just one more story to which I agreed. To questions of which adult she preferred, she thoughtfully answered most of the questions using Mommy slightly more often than Daddy, but Eve and Mandy were selected almost equally in an alternating pattern.

One day at group time Mandy had finished, but the snack was not yet ready. I offered to read a story to the group and used the opportunity to ask several children including the four focus children to help act out the story as I read. Lilly very quickly followed the story and responded to my promptings. She was focused on the familiar story and began to act out the drama spontaneously as I read.

Lilly's charm and personal appeal stemmed in part from her appearance, her voice and language abilities coupled with her awareness of how to engage others. Her balance between independence and involvement with others made her approaches welcome ones. She involved others without dominating them or demanding of them more than they want to give. Lilly's
representational model of self was that of being "worthy of an adult's attention." On the strength of her own working model Lilly was able to influence her adult caregivers to respond to her in a reciprocal fashion. Her teachers seldom initiated positive contact with her, but they were usually responsive to her initiatives.

The Teachers' Interactions with Abby

Abby was a tall, young four-year-old with straight, light brown hair and light blue-green eyes. She had been in Mandy's classroom ever since she turned 3 years old, a year before this study began. Mandy recalled that Abby's transition to her classroom had been very easy. "She was real dependent on me at first, but the change was fine. Abby seemed proud that she was going to be a "big girl" and never asked about her old teacher or classroom." The transition from home to school however, was difficult. Abby would cry and cling to her mother. Mandy blamed the poor transition on Abby's mother saying that she confused Abby by staying and playing with her some mornings and other mornings rushing out the door telling Abby, who was crying, to "be a big girl." Eve also was critical of Abby's mother, blaming her for Abby's problems.

Selected because of her pattern of dependence on adults Abby would sometimes cling to them and was often fearful of trying new things and gave up easily, behavior typical of anxious attachment (Sroufe, 1983). She sometimes excused herself from trying to do things for herself by saying "I'm just a little girl." Her behavior was not always dependent, however. She usually spoke softly and slowly
but at other times used a very demanding and bossy tone with peers and adults. When she was tired or upset her voice became whiny, a quality that irritated both of her teachers. One morning she complained, "Nobody will play with me."

Abby was less adept physically than her peers. She ran rather stiff legged and hesitantly. On the playground Abby chose to sit or walk around rather become involved in active play. She was generally compliant, but would occasionally assert herself and defy an adult when she really wanted something and especially if the adult's approach had been confrontational. When given a chance she would command an adult's exclusive attention and attempt to ward off any other children who might want to join them.

When Abby played with peers she depended on teachers to solve their conflicts. She was likely to cry or withdraw, but if a teacher was in the immediate area she would look to her for help. When another child was trying to see her toys, Abby moved away from him saying in a whiny voice, "stoooooop." Each time that Abby retreated, the boy continued to press against her with Abby becoming more and more distressed and seemingly defenceless. She took on the role of victim frequently, and was never observed to be the aggressor with her peers. Sroufe & Fleeson (1988) report victimizing to be common among anxiously attached children.

**Mandy and Abby.** Mandy complained that Abby's mom had unrealistic expectations for her child by saying that she is going to Yale or Harvard. "She comes in and says, '"'Don't worry Abby you're
better than they are any way and you have better toys at home than they do." While Mandy disliked the mother's parenting and did not particularly enjoy Abby, she continued to encourage Abby, and was consistent in her expectations of her. When Abby came out of the toilet having snapped her own pants she approached Mandy saying, "Look!" Mandy responded, "Good for you, Abby." For the past two weeks Abby had refused to fasten them but with encouragement from Mandy and others she had finally succeeded. Mandy was standing nearby and Abby chose her to seek recognition from.

Mandy commented, "I don't want to be mean to her, yet I want her to do things on her own so I try not to do them, or I've tried 'Abby, you can do it,' and I sort of walk away so she'll do it for herself. But she's very dependent and not knowing if she should do it-- if it's the right time to do it. It's not that she can't. I think that's her problem." Mandy explained Abby's confusion further, "She's dependent sometimes with her Mommy and other times Mommy doesn't want her to be and she's a 'big girl', and then sometimes she's Mommy's little girl again."

Mandy said that Abby's whining was very frustrating to her. Mandy described how she had tried to strongly encourage Abby to try her skates, "I said, 'Okay Abby, let's go.'" But Abby refused to try to stand up. Mandy reported that Abby's mother said, "Well what do you think? Those skates were borrowed, but Abby wants a pair. I think Abby's balance is really good." Mandy informed Mrs. Ames that Abby had not done very well with them. Mandy explained,
I think she plays with older children at home where she can be the 'little' girl, but she can talk real grown up, not grown up, but speaking really clearly and things like that, 'I don't like that,' and 'My mommy doesn't do that.' Sometimes she whines and sometimes--I think she is really confused about that, when to be grown up and when not to be. Sure she should be dependent, she's only 3-years-old, but yet she doesn't need to be a baby or grown up.

Abby received little positive attention from Mandy other than encouragement to try things that she was fearful of doing. Abby was greeted routinely in the morning by Mandy and then Abby would wonder into the room. At group time one morning, Mandy reminded Abby several times to stop talking to another child while Mandy was trying to give instructions to the group. Abby began talking again and Mandy banished her from the group by saying, "Good-bye, Good-bye" and waved her hand to motion Abby toward the time-out chair. Abby's face dropped as she plodded toward the chair and she began to cry. When snack was served Abby was told she could join the group. Occasionally Abby would be patted at nap time by Mandy, but it was assumed that she would be one of the last to fall asleep.

Abby's and Mandy's interactions were infrequent and usually low in affect. Mandy clearly disagreed with Abby's mother but it seemed that Abby's and her interactions were more a result of Mandy's lack of feeling for Abby than feelings of antagonism toward the mother. Mandy commented, that if she were choosing a child to
go with her on an errand outside the room she would not ask Abby because she was too clingy and would not be interesting to be with. Most of Abby's and Mandy's interactions were at transition times and group activity times when Mandy had addressed the whole group and then singled out Abby when she had failed to comply.

**Eve and Abby.** Eve described Abby as being fearful to try activities that required any effort. Eve reported on Abby's response to bike day.

And her mother had brought this big bike with training wheels, and I don't know, I don't think the playground is not that steep of a hill, but she kept putting on her brakes and I was like, no. She was like, "It's too steep of a hill." We're [Mandy and Eve] like, "No it's not, Abby." Why did her mother buy her such a big bike? And her mother wants to buy her skates. If you've ever seen Abby on skates--. [She laughed and shook her head.] Abby just seems so dependent. Abby is like, "I might get hurt," "I can't do this."

Eve contrasted Abby with Lilly, "Lilly might fall down on purpose just to see how it feels."

There is just something about Abby. "Tie my shoe," [Eve imitated Abby using a whining voice.] I think it has a lot to do with her parents. I'm sure they do everything for her. Her mother keeps telling us not to let Abby get by with anything, but if she lets her get by, how are we going to stop it? She says, "Mommy lets me." Her mother told
her she didn't have to take a nap. And then, how can you tell a child, "yes, you do." One day Abby was playing in housekeeping during nap and I had to tell her mother about it. And her mother asks me right in front of Abby, "If she gets a book and lays still, is that okay?"

Eve would like to have responded to Abby's mother, "You've been telling her that all along; why are you asking me now?" Eve reported, "Abby will tell you 'no' in a heartbeat if she doesn't like something you do."

It was rest time and the children had been reminded to lie down. Abby, explaining why she was sitting up, said, "My 'brother' was sitting on my head." Abby's brother was an imaginary figure that appeared from time to time at home and at school. Mandy instructed Abby, "Well, tell him to get off." Abby continued to have difficulty settling down for rest and had removed her shoes and socks. Eve commanded her, "Abby, put your shoes and socks back on, because you have so much trouble lately with getting cold." Abby replied, "But I have a blanket." Mandy in an softer tone said, "Abby, put your socks back on." Abby began to cry softly. The teachers were all occupied in patting other children's backs so I moved beside Abby and whispered that her feet will stay warmer with her socks on. She put them on and allowed me to pat her back and soon fell asleep. She was evidently very tired; she usually took a long time to fall asleep, if at all.
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Eve was resentful and angry when Abby tried to tell her what
to do. Eve's approaches to Abby were often confrontational and
Abby responded with resistance. One afternoon after rest time,
Abby had gotten some paper and went to a table and sat down to
draw. Eve had told the children that they were restricted from that
side of the room, but Abby had been in the toilet and it was unlikely
that she had heard Eve's instructions. I was too far from them to
hear the first part of the dialogue, but I could see Eve supporting
her self on the table and leaning directly into Abby's face. Abby who
was saying "no," Eve responded with "yes." The exchange went
several rounds increasing with volume and pitch each time.
Eventually Eve left and Abby remained at the table. During an
interview I asked Eve to tell me more about this incident and she
claimed not to remember it. The interview was several days later
and it is certainly possible that Eve may have forgotten it. When I
asked whether there were other interactions with Abby that she
could remember that I may not have observed, Eve replied, "Abby is
sometimes a sweet little girl. She'll come and sit in your lap and
whisper in your ear 'I love you' and give you a hug and you're like,
okay. It comes all of a sudden, you're like what?"

When Abby was at Eve's table using crayons during a teacher-
directed activity, Eve reminded her frequently to comply with the
directions. "Do it this way, Abby." It did not appear that Abby was
deliberately doing something contrariwise. When Abby would say, "I
can't," Eve would express her clear displeasure either verbally or through her frown and hands on her hips.

I'm like, 'Abby just keep trying,' and then she'll do it so slow where you have to do it for her, like [if] you're on your way out the door. She can do everything but snap her pants and she'll stand in the toilet stall and won't move and there are a whole lot of kids waiting to use it. It makes me really frustrated. I asked Eve if she thought Abby knew she was frustrated. Eve replied,

Sometimes I think she can and sometimes I think she doesn't. When she was trying to snap her pants, I don't think she knew. . . because I just kept saying, "try, try." When she was playing in the housekeeping at nap time, I'm sure she knew I was frustrated because I sat her down and made her lie down and take off her shoes. If I tell her, quit all your pouting, I don't want to hear it, you know. I think she tries to see how far I'll go. She's always like, "If you hurt me, I'll tell my mommy."

Laughing Eve continues, "You're immediate reaction is like, 'I don't care.' Her mother is like the type that blows everything up, you know, and well, -- I can't say that she is." Eve then described an incident where she had just put Abby in time-out just as Abby's mother arrived to pick her up. "I was like, oh no, but I explained it to her and she said, 'Abby's not perfect all the time.' She is really a nice woman, but Abby can do no wrong." Eve summarized her idea about Abby, "The thing that stands out with Abby is 'I can't do,' 'Do this for
me.' 'I can't.' I mean that's the first thing that comes to my mind, that's all I see." Eve added a comparison of Abby to Lilly, "Abby tells you what to do, Lilly asks you."

Eve clearly did not like Abby or her mother and Eve's attitude toward Mrs. Ames was reflected in her behavior and attitude toward Abby. Eve was impatient with Abby and Abby was resistant in return. Eve recognized that not all of Abby's behavior was negative and remembered when Abby had shown her affection. That act was not reciprocated and in fact it took Eve by surprise. Abby's dependence was frustrating to Eve because it demanded something from Eve. Eve's controlling behavior toward Abby was exacerbated when Abby made verbal demands on Eve. These demands threatened Eve's role of teacher and contradicted her concept of what a child's role should be.

Commentary. To her teachers, Abby was sometimes a boring child and frequently frustrating to be around. Both teachers recognized her lack of initiative in doing self-help tasks, and her timidity in trying new skills. They were annoyed by her whining and by her dependence which seemed to them to be the result of inappropriate parenting on the part of Abby's mother. Eve thought that Mrs. Ames had undermined her authority as a teacher by giving Abby contradictory messages as to what was expected of her at school. Mandy also identified Abby's confusion as a result of Mom's ambiguity of wanting Abby to remain dependent when it was convenient, but at other times insisting that she be grown up.
Abby's dependence put demands on her teachers which they were not willing to perform. In addition to the demands they saw little in Abby that satisfied their own needs. Abby sometimes made demands on the teachers using an aggressive tone modeled from ways she had heard an adult speak to her. The inconsistency between her dependency and her occasional assertiveness was an irritant to her teachers, especially Eve who seemed to prompt Abby's bossiness. Abby made claims of an adult's attention and guarded it possessively as if it were the only way to assure continued attention. Abby initiated more positively affected interactions with her teachers than her teachers did with her. When the children were seated on the floor to watch a video Abby would sit in a teacher's lap if a teacher made herself available. During these times of intimate contact Abby would occasionally tell the teachers that she loved them or whisper other endearments. These actions were tolerated, but seldom reciprocated. Teachers' initiatives with Abby were most often in the form of correcting her behavior.

The teachers were puzzled by Abby's imaginary friends. Abby's fantasy world was based on realistic details and was told in a rather droning voice which offered little intrigue to her teachers. Once Abby told about being invited to her cousins overnight. When Abby left to go home I wished her a good time at her cousins to which her mother retorted, she's not going to her cousins and no such plans had been spoken of. Abby's fantasy appeared to serve as an outlet for her own expression and not as a means of manipulating
others as Brent's did or to entertain as did Lilly's. One day Abby came with a small pocket calculator telling me that she could talk to her Dad when ever she wanted to by pressing certain buttons. Throughout the morning she would occasionally pick it up and hold it to her mouth as if she were speaking into it. For several days earlier a silk scarf seemed to serve a similar link to a world beyond school.

Mandy wondered whether she should be concerned about Abby's make believe characters. "She doesn't talk about them all of the time but when she does its as if they are real." Eve said, "She can just ignore you better than anybody." Abby's inattentiveness was more likely the result of her involvement in her fantasy world than it was a conscious choosing to ignore Eve.

During my first visit to the room Abby took my hand saying, "Want to play with these?" I sat down with her and we played together until Brandon came up and wanted to join us. Abby scolded him and let him know that there were not enough pieces and that she was playing with me. I suggested another set of pieces. Abby acquiesced and Brandon happily joined us. Later at the circle game Abby sat beside me and got very angry when another child tried to sit on the opposite side.

Throughout the beginning observations Abby would greet me when I arrived even leaving play with peers to do so. She sometimes would ask me to play with her, one day announcing that we were going to play jacks. My response to Abby's possessiveness was usually to accept her invitations but to include other children in
the play as well. Toward the end of the observations she informed me one morning that no one would play with her. I asked her who she had wanted to play with her and she named a particular child. I responded, "That hurts your feelings doesn't it. She nodded and went off to find another activity. I was fortunately no longer her first or only choice of playmates.

During my 'interview' with Abby I asked her to tell me which of her teachers she would ask to play with her. I had dolls representing Mandy and Eve. She said, "You," pointing to me. I said pretend that I'm not here and asked her again, Which one of these would you ask?" She replied again, "Pretend that you are here and I would ask you." Mrs. Ames had commented that Abby didn't seem particularly attached to either of her teachers. When Mandy and I discussed Abby's insistence on having me to herself, Mandy said "I could have predicted that she would do that." Mandy and Eve believed that Abby's dependence on adults was excessive but were unable to build a relationship of trust with her. It appeared that Abby had given up on them, but saw new adults who were in anyway receptive to her as potential candidates for their attention.

For Abby, some caregivers must be sought after and possessed. At other times they must be commanded into action. Her tactics are coherent with her own model of herself as not being worthy of the adults' attention by simply being Abby. Abby's model of herself was frequently of one who was unworthy and incompetent. "I can't, I'm just a little girl." Sometimes adults must be commanded into a
response. She in turn must require the same of them otherwise she is invisible to them, their own needs shadowing hers. Eve and Mrs. Ames have both sought to control Abby by raising their voice and commanding her. And Abby responded by accusing both of them of hurting her. Abby had learned the voice of control well and used the same belligerent behavior against them, much to their dismay.

Mrs. Ames gave Abby conflicting messages. Mrs. Ames hoped that Abby would grow up to do all the things that she, as her mother had not been able to do. Mrs. Ames was also determined that Abby would be disciplined so that she would become as "perfect" as her friend's daughter. To fulfill these goals it was necessary mother to control Abby. By remaining a little girl Abby would be controllable. However, the cost of Abby remaining dependent was high. Dependence requires that the caregiver give of themselves to the dependent, a position that is difficult or impossible for those who believe they do not receive what they need for themselves. Abby's ambiguity arises from not knowing when to play which role and getting caught for not playing either one well. As Mandy said, "She's only three, she doesn't need to be a baby or grown up."

The Teachers' Interactions with Brent

Brent was a small, blond haired, 3-year-old who habitually wore a baseball cap and frequently clutched a small car in his hand. At 42 months he was the smallest and was also one of the youngest children who joined the class when Eve's and Mandy's classes were merged at the time of the center relocation. At the start of my
participation Eve and Mandy had been working with Brent approximately 10 weeks. Mandy said, "He is a cute little boy and I came to find out real fast that he was going to do what he wants to do, when he wants to do it and how he wants to do it. I had him all wrong. Now he's still cute but that's not the way that I thought he was going to be..." Eve described Brent when he joined the class, "He was just totally out of control, not saying that he's a lot better now, but he is better than he was."

Brent displayed some behaviors characteristic of children with anxious/avoidant attachments, that is, impulsivity, tending toward solitary play, and provoking the anger of caregivers through non-compliance (Sroufe, 1983; Erickson, Sroufe, & Egeland, 1985). Brent was chosen for this study because of his pattern of withdrawal from the group, his preoccupation in solitary play, and his defiance of teacher direction. Brent vacillated between solitary play and social dialogue with the teachers that was often manipulative in nature. Verbally he could express complex ideas as well as creative ones. He had an imaginary "Mousy" that was the subject of many "off the wall" comments and stories told to his teachers. "Mousy" seemed to function as an "alter ego, doing and saying what Brent could not, and standing in for Brent when he was in trouble with the teachers. Brent was cognizant of his ability to entertain the teachers and did so on different occasions, but especially during rest time when the teachers were a rather "captive" audience as they tried to get him to sleep. An example of Brent's unusual sensitivity and ability to
express himself occurred one morning when the sky had turned black in the wake of heavy rain. He turned and said to me, "It's really getting dark outside!" and then added thoughtfully, "And I can't do a thing about it!"

Eve and Brent. Eve was baffled and intrigued by Brent. She felt helpless at times, seeing him, this small three-year-old as more powerful than herself. To her he was unruly, undisciplined, and "spoiled," and in the same breath, "but at times he can be so sweet." Eve and Brent conflicted and got into matches of will. Eve: "Yes!", Brent: "No!" etc. Eve appeared to give up in frustration and to feel that she had "lost." Eve commented that even in time-out he played and talked. "Nothing seemed to work or to get to him." "He says he is sorry because he knows that that will get him off the hook."

Eve was very amused by his stories especially at nap time and at other times when the imaginary Mousy was discussed. Brent succeeded in drawing her into his imaginary world especially at nap time when she had told him that she didn't want to hear any talking. Brent would sometimes put his hand on her face to guide her eyes to him and begin a long story to which Eve listened attentively, laughing with him and pausing now and then to remind him, "no more, Brent." One day Brent got off of his cot and began walking around the room. Eve told him to lie down and warned, "Brent, one more time and you'll have to go out in the hall." He screamed, "No!" and began a story about how his grandpa with a broken back was going to come and get her. To avoid further screaming which might
waken other children, Eve told him "okay" and eventually he laid down and went to sleep.

One day Eve called to Brent and he ran away from her. When she caught up to him, I could only hear him say, "I hate you!" Eve recalled the event, "He has the cutest little face, but its not his face, its his personality, wanting to get up and run away. He just tries your patience so much. Then when you have to discipline him he starts crying and throwing fits." Eve saw Brent as a negative model for the other children by enlisting their support for himself in his conflicts with her. Eve said, "You can't talk to all of them at the same time because they'll just sit there and smile at each other and laugh because it's so funny. To be so small, he can be a big influence on the class." Another time Eve told Brent to sit in time-out for running around the room and waking other children. Brent responded, "I don't like you! I don't like you! I don't have to sit in time-out if I don't want to." Eve said, "He yells in your face and it's really irritating! One time I yelled back at him and he started crying. Sometimes he'll sit in time-out and he'll kick you. What else can you do to him? He's already in time out? I think Brent has sat in time out so much that it doesn't scare him any more."

She went on to explain that Brent was not made to do anything at home and was not going to do what he was told to do at school either. "I think he needs discipline." Eve explained what she thought needed to happen. "I think we need to take stuff away from him that he likes a lot like his trucks and cars and things like that. His outside
time and his art. He loves art. Because he just sits in time-out and plays and it's no big deal."

One afternoon, sensing Eve's despondent mood Brent asked her, What's wrong, Eve?" Eve reflected,

I don't know, I look at him in awe because he is so small in size and what should he know, and he knows so much more and he can just pick up -- it make me feel strange that I can't always show so much of myself in front of him, because I'm scared he'll notice something is wrong or something like that so you kinda have to, you really have to keep that happy kind of "Brent" [said in a high-pitched light voice]. That makes me feel strange. A little child can know so much.

Eve was amused by Brent's talk but had not seemed to find a way to support his imagination at times when it was not used to manipulate her. "See, he can be so sweet at times and give you hugs and that makes it all the harder. I've never seen a child talk so much. He knows that if I just talk the whole time and if I be cute, then I don't have to go to sleep or I won't get in trouble." Her feelings about him were very ambivalent. She was unable to control this small three year old and that frustrated and sometimes angered her, but on the other hand she said "he is so sweet and cute" and he made her laugh and entertained her. She saw these different aspects in one child as very puzzling and almost impossible for her to deal with effectively.
Mandy and Brent. Mandy described Brent as having a short attention span. She said that he could not stay with any one activity for more than 15 minutes. "He's got to be doing something fast."

Every day the children came in from the playground, washed their hands and lined up to go to the lunch room. Mandy described how Brent would play with his car, walking over the cots that were set out and ready for rest time, and then refuse to wash his hands. When he finally did wash his hands he would get in line anywhere instead of going to the end as he was supposed to. "I've even tried letting everybody else go and he and I would go [to lunch] by ourselves because he's waited too long. He doesn't care, it doesn't make any difference.

Mandy reported, today he was upset because Eve made him go to the end of the line. He gets real mad--"No!, I'm not, No!" It's always, "No, No, No." Mandy related how she invited Brent to get involved in an activity to help ease his separation from his Mother and Dad when they bring him in the morning. "Brent's response is always, no, as if we are telling him what to do--its just to give him something to focus on."

Mandy threatened Brent at nap time and said she would send him to the director if he didn't go to sleep. Brent quickly made promises to change his behavior and more than likely relapsed into the forbidden behavior even more quickly. Sometimes Mandy followed through with her threats promptly and at other times the threat was forgotten or she was distracted at least temporarily by
other children or the teachers. Brent was frequently able to distract her by asking a question or complying at just the right moment to win a reprieve.

Mandy, however was less likely to get drawn into Brent's stories when she was leading the group in circle time. She was firm and consistent with the behavior she expected of the children. Brent's position in the circle was beside Mandy. Brent resisted sitting and attending at circle time and often was sent to time-out for not paying attention or for distracting the others. Many times Mandy would remind him to put away his toys when he came to the circle. But as usual he brought a toy car with him or if it was removed to his cubby, Brent would simply leave the circle, get it and begin to play. By the end of the observations Brent had learned to sit through most of the group time although talking to a child near him was a nearly constant temptation to which he usually yielded.

One morning when I came in Brent excitedly showed me a paper that he had been working on. "Look what I did." He was very proud of his efforts and had just received recognition from Mandy for his efforts to trace the numbers from 1 to 10. He was pleased with the praise from Mandy and expected it from the next available adult also. Mandy and Brent's relationship was in keeping with the role Mandy had defined for herself as teacher. She, like Eve, thought that Brent was cute but she did not get into the entangled battles with him that Eve did. She was more likely to modify the situation
to accommodate Brent than to bring on demands that he was unable
to comply with.

Commentary. The teachers were as intrigued by Brent's stories
as they were frustrated by his noncompliance. Brent was skillful at
winning his teacher's admiration by his cute and clever conversation
which he also used to engage his mother. This same story telling
with "Mousy was used to manipulate his teachers especially at nap
time when little else was competing for their attention. Brent
strongly resisted nap time and did everything in his power to keep
himself and others distracted and entertained. He resisted adults
who tried to soothe him and to help him relax and go to sleep. He
told them not to rub his back, but to hold his hand or whatever it
was they were not doing. He went into long verbal discourses about
why he needed to sit up rather than lie down and then digressed into
long tales that were often irresistibly amusing and entertaining to
the teachers.

Brent responded to limit setting by his teachers with defiance.
Brent's mother used bribes, her undivided attention and other
conciliatory measures not available to his teachers. Brent's
resistance to his teachers escalated in response to their increased
effort toward controlling his impulsive behavior. Mandy and Eve
were both frustrated by Brent's aloofness in time-out, though they
thought that Brent was not as "bad" as he was when he first joined
the class. Often in time-out, which was intended to isolate him from
other more desirable activity, Brent seemed perfectly happy as he
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escaped to his own fantasy world. To Eve this response was especially frustrating because he seemed to enjoy himself in a situation that she intended to be unpleasant for him. Mandy and Eve expressed their surprise that this "cute little boy, who could be so sweet," could also be so unmanageable.

During my "interview" with him, Brent quickly lost interest in the game and did not seem to prefer one teacher over the other to accompany him in the various activities. And it was not apparent that he favored one over the in the way he initiated interactions. Brent appeared to ignore my presence in the room except when I happened to be the adult closest to him when he needed his shoes tied, a lap to sit on, or someone to express an idea to. Often Brent played by himself, oblivious to children and teachers except when they were in his way or he needed something from them. One day as he was running around the room, Brent stuck out his fist and hit every child in his path, quickly saying "I'm sorry" when a teacher stopped him. At other times he was affectionate and wanted the full attention of an adult, especially, but not always, when he was trying to manipulate them. Circle time and waiting in line were the most difficult times of the day for Brent. He cried and argued when reprimanded and frequently ignored teacher's reminders leading to his being banished to the time-out chair. Even then he would sit in time-out and play in defiance when told not to.

Brent's often impulsive and uncontrolled behavior was characteristic of an anxiously attached child. Brent's expectations for
adults was that they would probably not insist on certain behavior from him and that, in addition, he would likely able to manipulate and distract them almost at will. Though on the surface this child was powerful his power was a frightened and inappropriate power of the bully with an underlying script, "I am not worthy of being guided, and the adults in my world are weak." A world where the adults are weak, was a frightening world and a world out of control.

At 3 years old Brent was able to accurately sense the negative emotional states of Eve and his parents and to assume responsibility for "cheering" them. Brent's fantasy world provided both an escape from a world out of control and a way to connect with that world in a safe way. Brent had devised defenses that well suited his needs.

The Teachers' Interactions with Gerald

Gerald was a handsome child, the tallest in the group and one of only two black children in the class. Mandy said that Gerald's participation in group time was very difficult. "His movement was unreal. I mean he would not sit in group time. He didn't not want to do it, period." Gerald moved and changed his position often regardless of the activity, but it was not obvious that this high activity level directly interfered with his ability to attend to what was going on. His movements were however very distracting to his teachers, especially when they had told him to sit still and listen and Gerald did not comply. Eve described him simply as "a mean little boy."
Gerald's first notices of me were negative. One morning I turned off the room lights while the children were standing in line to go outside. The room was still well lit by the large windows. Gerald adamantly told me to "leave them on!" and forcefully switched them on again. Another day early in the study, I entered the room while the children were still on their cots. Gerald who was not asleep, looked up and said disdainfully, "You again!" To that point he had not initiated any other interactions with me.

Gerald was chosen as one of the four target children in part because of his obvious and overt annoyance with my presence in the room. Lilly had welcomed me by asking me to 'baby sit,' Abby had claimed me as exclusively hers, Brent had ignored me, while Gerald had openly expressed his resentment of me. His frequent and lengthy occupancy of the time-out chair and his angry, crying outbursts as a result, resembled anxiously attached preschool children's behavior described by Sroufe (1983).

**Mandy and Gerald.** Having turned four the month the study began, Gerald had been with Mandy for about a year. Her gradually increasing understanding of Gerald's behavior contributed over time to her improved ability to supervise him more effectively.

I can always get Gerald to do what I want him to do. I mean, if I have to tell him that I'm going to take something away and I can get him to calm down when he's going to cry and put his hands in his mouth. I say, Gerald, I can't understand you.
Take your hands out of your mouth. Then he's going to calm down.

Gerald was generally responsive to Mandy except when misbehavior lead to her threatening him. "You'll have to stay inside since you couldn't stop talking." She claimed she could sometimes thwart his outbursts of crying but could not say what triggered them. She felt that she had to have lots of patience with him.

Gerald came to Mandy's classroom with a reputation for bullying the other children who were all smaller than he. "He wasn't like that at all. He did not show that he was a bully and that he would pick on somebody else just because he was bigger. He is bigger and he will hit or punch back and stuff like that but not because he's bigger. I haven't seen him be a bully." Mandy believes that Gerald will not hit others now because they are strong also and will hit him back. "I will ask him if he hits Robert, 'Do you want me to let Robert hit you?' And if I go to get Robert to bring him over, Gerald really gets almost out of control thinking that Robert is going to hurt him."

One nap time when he had wakened before the others as he usually did, she took him on her lap and talked to him about his behavior earlier in the day when he had pulled another child off a tricycle that he had wanted. He looked at her sheepishly and at her questioning promised "not to behave like that any more." He smiled. She joked with him and he responded with smiles seemingly enjoying the positive one-on-one attention from Mandy and the
physical contact with her. She told me later, "He was awful. It started when his mother forgot to bring his tricycle. He didn't like that one bit."

Many times Mandy called Gerald's attention to behavior that was not appropriate and would tell him to leave the group to sit in time-out. She almost never noticed when he was managing his behavior to call his attention to that. In fact it seemed that he was ignored until his window or threshold for self-control had passed and he was "misbehaving" again. When Gerald did have to go to time-out especially when he is loosing a privilege at the same time, he often cried loudly. Mandy would tell him. "Gerald, stop crying, you're not hurt," "You're okay," or "You need to stop crying before you can get up." Sometimes that made him cry even more, but when he did stop no one seemed to notice. Eventually he would begin to play while in time-out and as a consequence, more time was added. Many of Mandy's and Gerald interactions were centered on his noncompliance especially at transitions and at group time.

Mandy seemed to recognize that Gerald had some special abilities but supporting those special characteristics, other than as they were manifested in conflict situations, did not seem to be a concern of hers. Mandy recognized that he had special abilities but did not interact with him as teacher on that basis. She was not aware of the academic skills that he had learned at home and had little one on one time with him in any kind of assessment or close observation. She was unaware for example, that he recognized the
numerals up through 100. Gerald got the same opportunities and penalties as everyone else. No adjustment appeared to be made to accommodate his particular needs or support his strengths. No more or less was expected of him than for the others. When Gerald arrived Mandy sometimes tried to assist him in the transition but usually other than a "Hello" the separation from home to school was left to the parent. Gerald made few demands on Mandy directly—only when he was not complying with the rules at the particular time when those rules were being enforced. Otherwise he was independent in doing things for himself and meeting his own needs. Gerald attended to Mandy more readily than he did to Eve. Mandy believed that his parents were doing a good job with Gerald and that they were comfortable to talk with.

**Eve and Gerald.** Eve expressed disappointment in her relationship with Gerald. With both of them being African Americans she had hoped and had assumed a relationship with him that would be qualitatively different than with the other children. "You're kinda like hoping it will make a difference because I'm the first black teacher he has ever had, but it didn't." She began her discussion of Gerald, "He is a mean little boy." Eve thought that Gerald's mother was nice but that Gerald's dad was critical of her and that his indulgence in his son was the cause of Gerald's behavior. Eve thought that Gerald was a really difficult child and for her, he certainly was. Gerald resisted or protested when he was verbally, pushed, threatened or denied. For Eve this was her most common
way of supervising children resulting in a relationship with Gerald that was mostly antagonistic.

One afternoon Eve was, as usual, admonishing children to be quiet. Gerald, as usual, who seldom slept was not quiet. He began to mock her as she continued to scold them. His quiet but audible mockery, infuriated Eve and he was sent to time-out. Another afternoon, Eve told Gerald and several other children who had been noisy at nap time, to sit in time-out. He sat and cried and she told him not to cry or he would not get to go outside. The other children didn't seem to be affected by the threat, but Gerald cried all the louder. Eve instructed him to be quiet several times each time with a reminder of her threat. When it was time to go out, Gerald and his peers had to continue their sitting in "time-out," outside. Eve soon released most of the children to go and play but Gerald was made to sit longer for having cried.

One day near the end of nap time when Gerald was awake, Eve continually threatened to take something away from him if he didn't get quiet and stay on his cot. At one point Gerald approached her at her seat calling her name, "Eve!" "Eve!" She turned to him and said, "Eve is not here." He replied, "Yes, she is." For several rounds she declared her own absence as he contradicted her. At one point he asked, pointing at me, "Is that Eve?" She said, "No." Then he grinned and put his arms around her. She held him to her for a brief while, one of few times I had seen her show affection with him. Another time on the playground, Gerald came up to Eve and put his arms
around her. I did not observe Eve initiating similar affection with Gerald. Gerald seemed to want to be physically close to Eve, but did not receive much reinforcement for it.

Commentary. My first visits to the class were generally ignored by Gerald. He announced one morning when I came in, "Today is Dr. Martin Luther Kings birthday." I responded "You're right, Gerald. How did you know that?" Gerald answered, "My Dad told me." One day I was at the end of the line as the children were coming inside from the playground. Gerald had been told by Mandy to go to the back of the line for pushing other children. Instead of going to the end of the line, however, he angrily pushed some other children over. Mandy had already begun to lead the children inside so I took Gerald's hand to prevent further aggression. He protested and then declared that he could walk by himself, I let go of his hand and he walked beside me.

The next day at circle as I sat on the floor Gerald came up from behind me and put his arms around me. Gerald continued to test the limits but when given clear guidelines with an element of choice for him he responded positively. During free play Gerald was often the leader of a game or activity which he had brought from home. In addition to teaching his peers, he also dominated them with his superior strength, knowledge of the games and his confident assertiveness. Gerald had few challengers in the classroom.

Gerald's leadership ability among his peers was virtually ignored except that it was allowed to flourish when the children
were in free play, a time and when the teachers were generally uninvolved and often "unavailable." Gerald initiated most interactions with the adults, both involuntary ones where he was being punished as well as ones involving exchanges over positive discussion or affection. Mandy was sympathetic with his parents but did not actively appreciate their knowledge of Gerald as his teachers as well as his parents. They on the other hand expressed interest in being more involved and better informed about their son's activities at school.

During my interview with Gerald we played the game of choosing the preferred adult. Gerald's choices did not seem to indicate a preference of one teacher or one adult over the other except like Abby when asked who among his teachers he would want to read to him, he said, "You." I had not counted myself as one of his teachers and it was interesting that Gerald considered me among them given my irregular attendance and somewhat unusual role. In fact his confusion over which doll represented which teacher [one doll was white and one was black] suggested that race was not a factor in his choice of the preferred teacher. Following my lead of pretending about the activities Gerald suggested a pretend game of his own in which he assigned each of us a role. He then asked me to read his book which I did before returning to the group in time for lunch.

Gerald's often negative role in the classroom seemed to be partially a product of the classroom system and his rather difficult
temperament. The failure of his two young teachers to actively acknowledge Gerald's leadership and abilities, to accommodate his need for consistency and structure and to support him with a sense of controlling his own behavior, lead them into innumerable conflicts and frustration on the part of the teachers and the child. Gerald was a dominant child whose "slow to warm up" and "difficult" temperament (Chess & Thomas, 1968) did not support ready classroom compliance. Eve's and Gerald's relationship was characterized by conflict contrasted with Gerald's occasional show affection. As the adult in the relationship Eve seemed unable to compromise her own needs or adjust her expectations in order to meet Gerald's needs. Once a course of action was determined Eve followed it to its completion. Mandy's and Gerald's relationship was more open and was not relegated or limited to the role of problem child although the problem behavior was the point around which most of their interactions revolved. Time-out was the context for many of Gerald's interactions with both teachers.

Gerald's interactions with teachers were often characteristically battles. His late arrival after the morning free play meant that his first instructions were sharply counter to his desires. Often just as he had just begun to play, the class was told to clean up for group time, an activity that required him to sit still and be quiet. Gerald's parents in contrast with his teachers planned their activities with him on the basis of his natural curiosity while taking into account his need to "be in control" and his need for predictability and continuity,
his inclination to be in motion and his strong emotional responses. Gerald's behavior at home and his interactions with his parents stood in stark contrast to most interactions with his teachers. Though his parents made allowances, Mr. Graham in particular was clear in his belief that Gerald needed firm limits and high expectations. Gerald's response to parental correction was compliance. Mandy too described Gerald as being usually responsive to what she asked him to do, but that he frequently reverted to his former behavior. With his parents, Gerald was their only study, for Mandy and Eve he was one of twenty-four.

Gerald's models for parental caregivers were of adults who were sensitive and responsive to his needs, while giving him consistent and achievable limits, and at the same time providing him with stimulating experiences. And from his mother, a caregiver was one who provided warm and nurturing. His experiences at school were likely to support a different model, one that reinforced a sense of his being unable to control his body and his emotions, and one that suggested that he was indeed a "mean" boy whose role was to defend himself against adult restrictions.

Commentary on Mandy, as Teacher

I had observed Mandy on the playground earlier in the day playing with the children. She commented, "There is not a whole lot to do on the other playground. I like to play games--structured games, I guess instead of letting them run wild." Mandy could not recall having had adults to play with her in a similar way and
concluded that she had learned to play games with her peers when she was in school. The other playground that Mandy referred to was a large parking lot used in lieu of the fenced playground which was frequently too muddy. Mandy did not assume any responsibility for finding activities or equipment that could be used in the parking lot. The children were left to discover their own. The bare parking lot was perhaps for these children what the TV was for Mandy as a child. Interactions between children and adult were minimal. When the children very naturally turned to playing in the dirt around the perimeter, they were reprimanded, but not provided alternatives. The teachers stood in a huddle and talked unless interrupted by children needing their aid. Although not the rule, this pattern of the adults being present but uninvolved was frequent indoors as well as outside.

Except for those who misbehaved, few children received attention from Mandy who had not initiated interactions themselves either indirectly through misbehavior or direct contact. Mandy's lack of initiated interactions with the children, seemed consistent with her shyness in meeting or initiating interactions with new people. However, these were children that she had known for months and for some for nearly a year, not with strangers. A second theme that ran through Mandy's early experience was that of playing alone. Mandy's pattern of letting the children play on their own fit her description of her own experiences with her early caregivers. She played with her brother or by herself or sat in front of the TV.
Mandy voiced her intention of letting the children know that she liked them and cared about them. "I want to let the kids know that I like them and to not shy away from me." My observations supported a somewhat different practice. Mandy described herself as not taking the initiative in meeting new people and it is this pattern that seems to dominate her interactions in the classroom as well. "I'm not the kind of person that can approach somebody." Mandy was generally receptive and available to children who approached her, but was more likely to listen to and dialogue with the children who had well-developed social skills. Every morning one of the younger children in the class spent his first 5-10 minutes in her lap before getting up and joining in the play. This was a child that Mandy considered cute and well-behaved. She said that he had done that with his previous teacher, and it was his habit, not his attraction to her that accounted for the behavior. She laughed, "Any old lap would do." I couldn't help but wonder whether this habit would have been established if Mandy had been his first teacher.

Lilly and Brent were considered "cute" and were among the children able to get and maintain Mandy's attention readily by telling her "stories." She listened to those who were interesting to her, that is, those who could tell stories and were entertaining, such as Grant or Lilly. Abby, who tended to be demanding and was not well liked by Mandy was unsuccessful at getting Mandy's sustained attention. One afternoon Abby told Mandy, "I don't feel good." "Well,
go lie down," was Mandy's only response. Though Abby tended to whine, complaining about being sick was not a repeated theme. Another child in a similar situation was asked what was wrong and a diagnostic dialogue ensued. Some children's initiations were extended by Mandy's responses while others were abruptly terminated. Mandy seldom if ever encouraged or supported similar initiatives on the part of children who were less skilled or who like Abby, she found uninteresting and generally unappealing.

Interactions with Gerald were frequently Mandy's reactions to his misconduct. One day at nap time while most of the children were still asleep Gerald approached Mandy and asked her a question. She then put her arm around him affectionately and he climbed into her lap. In gentle tones she told him, "I hope you have a better time this afternoon than you had this morning." This interaction seemed to be mutually enjoyed in contrast to many between them. Even so, the content of the discussion was a reminder of his misbehavior.

Mandy's unobtrusive approach as a teacher provided children with ample opportunities for working things out among themselves but for children who had not developed appropriate and positive techniques for engaging adults or peers, there was little opportunity through interaction with her to practice and develop better social skills and to thus build confidence in doing so. A child whom both teachers described as a nearly "perfect" was virtually ignored by Mandy despite his own initiatives to the contrary. His good behavior resulted in his having almost no one-to-one contact with her. One
morning on the playground, despite the presence of all of his regular teachers, the child approached me to tell me about his vacation having just returned after several weeks absence. I found it peculiar that he had chosen me to talk to over Mandy with whom he was much more familiar. His behavior did however, symbolize what I had observed previously. Though "perfect" this child like Abby lacked the skill to entice Mandy in listening to him. He was compliant and made no demands on her. In some ways he seemed to represent the kind of child that Mandy herself may have been. When caregivers were perceived as unavailable, he did not persist but rather figured things out alone and kept things to himself. Mandy's lack of attention to him in the past had taught him to seek attention elsewhere.

Mandy's role as teacher defined and guided her behavior with both children and parents. Being the teacher meant enforcing her expectations of the children. She said of Gerald, "I know he doesn't want to, but I've got to make him do it." Mandy prided herself in having the same expectations for all of the children, although in practice that was not always so. "I treat him just like I do all the rest," she said of Gerald. She made a similar statement when discussing Lilly. Expectations of Gerald represented her equal treatment of all children despite their racial or behavioral differences. The statement regarding Lilly was said in defense of not altering expectations despite favoring her. As enforcer of the rules Mandy responded by halting behavior; preventing inappropriate
behavior would have required her involvement and keen attention before the infraction, which was not part of Mandy's schema for "teacher." Mandy's approach to children's non-compliance was at times thoughtful and planned. She knew what worked with Gerald and what did not. She herself stayed relatively detached when children attacked her personally even once when a child in time-out kicked her in the shins. She was visibly upset but she did not react in anger toward the child.

For Mandy, approaching parents was possible for her because that behavior was inherent in the teacher role. "I couldn't do it if I wasn't their child's teacher." Much of her dialogue with parents centered on problems with the children, mirroring her function as teacher.

The role of teacher for Mandy also meant being leader of the group. Most of Mandy's instructions and admonitions to the children were given to the whole group. When children failed in carrying out group expectations, individuals and well as the group were admonished. Often the individual infractions became the focus of extended teacher-child interactions. One significant exception to Mandy's relating to the children as a group was at nap time. Routinely Mandy chose to pat the same children in the same order. Children who fell asleep rather quickly with assistance were patted first, followed by children such as Grant who tended to distract others. Children, such as the nearly "perfect child," whose cots were on the opposite side of the room were never patted. Nap time was a
social time for the teachers and not to be disturbed by one of the teachers leaving the area. Nap time was an intimate time when individual children received physical nurturing from teachers, one-on-one, in the form of being patted and tucked in. More than any other time of the day, despite teachers simultaneous involvement in their own banter, and occasional outbursts from Brent, nap time represented the time of day when the most positive affect was exchanged between children and teachers.

As a child, Mandy experienced her primary caregiver as "always working." Even though she and her mother currently have a "close" and apparently comfortable relationship that includes telling all, Mandy places limits on what she tells others. As a child she figured things out for herself so as to not "bother anybody" including her mother. In essence as a child she attempted to compensate for the nurturing that an adult did not provide. Her "independence" was a defense against not always having what she needed. Mandy's model of herself was one of uncertainty of being worthy, "they may not like me." Consciously, Mandy as teacher, wanted to let the children know that she liked them, but with little support from her work colleagues and the lack of experience and training in doing so, Mandy tended to rely on her earliest model of the adult who provided basic care but was otherwise unengaged.

Mandy was low in engagement except when the children made demands on her to carry out her role as the teacher who maintained order. She had not had adults who played with her and did not do so
with the children in her care. She returned affection with those children who initiated it but again in keeping with her own experience she did not initiate affectionate or nurturing interactions with the children.

Commentary on Eve, as Teacher. Eve had been teaching in day care for approximately two years after having completed two years of college leading toward a major in education. Eve shared,

All my life I've always wanted to be a teacher so that I could write on the chalk board and tell other people what to do. All my life I've wanted to be a teacher. Always. I remember playing teacher. If I can't be a teacher--what I wanted to do all my life. I mean, that's what I went to school for. I've talked about it for I don't know how long and now I'm finally doing it. Eve commented several times in her interviews, "I just love kids." In an effort to understand Eve's meaning of the word "love" as in the context of young children, I asked what that meant to her. After along pause, "That's a hard question." Eve responded using the same words, "I just love them." Perhaps her explanation of why she chose child care over the more lucrative, yet personal interest in fashion merchandising as a career offers a clue. Speaking of her job in merchandising she said, "I just didn't like it. I felt like I just had to put so much more of myself forward--I tried to be nice, but I had to be so much nicer than that. I just didn't like it. Where with kids, you have to be nice, but not, you know, when you're angry you can show it. You know what I'm saying?" In working with children Eve
felt less was demanded of her by way of monitoring and controlling her own behavior.

Once Eve had made an effort to connect with a child, "It is up to them, they have to come to me." Eve saw her responsibility ending after an initial attempt to get to know them and have them get to know her. Eve said that she thought that they knew that she loved them. "I love them all the same except for Lilly, but it's their attitudes." Eve acknowledged that she treated Lilly differently than the other children. Eve felt that once she had made her move it was up to them. "I think I just have to wait. They have to come to me, there's only so much I can do to make them come to me, but I think it's their turn." Eve did not perceive that she as an adult had tremendous resources for connecting with the child that some children might not have. As with her family relationships, Eve saw the responsibility for change in the interactions as lying outside herself. She resigned herself to living with what was, until the other made the change. Change within herself was not considered.

"I always wanted to be in a classroom, but I feel like sometimes my patience goes, but I want to have some connection with kids. I just love kids, especially babies." Eve explained that the younger the child the less critical they were and the less corrupted they were by society. "Here kids could care less what you have on or what you look like. I guess that's--I just love seeing that." Eve appreciated the relative lack of prejudice and social discrimination of the children. She commented on how she and Lilly could be close in
this situation, but if they were in high school people would notice that they were of different races and that Lilly was adopted. Young children, as compared to adults and older children were less threatening to Eve.

All I know for a teacher is that you have to be not strict-strict, but kind-of-strict, you also have to be fun. You have to make sure they mind. I don't know how they put that. I don't want to say make sure they mind, but you have to see that they are learning anything, not just playing all the time. Eve had a sense that children needed to be disciplined in the way that her parents did her or they would grow up to be the kind of "wild" children like those her sister saw in the high school. Eve mentioned frequently that the children did not seem remorseful in time-out and that she would add another 5 minutes even if they were crying loudly. For her, discipline for wrong action necessitated having a child regret his actions because the punishment was unpleasant. Brent was particularly frustrating to her when he sat in time-out and played. Eve sometimes told children in time-out to stop crying, that "there is nothing to cry about."

When Eve had difficulty managing a child's behavior, she saw it as the fault of the parents. She accused them of being permissive and giving their children too many material things. Eve was especially scornful of parents "who had money." Brent's parents, for example, pledged too much money to the fund raiser, Abby's father drove an expensive car, a sure sign that Abby "didn't want for
anything" and Gerald's Dad bought him too many toys. Eve described her own parents' discipline as harsh. "They let you know with just a look that you were doing something wrong. Mother had a kind of scorn that you knew that you had better stop. Daddy spanked us and as we got older we couldn't use the hi-fi and were grounded and stuff like that."

Loss of privilege and loss of possessions were frequent tactics that Eve used in an attempt to get compliance from the children. If removing one object was not enough to bring the desired behavior surely more deprivation would be better. One particular afternoon when Eve had had a "bad day," the children were starting to wake up having already been on their cots for nearly 3 hours. Other than myself, Eve was the only adult in the room and was determined to keep them quiet and still until the other teacher returned from her break. One child's crying turned to rage as Eve took first a toy, then a book, and finally his blanket, placing them over the cubbies out of his reach. Her response to his crying was a sarcastic, "I'm sorry, but you were talking." The child climbed onto the cubbies and began to pull on his blanket which threatened to pull another heavy object down with it onto a child lying on the cot below. Eve had turned away and was not aware of the impending danger.

Eve's determination to have the children remain quietly on their cots was contrary to children's own needs. She seemed unable and unwilling to take their perspective or to find a compromise solution. Once set in motion her decision to keep them down grew
stronger and more resolute. The more the children resisted, the more determined she became. Her control of the classroom was being threatened and she responded by trying to tighten her hold. Eve perceived her father as having power by being strict and by being stubborn, the latter quality having also been attributed to Eve by her family. In the above incident, Eve's sense of personal power was diminutive. The children she "loved" because they posed the least threat to her tenuous sense of self were threatening the very role she identified for herself as teacher, "telling other people what to do."

For Eve the role of teacher was unclear and lacked a conscious model. Her childhood concept of teacher as being someone who told other people what to do became "as I got older, to help people learn and stuff like that," a simplistic association between teaching and learning. In the classroom Eve still operated from the position of "telling other people what to do." Her model though not a conscious one, was influenced by the practices of her parents and indirectly by Eve's need to feel in control.

Eve's standard for behavior was externally guided by what would please others and thus when she is unable to measure up she committed herself to considerable failure. Eve dismissed her ability to influence the children by saying that the children's parental control was far too strong. Her days were categorized as "good days or bad days" depending on whether she had had a fight with her parents or whether someone had said something to upset her. "I
know whenever I get in a fight with my mother or my father I feel like I'm having a bad day. I mean Mandy and the kids can be great, but I'm still having a bad day because of that."

Eve's relationships with the children appeared to be dependent on the children responding to her in ways that were accepting of her and in ways that did not threaten her control. Eve's discussion of the children focused on their conflicts and her frustrations with behaviors that she wanted to control, but was unable to so so. Eve felt scared and out of control even in the face of these small children. Abby told her what to do. Brent read her feelings and Gerald mocked her authority. Even Lilly had her moments. Eve found it difficult to reconcile that children could be horribly disobedient at one moment and loving and kind to her in the next. The seeming ambiguity of their behavior was always described by Eve as a puzzling dichotomy.

The demands of the children weighed heavily upon Eve, and to cope with the demands, Eve developed an elaborate schema of conscious and unconscious behaviors of disengagement. Deliberate preoccupation with materials and redirecting children to other adults were among the ways that Eve told me that she turned children away when she was tired of hearing them call her name. Eve sought every opportunity to do housekeeping chores such as leaving the room to get the snack, cleaning up after snack, and changing the cot sheets, etc. These chores served to limit her direct responsibility for the children and gave her a legitimate excuse to refuse their
requests. Other ways in which Eve became unavailable to the children were by ignoring their requests, (she simply did not respond); by disavowing their requests, "You're not hurt," when a child with a scraped knee asked for a band aide; by consistently refusing their requests, "No, you can't have that"; and by shutting down. When Gerald called her name repeatedly she said of herself, "She is not here." Her almost consistent refusal to honor even simple requests, resulted in fewer and fewer children addressing such requests to her. They seemed to learn that going to another adult was likely to yield a more favorable result. Sometimes Eve would sit without facing the children staring at her fingernails as if far away in thought.

The most common practice that separated Eve from the children was her talking with other adults. While some amount of personal talking among adult staff members was necessary to create a supportive social climate, Eve became absorbed in their discussions to the exclusion of the children. Her talking not only maintained a distance between Eve and the children, it also served to keep the other teachers occupied as well. "I think one of my biggest problems is that I love to talk and sometimes I talk too much. I mean I can still watch them, but you know I should be watching them. I'm not saying that I just totally turn my back on them and have a good time talking, but I think I talk too much." All of the teachers who worked in the room during this study clustered around each other both in the classroom and on the playground. They were attentive to the
children to varying degrees, Eve being the least likely to interrupt her conversation to proceed with activities or to notice a child that needed adult supervision.

"I just feel I would do anything for those kids. Not anything they ask, but if like after lunch, we're having trouble with crying. I just felt sorry for them because they were tired." I followed her comment about doing "anything with the question," Is there a limit to what you can do in this setting?" Eve answered, "I think so. I can't beat you--I feel like I'm probably a second mother but I can't beat you like your mother because most parents get upset." My question on the limits of what she can do, was intended to refer to her own statement of "doing anything for those kids," Eve however interpreted the question as the limitations related to disciplinary situations and with a comparison to parental behavior. "I don't want to do too much but sometimes I don't feel like I do enough. It's kinda hard." She added that she did not want to compete with the parent by doing too much including presumably, by disciplining a child in the way that a parent should. The association of limits to what she can do for the children, and the restriction on "beating" is perhaps understood in the light of Eve's experiences with her own parents.

During my first few days in the classroom I suspected that Eve was closely monitoring her language with the children because of my presence. After the first week she began responding to the children more spontaneously. "You're probably thinking that I yell a lot, but
that's what you have to do in day care," she told me. When asked later about changing her behavior, she denied that she had altered her behavior because of my presence but added, "Well at first it was kinda funny because I felt like, okay, I have to be perfect. Then after a while I'm like, oh, she's just Doris (laughing). Don't worry about it. It felt kind of funny because you know there's someone studying your room. Now, I'm just like, I don't know, I can talk to you."

With Eve's long held determination to be a teacher, I expected that she had had some teachers in her past that had inspired her or served as strong role models for her. However, after lots of probing I received no support for that idea. In fact, not only could she not recall any memorable teachers, favorable or unfavorable, she could not remember their names nor describe any relationships she had had with her early teachers. Teachers as people in relationship to Eve did not exist in her remembered experience. For Eve, teacher represented a goal: "All my life I've wanted to be a teacher so that I could write on the board and and tell other people what to do."

Summary of Teacher-Child Interactions

The eight teacher-child interactions of teachers, Mandy and Eve with children, Lilly, Abby, Brent, and Gerald represent coherence within the individuals as well as continuity across relationships. Mandy's relationships with all of the children were characteristic of Mandy as the teacher who wanted the children to know that she cared, but that operated with a personal and pragmatic model of low
involvement and low engagement (Sroufe, 1983). Mandy's own early experience was of a mother who always worked and of secondary caregiving that lead Mandy to the conclusion that to express one's needs was synonymous with "bothering" somebody. As a child she was not worthy of intruding on an adult's time. Eve's model of care that was consistently expressed in her relationships with the children was one of disciplinarian. The one who controls others by telling them what to do, and punishing them when they fail to do so. The teacher role warranted her involvement with the children, otherwise she did not "bother" them. The teachers' interaction themes were moderated in their relationships with the children by the children's own expectations of their caregivers and of themselves as children.

Lilly's behavior most closely demonstrated that of the securely attached child as might have been predicted by the coherence with which her parents related their own relationship experiences and their expectations for themselves as Lilly's parents. Abby, like Brent and Gerald behaved in some ways typical of anxious or insecurely attached children (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1988). Abby's mother's and Brent's parents' own histories and current relationships with their children suggested models of caregiving for Abby and Brent that were inconsistent and ambiguous. Abby's expressions of inappropriate dependence coupled with defiance toward Eve was consistent with her interactions with her mother. For Brent discord in the family system and maternal dependence on Brent were
expressed in his own anxious behavior ranging from manipulation through seductive story telling, to extreme expressions of anger. Gerald's interactions with his parents, as observed, were drastically different than his interactions with his teachers at school. However his behavior and emotional responses to new situations and changes in his environment were very consistent in both home and school settings. This behavior was also consistent with how his parent's viewed his temperament. Of the four children, Gerald was the only one whose temperament was as strong a variable in his relationships with his teachers as was the influence of his parental caregiving models.

The children's behavior was moderated in interaction with the teachers' behavior. Children's negative behavior was accentuated in interaction with Eve's model of control and punishment. The children increasingly directed positive interactions, especially those requiring an adult response, toward Mandy rather than toward Eve. These eight teacher-child relationships were "complex products" of each individuals' early caregiving experiences and their continuing interactions.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationships of four preschool children with two of their teachers. Attachment histories of each of the six individuals provided the basis for the interpretation of their interactions and their ensuing relationships. This chapter summarizes the results of Chapter III and includes possible applications of these findings. This chapter also discusses research limitations and suggests further research questions and future research directions.

Discussion of the Findings

The progression of this study was guided by the research questions in interaction with the "flow" of data collected through observations and interviews. The research questions also provided the focus for the discussion of the results. The research questions were:

1. How do early primary relationships influence the relationships between preschool teachers and children?

2. What are the significant factors that influence the preschool teacher-child relationships within the context of child day care?

3. What is the nature of teacher-child relationships targeted in this study?

These questions will be encompassed in the discussion that follows. The influence of early primary attachments across development will be addressed first.
The coherence of the teachers' and children's relationship histories with their current interaction patterns supports the assumption that early attachment meanings or representations provide a thread that runs throughout an individual's social interaction experiences (Sroufe, 1983; Bretherton 1985; Bowlby, 1988). This is not to say that the patterns are unalterable but rather that their influence can be traced across individual development, across relationships and between relationships.

Consistent with the work of Ainsworth et al. (1978), mothers, rather than the fathers, were the first figure in the attachment hierarchy for all the participants of this study. Individual internal working models of self and others are more strongly influenced by experiences in the relationship with the primary attachment figure than through any other single relationship (Bowlby, 1988). The following discussions of the teachers will focus primarily on the teachers' relationships with their mothers because this was the relationship that was most foremost in their discussions. The comparative influence of fathers and mothers in their children's lives was less clear. Both relationships will be addressed. The main findings are grouped under themes from the teachers' relationship histories, themes from the children's relationship histories, patterns of the teacher-child relationships and child day care effects on teacher-child interactions.

Themes from the teachers' relationship histories. Throughout the telling of their relationship histories, Mandy and Eve described
their relationships relative to the "closeness" that they felt with the other individual. Mandy's and Eve's concepts of closeness were related to the level of comfort or satisfaction they achieved in relationship. "Closeness" with the primary attachment figure was related to two main themes, the availability or proximity to the caregiver, and communication and self-disclosure with the caregiver. Gilligan found that adolescent women are intent on pursuing or maintaining relationships with their mothers, rather than seeking separation from them (Gilligan et al., 1990). Young women whose relationships with their mothers were ambivalent or insecure, attended to the relationship because it was a matter of serious concern to them (Saltzman, 1990).

The first theme, availability, is closely related to the infant behavior of seeking the presence of the caregiver. Proximity seeking of the attachment figure is an attachment behavior identified as biologically or ethologically based (Hinde, 1982). The theme of "being there" or having available mother's presence, was also noted as a reoccurring discussion in a study of adolescent girls (Saltzman, 1990). It's continuing prominence in the attachment relationships of Mandy and Eve is evidence of it's being represented in their unconscious model of the caregiver and of themselves as the recipient of care. Differences in family configurations and circumstances have resulted in different responses, but Eve's and Mandy's insecurity regarding "mother's presence" was ongoing. Eve continued to seek mother's presence; Mandy continued to hold on to
it. The theme of seeking to be in the caregiver's presence more than any other theme appeared to run throughout the course of their individual developments and throughout their relationships with their mothers. Though the actual behaviors may change in form attachment remains highly recognizable across development (Sroufe, 1983).

Eve's ambiguity or "unknowingness" about her relationship with her mother sustained her interest and her efforts in an ongoing quest for her mother's presence. In early childhood, Eve's relationship with her mother was threatened by the arrival of her younger sister. "She ruined it for me." The secondborn's arrival immediately affects the mother-firstborn relationship simply because the baby demands the mother's time and attention that was previously the province of the older child (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986). A mother's response, depending on her relationship with her husband, her own mother and her children, will ultimately determine whether the older child adapts or sees the newcomer as a rival and becomes alienated (Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986). The rivalry with the younger sister sustained Eve's relationship with her mother. As a young adult Eve described the on-going conflict with her sister as having become, "more joking" now that mother had taken two jobs and was no longer there to referee. Eve's competition with her younger sister over mother's attention was being replaced by competition with mother's work. Eve perceived her mother as "never there." "If Mom gets out of the stage of working two jobs,"
Eve expressed hopefully, "we'll be close." Eve's close relationships with her older sisters and her perceived closeness to Father, did not compensate for her desire to be close to her mother. Eve's efforts at being close to her mother was represented by her physical presence; the quality of the relationship had yet to be considered.

Mandy expressed satisfaction in her current relationship with her mother, but because mother "always worked," Mandy also recalled being left with sitters who failed to provide for her needs as a young child. "I've always felt, do they like me?" Did the young Mandy also wonder, "Does mother like me?" Mandy remembered not wanting to go to the sitters, but also remembered not telling her mother about her discomfort. Mother's inaccessibility left a doubt as to whether Mandy was worthy of Mother's full attention. She learned to do things for herself in compensation for her mother's absence. As a young adult, Mandy maintained "closeness" to her mother by living in the parental household to assure her Mother's accessibility, "Now when I go home I know that Mom and Dad are going to be there." The lack of proximity and accessibility to her primary attachment figure was a measure of the early insecurity experienced by Mandy in relationship to her mother (Main, 1985).

A second theme that indicated closeness in the teachers' relationships was communication or "telling things." Communication and understanding was also an index of mother-daughter relationships found in a study by Rich (1990). Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde (1987) list intimacy, interpreted as self-disclosure, as one of
eight categories describing interactions in every-day-life. Mandy described being cared for by her aunts, as a more satisfactory arrangement because she was familiar with them and could "tell them things" that she "could not tell a stranger." Family members provided a familiar context thereby reducing some of the risk of self-disclosure. For Mandy the "telling of secrets" was necessary for the development of closeness with her caregivers. The highest degree of closeness was with Mother to whom she told "everything." As an adult Mandy said of her mother, "She knows everything about me." Mandy continued to find it difficult to talk to strangers unless they initiated the interactions. Self-disclosure and the "telling of secrets" was reserved for those with whom she was familiar and for those who first revealed something of themselves to her.

Eve did not have an exclusive "telling" relationship with her mother, however her older sisters, as her best friends, were the ones of whom she said, "I can tell them anything." They even listened to her talk when she "wasn't really saying anything." Eve's practice of telling was her way of connecting, but unlike Mandy, Eve talked almost indiscriminately with anyone who would listen. Like Mandy however, there were limits on what she intended to reveal. Only with her older sisters was she able to tell "anything." Eve's lack of talking with her mother, except in the context of arguing, further reveals the emotional distance Eve experienced in this relationship.

Both Mandy and Eve recognized telling and talking as a means of maintaining relationships. Eve talked a lot although not
necessarily intending to reveal herself. Mandy talked also, but despite Mom's knowing everything, Mandy described herself as a person who like her mother, keeps things to herself. These teachers' rather shallow disclosures were coherent with the level of security they experienced in their caregiving relationships. To "tell all," put one at a risk, a risk that could not to be tolerated when was not secure in the relationship. Both teachers referred to telling others, but neither mentioned reciprocity in the "telling relationship." The activity of "telling to" brought them into the presence of the other but did not necessitate an intimate exchange between two persons. Their one-sided telling is reminiscent of a child, who with no consideration of the adult's perspective, chatters on egocentrically.

These teachers' histories represented insecurities in their attachment relationships with their mothers. In their family systems, their representational models of the caregiver-child relationship was primarily of themselves as the one "cared for." In the child day care system their representations were primarily of the reciprocal role, themselves as "caregivers." These young women felt compelled to continue investing energy and time toward securing their own primary relationships. This flow of energy into what developmentally could have been established in early childhood detracted from the teachers' ability to connect with children in a manner that optimized their sensitivity and nurturance toward the ones "cared for." The influences of their early relationships were carried forward into future relationships in two ways. One, the
quality of their early attachment relationships provided working
models for the caregiving roles they assumed as teachers, and two,
their lack of security in the attachment relationship deprived the
teachers of a working models of themselves as socially confident and
competent women whose presence could be counted on by the
children in their care.

Themes From the Children's Relationship Histories. Two
dominant themes that emerged in the analysis of the parent-child
relationships were: one, parental goals and expectations were
modeled from the parents' perceptions of their own experiences as a
child, and two, parents' communication patterns with their spouses
regarding their own and their partners' parenting affected their
relationships with their children in consistent and coherent ways.
The parents' perceptions of their childhoods ranged from, "I've
always felt I didn't live out my childhood" to "I always felt that I had
what I needed. The range included perceived sufficiency and
perceived deficiency.

The parent's most notable perception of their childhoods, and
the perception that was most frequently and directly expressed, is
what I have chosen to call the "deficit model." In this model parents
expressed that they had not gotten what they had wanted or needed
as children. As a consequence they resolved to provide for their own
child, what childhood had not provided them. The deficits of their
past experiences were used as a guide in determining what and how
to provide for their children. These parents based their parenting
narrowly on their own past, whereas parents with secure children based their parenting on cues from the child. The parents had not been asked to state their goals for their children; their statements were simply a response to a general question about their relationships with their children.

Mr. Brown, Brent's father, was determined to provide for Brent, "things that I didn't necessarily get to do with my parents." He listed excursions that they had already been on as well as plans for the upcoming summer. He added, "I've been to Europe and quite a few places and I want him to be able to do those things at an earlier age because I think it will be good for him." Lacking as these experiences may have been, they are likely to represent Mr. Brown's unmet early psychological needs, not the absence of these tangible experiences. Mr. Brown expressed his eagerness for Brent to grow up so that they could do "boy things" together. Mr. Brown's push for Brent to grow up may represent a vicarious compensation for his own father's lack of respect, "I'm the baby of the family and unfortunately I'm still treated that way." Similar to his own father "who only got involved when there was something wrong or there was a real need for discipline," Mr. Brown's descriptions of his day-to-day interactions with Brent consisted of a list of common activities more appropriate for a school-age child than a child of 3 years old, "baseball, basketball, . . . cars and trucks, . . . cops and robbers." Mr. Brown had a long term curriculum planned for Brent, but of his daily involvement with Brent he had almost nothing to say.
Mrs. Brown shared her husband's desires for Brent but had others which she expressed in different ways. Her description of her overwhelming responsibilities as a child ended incoherently with, "It wasn't an unhappy childhood. My parents gave me an allowance. I always felt like I didn't live out my childhood. Sometimes I'd like to live my life again--because I didn't get to do a lot of things that other kids did." Mrs. Brown lamented, "I still feel that I can't spill everything out to my Mom. And she's my mom, I wish I could." For her own child she believed that, "He will grow up to know, not only am I his Mom, but that he can come to me." Her hopes, though sounding altruistic were based more on her own needs than they were on Brent's. "It's almost like there is nobody else but Brent and myself." Three-year-old Brent was his mother's exclusive companion. "I look forward to seeing him everyday. . . . I don't know what I'll do when he grows up and moves away. I'll be very lost."

Mrs. Ames, Abby's mother, explained, "She is going to be what I couldn't." "I can sing pretty good and I can move, but I never had dance lessons." Her plans for Abby included a wide range of activities and attributes including "going to Harvard or Yale." She described her friend's daughter as being "wonderful, real responsible, intelligent, and really talented. I want Abby to be just like that." Mrs. Ames' own needs superseded Abby's. Abby's lackluster participation in the Cinderella drama enacted for me at the end of the home visit made it clear that the production was mother's
way of drawing my attention to her own dramatic flair, not her daughters’. The "play" was staged for mother's pleasure, not the daughter's.

Other parents acknowledged various gaps in their childhood experiences, but their desires for their children were not so entirely predicated on their own unmet needs. Graham's father said, for example, "The things that I did not have, I want him to have." This parent, however, also considered his son's needs when he immediately added, "But I guess I run into conflict . . . . If I provide everything for him, he might not develop his skills." Other parents were more likely to have expressed satisfaction with their childhoods and to express, as a goal, their children's happiness. Mrs. Graham, who said, "I always felt that I had what I wanted," wished for her son to first "be happy." Similarly Lilly's parents were concerned with preserving Lilly's friendly, positive nature. "She is happy and warm and that's what we don't want to mess up." And Abby's father said of his daughter, "I just want her to be whatever she wants to be, as long as she is happy."

Parents whose own needs had not been met through warm, responsive and available caregiving were likely to base their plans for their children either consciously or unconsciously on a continuing effort to fulfill their own needs. The children became the vehicle for vicariously meeting their parents' needs. Or as in the case of Brent's mother, Brent was given the responsibility for directly meeting his mother's needs through their relationship. Similar to the unmet
needs of the teachers, these parents continued their quests for the security they had not found in childhood. Instead of their "caregiving" being bequeathed to the next generation, their caregiving was diverted onto themselves. In the internal working models of these parents, the roles of caregiver and "cared for" were never clearly sorted out. Their children's relationship histories and perhaps their future ones "are likely to develop along a deviant pathway which is in some degree incompatible with mental health . . . ." (Bowlby, 1988).

The second theme from the children's relationship histories centered on the parents' communication patterns with their spouses regarding their own and their partners' parenting and its affects on their relationships with their children. Baumrind (1967) described elements of nurturance and control related to different parenting styles as authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Using only permissive and authoritarian as representing polar opposites of both control and nurture, all four couples represented one parent who was more nearly authoritarian or more nearly permissive than the other. The parents' approaches to their differences in parenting styles could be categorized along two dimensions, awareness of differences and acceptance of differences. Some individuals categorized themselves, while some couples categorized each other. Only one individual made no direct statement regarding his own style, except to say that he hoped that he had adopted only the best parts of each of his own parents.
Two couples were both aware and at least tacitly accepting of their partner's different parenting style. Both of the Lyles, Lilly's parents, categorized their own and their spouse's parenting style with great consistency. Together the Lyles had discussed their differences including weaknesses and strengths and in fact, saw their differences as complementary of each others styles. Mr. Lyle's comments reflected the respect that each held for the other, "It's working, there is probably a counterbalance there." Similarly Gerald's parents each acknowledged their awareness of the other's differences. They did not directly express appreciation for the other's different style nor did they in any way express any negative feelings about the other. What was expressed clearly and consistently was their overall goals and aspirations for Gerald indicative of a couple who communicated in depth their joint responsibility as parents. Both of these fathers were admittedly the more authoritarian; both mothers by their own admission, were more permissive than their husbands. These couples' relationships provided a secure context for their individual relationships with their children evidenced during the home visits and the interviews.

Contrastingly, Brent's parents, both spoke in support of their chosen parenting styles in comparison to their spouse's. Mr. Brown said, "... when you got a spanking from Dad you knew it. I mean you knew it for a while! I think its good for kids to have discipline." Mrs. Brown criticized her husband's approach, by telling him, "You're just shouting at him and he's shouting at you, you're not going to get
anything settled." Of herself she said, "I tend to spoil Brent." Their conflict around parenting was likely to be indicative of other conflicts between them.

Brent's experience of his parent's relationship was coherent with his relationships with each of them. Mother was finding it increasingly difficult to "control" Brent and father attempted to do so by power over his son. Brent's increasing non-compliant and defiant behavior was consistent with research relating the quality of marital relationships to children's behavior. Belsky (1984) reported that insecure children were more likely to come from families of low marital adjustment.

In Abby's family, Mother, not Father, was the self-declared "strict disciplinarian." During their interviews neither parent spoke of how the other parent interacted with Abby or parented her. They neither expressed opposition to the other's style nor did they appear to acknowledge that they were in fact different. They even spoke of their own expectations using very different terminology and content. Their individual styles were as different, if not more so, than any of the other couples. Their different patterns were even evidenced during the brief home visit at which both were present. Was their failure to openly acknowledge their differences, an indication of acceptance, or was the apparent tolerance a way of avoiding a topic that could potentially disrupt a fragile marital relationship?

In direct interaction with their parents the children had formed different working models for each of their parents as a result
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of their individual parenting styles. Except for Abby's, the children's representation of mother was likely to be more nurturing and with less control than was the representation of father. Less directly the children were experiencing their parents' relationships as part of the larger system network. The varied configurations of authoritarian and permissive and the couples' open awareness and acceptance of their different parenting styles could be a source of security as with Lilly in her family, or in its absence, a source of continued insecurity as with Brent and Abby in their families.

**Child Day Care Influences on Teacher-Child Interactions.** The influence of the teachers' relationship histories (family system) in the form of the teachers' representational models of self and others, interacted with variables constrained by the child day care system in general and in the individual center and classroom in particular. Teacher-child ratios and teacher training were dictated at the state level but in practice were interpreted on the micro or classroom level. Discontinuity of location, group configuration and staffing affected staff morale and performance intermittently.

Before the merger of the classrooms, Eve's group of eight children with one teacher maintained a staff-child ratio below the state requirements for 3-year-olds. Presumably this lower child staff-ratio meant an opportunity for more individualized interactions between teacher and child. Given Eve's minimal training and her maladaptive representation of caregiving it was unlikely that she would provide quality interactions even under those preferred
circumstances. After the merger Mandy and Eve were confronted with forming or maintaining relationships with 24 children. Though the same rather "ideal" child-staff ratio existed the context in which the teacher-child relationship took place had radically changed. Individual child care center practices and philosophies influence the quality of teacher-child interactions, but the significance of the teacher is undoubtedly the strongest single factor in providing young children with appropriate care. Mandy and Eve had similar levels of college training but because they had dropped out of school they had received little training specific to their roles as teachers. Their default model of "teacher" was comprised of what they themselves had experienced of their primary caregivers and in part what they had experienced of their teachers. It was this essentially uneducated role of teacher that served to guide their interactions with the children. Mandy's assumed the role of a rather passively involved group leader whose responsibility it was to maintain order. Eve's model was less well articulated but included an emphasis on controlling behavior by making children recalcitrant. Appropriate training would have at the very least provided Eve and Mandy with models of teaching roles that extended the range of their teaching behaviors beyond their unconscious representation of mother and other childhood caregivers/teachers. Teachers whose representational models of caregiving are built in secure relationships have at least a sound base on which to build their own
teacher role. In this case the teaching/caregiving roles that Eve's and Mandy's employed were inadequate to their task.

The child day care class experienced numerous disruptions in rapid succession that were essentially outside the control of the individual teachers. Change in location, change in the size and configuration of the group and changes in staffing all contributed to the instability. The number of changes occurring would appear to be unusual when in fact the only unusual change was the change in center location. Changes in staff were rather common place according to Mandy who reported having worked with over six different women in less than three years. Changes in the group of children occur several times throughout the year. Through teacher acceptance of and adaptability to change, the stress on the children can be minimized. When staff themselves are moving in and out of the situation these experiences will undoubtedly affect the development of secure relationships between teachers and children.

Individual child care center practices and philosophies influence the quality of teacher-child interactions. Disruptions in the classroom create additional stress that affect teacher morale and performance. The strength of collective and individual day care practices and policies can be either weakened or strengthened depending on the quality of the teachers and administrative support.

Patterns of the Teacher-Child Relationships. Influences from two family systems converged in the vertical relationship of each teacher and child. These relationships reflected the unique
interactions that characterized something of each of their individual working models as well as the character of the relationship itself. The patterns that illustrate the complexity of the formation of these relationship are: one, the influence of the interaction between parent-teacher relationships and teacher-child relationships on both levels of relationships and two, teacher presence and availability as related to child initiated engagements with teachers.

The relationships between individual children and teachers reflected a corresponding relationships between the parents and the teachers. The relationships formed in the classroom between teachers and children represented the overlap of each of the family systems of the individuals in the child care classroom. Bronfenbrenner described the ecology of human development occurring in the interaction of the individual within elements of the broader environment (1979). In this study the children were interacting with caregivers from two separate systems, one representing the family and the other caregivers (teachers) representing the child day care classroom. Because both parents of each family were involved in transporting their child to and from the day care, both adult family members were interacting on some level in the classroom system. In addition to brief interactions in the classroom, the teachers and parents met occasionally for conferences, especially if there were problems. The teachers' opinions of parents were unsolicited; they came in the interviews as a spontaneous extension of their discussion about individual children.
As teachers, Mandy and Eve had formed opinions of the parents' caregiver roles from observing the parent-child interactions and from interacting with the parent themselves. Their own direct interactions with the child provided clues as to what they would expect of the parent. Parent behavior was used to explain the child's behavior as well as to excuse a teacher's ineffectiveness in disciplining a child. Eve noted with certainty that Abby's, Brent's and Gerald's parents were all guilty of spoiling their children. She disapproved of their parenting and had little respect for them as people. Correspondingly Eve had difficulty in "controlling" the behavior of their children and blamed her difficulties on the influential strength of inappropriate parenting about which she could do nothing. In contrast Eve as well as Mandy thought that Lilly's parents were "really great." Lilly's mother especially, with whom they had more frequent contact, was described as easy to talk to, very friendly and "just so nice". And Lilly was their clear "favorite."

Both teachers were critical of Brent's and Abby's mothers for their inconsistency when separating from their children. The teachers believed that these mothers were contributing to their children's difficulties in separation and other classroom behavior generally. Mandy, who was generally more tolerant than Eve, was adamant in the case of Abby's mother. Both teachers expressed their clear dislike for Mrs. Ames as a person and as a parent. And of the children, Abby, was one of the children least-liked by the teachers.
The teachers' perceptions of parents were influenced by the teachers' perceptions of themselves. Eve, whose relationship with her mother was the least satisfactory, seemed also to be less sure of herself and consequently more easily threatened by failure. With parents whose children presented special challenges, Eve found a way to put the blame on the parent. She was especially offended by parents who did not appear to take their children's misbehavior seriously. To her they were undermining her authority when they failed to further reprimand their children to the degree that she felt was warranted. Mandy, whose relationship with her mother was currently satisfying, was increasingly confident in forming relationships with the parents as part of her teacher role. Her judgements about parents were more specifically connected with actual observed practice and less her projection of the child's problem as directly related to the parent. For example, Mandy felt that Gerald's parents were doing a good job, despite her difficulties with him. Her confidence in relating to Gerald and her opinion of him was more open and positive than was Eve's. Eve said flatly that Gerald was a "mean little boy." Mandy claimed that she liked him because he was smart and interesting even though she didn't always like what he did. Mandy saw herself as changing and that flexibility found its expression in her judgements of others. Eve saw herself as unable to do more than present herself to others and then, even with children, it was "up to them." She could do nothing to influence the relationship.
The teachers regularly discussed the parents and it is likely that they influenced each other's opinions. Parents who took time to come into the classroom and talk personally to the teachers were perceived more favorably than those who either did not stay or stayed, but focused only on their children. Except for Gerald's parents and Lilly's mother, the parents offered no critical comments about the teachers. Gerald's parents were concerned about the level of activities being offered, but did not directly criticize either teacher. Lilly's mother wished that Eve would not "give-in" to Lilly so easily. Part of the difference in the teachers' and parents' perceptions of each other may be accounted for by their relative ages and maturity. In addition, the parents may have felt more restraint in talking about the teachers without knowing the nature of my relationship with them.

The next patterns of teacher-child interactions were related and will be discussed as one topic. The phenomenon that could be traced across all eight teacher-child relationships was the availability of the teachers to the children and the children's behavior in engaging the teachers. When I began the observations I was singularly struck by two practices: first, by the lack of teacher involvement except at "organized" teacher-directed activity times where interactions were primarily initiated by the teacher and directed to the group rather than to an individual; and secondly, by the way in which children played either alone or in small groups
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with little notice of the adults. Relatively few children sought exchanges with and assistance from the teachers.

The teachers though usually physically present, were likely perceived by the children to be unavailable. That is by focusing their attention on each other the teachers were collectively and figuratively turning their backs to the children. This practice was so prevalent that it was found in different forms through-out the various daily activities. When the second and third teachers arrived, they congregated, around Mandy who had arrived first, to share personal news and news events about the day care center. The "clean-up" time transition signaled the teachers' dispersing to prepare for group time and snack. On the playground the teachers stood together talking except when interrupted by a crying child or the perceived need to reprimand a child for misbehavior. At rest time the teachers sat together on the same side of the room close enough to carry on a lively conversations while patting the children.

When not part of a teacher group, Mandy was likely to respond to an individual child's requests. Eve however, had well-developed strategies for making herself deliberately as well as unconsciously unavailable to the children. Some mornings Eve sat for 15-20 minutes staring and picking at her fingernails with her legs stretched out in front of her in a part of the room least occupied by children. Her posture and her averted gaze were interpreted by the children as, "She is not here," words she herself had once spoken to Gerald when he continued to call her name even after she ignored him.
The juxtaposing of these two practices posed the question of the influence of necessity and possibility. Were the children in fact playing independently of the adults because they did not perceive other options? In other words, had the adults created the necessity of this pattern because they simply did not avail themselves to the children? Or was it a case where adults, by not being easily accessible, had created a situation where children were given the possibility and opportunity of independent play and had, so called, "risen to the challenge." The answer to this question, I believe lay in the understanding of the children's developmental needs. Preschool children are moving toward independence and exploration from the position of a secure base. However, they still need the relationship of the caregiver to provide security, protection and "basic social skills." Hartup (1989) defined these skills as developing language, distinguishing between self and others, and understanding the motives and intentions of others. Without adult presence the development of these skills would be hampered. The horizontal, or peer, relationship provides the arena for practicing, elaborating and mastering these skills, but it is in the context of the vertical relationship, adult to child, that these skills are introduced.

These children needed and desired the presence of an adult, both her physical and emotional/social presence. The teachers' unavailability encouraged the children to focus their attention on peer relationships or to content themselves with playing alone. The ample supply of manipulative activities and the encouraged practice
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of bringing toys from home provided a variety of stimulating materials from which the children could choose. Children who had the social skills to sustain peer play were less likely to be perceived as problem children than those who had difficulty playing quietly or cooperatively. Children like Brent and Lilly who had learned how to engage an adult using personal charm or clever manipulation were more successful in making individual connections with their teachers than were children like Abby whose dependence was disdained by her teachers. The latter children required less of the teachers to become engaged than did Abby. When less was required, more attentiveness was likely to be available.

Negative ways that children frequently and successfully engaged teachers were by crying, running around the room, yelling or violating rules for use of materials. Children's use of positive initiatives were less likely to provide a sustained interaction, especially with Eve. Requests to "play with me" or "read this" were likely to be met with, "Not now, Sweetie" or "Go ask ______," or they were ignored. Affection and phrases of endearment, from the children were responded to with amusement or depending on the personality of child, were reciprocated.

The teachers limited their availability in a seeming defence or protection of themselves. Part of the teacher was still looking backward toward her own mother. Only part was available to the child. To create the interactions that fit their expectations, the children developed and used whatever means they had learned and
were continuing to learn within these relationships, even if it meant devising behavior that was in the long run maladaptive. The partial availability of their teachers required more from the children in making connection with their teachers. Secure children such as Lilly, were able to compensate at least in part for her teachers' inability to be present and available.

Implications for Teacher Education and Practice

Teaching at all levels is about content and curriculum, but it is also about relationships. In the formative years of early childhood, where the adult is still more likely to be in control of the relationship, teachers must be provided the training that promotes their ability to form and model healthy relationships. The findings of this study support the goal, of the once popular humanistic education movement, to incorporate study of the self along with the more traditional content of teacher education programs. Bowman declares, "By helping teachers get in touch with their own feelings, both past and present, another dimension of knowledge is activated, a dimension that should have high priority in the teaching profession" (1989, p. 450).

Few programs provide the depth of training that is needed to promote self-understanding beyond a superficial level (Jones, 1986). Although a chapter on understanding oneself may still be included in educational psychology textbooks (Hamachek, 1990), the importance of understanding oneself may just as likely go unmentioned (Dembo, 1991). Eve and Mandy are not representative of all early childhood
teachers, nor are they totally or drastically different from many others. Their experiences and their practice is unique to them, but the influence of one's early relationship experiences on later relationships is a phenomenon that is common to us all.

The focus of the training is however not the crucial issue regarding child care workers. For all too many, no specific prior training is even required. Until such a time when all states have developed mandatory training requirements for child care workers, the inclusion of self-understanding may appear peripheral to the central concern of early education. However, now is the time to educate policy makers of the need for and significance of such training. "At the same time that this dimension of knowledge [self-reflection] is more fully recognized in teacher education, it can be articulated with the existing formal knowledge base, so that the two together can form the coherent base to ground and shape future practice in the care and education of young children (Bowman, 1989, p. 450).

Mandy and Eve can be criticized for not providing the quality of care that should be available to all children. The care that they provided was however, considered by many as quality care, including many of the educated parents of their classroom. By some standards and along some dimensions, the care provided by Mandy and Eve was "quality" care. The least appropriate of their teaching practices however, could be, with basic and ongoing relevant training, significantly improved. As mentioned earlier in this
chapter, training could provide, at the very least, a wider choice of behaviors through the development of a more informed "teacher role." However, because the mental representations that guide behavior are largely unconscious, training without an understanding of the influence of ones' early relationship experiences on later behavior, is insufficient to guarantee appropriate teaching practice.

The experiences of Mandy and Eve as children and later as caregivers of children illustrate the need for mandatory training for child caregivers. More specifically, results of this study demonstrate the need to incorporate self-reflection and self-awareness training as an integral part of teacher education, especially in early childhood.

Further Research Questions

The purpose of research is to add to the existing base of knowledge, but perhaps even more importantly, the inquiring and exploratory design should engender new questions and new ways to consider old questions. The original research questions have served to focus this inquiry while at the same time exponentially creating new questions. Some of the more provocative and cogent questions are discussed below.

Attachment relationships have been conceptualized as providing a secure base in the caregiver-child relationship verses one that is not secure. Ainsworth et al. (1978) and other researchers of attachment have provided categories with which to further classify attachment relationships. There is no doubt that these classifications of attachment relationships have spawned far-
reaching and fruitful research. However, Main et al. (1985) has cautioned that the individual's attachment reality may lie outside the reality of the fabricated categories.

As we expand attachment research beyond the bounds of infancy from which the original classifications evolved, are we in danger of putting new wine into old bottles by continuing to use a system that was in place before the broader scope of attachment research was even conceived? In cross-generation attachment research and research involving populations beyond infancy, the search is for developmental coherence, not necessarily stability of behavior (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). How do we recognize when not only the behavior has changed, but the underlying pattern or model has also changed? Main et al. (1985) notes that perhaps formal operations permits the individual to see themselves within the "operations of a whole system" and thus allows the possibility for change. What accounts for one individual's ability to change and another to remains stuck in a pattern that is unhealthy? It would seem that we now have sufficient research showing a relationship between insensitive and unresponsive caregiving and maladaptive behavior in children. If hope lies within the structure of the change, should we not focus our attention on the phenomena of these changes rather than in continuing the prediction of pathology?

Bowlby's (1980) conceptualization of the internal working model has provided a way to examine the path by which one individual's attachment history traverses across development and
across relationships. Bretherton (1985) defines internal working model as a mental representation developed in interaction with the caregiver and which serves as an active guide of behavior. Is the strength of the model related to the degree of the security or insecurity? Main et al. (1985) lists 12 definitions of the internal working model, one of which refers to the multiple models the child creates for different caregivers. With regards to the hierarchy of caregivers, do the various models guide the child's behavior with corresponding influence? When faced with disparate models, are the child's expectations of still other caregivers matched against an external context? What are the circumstances that activate one model to act as a guide verses an alternative model?

Consider a child who experiences the continuity of her parents' interactions and is then placed in the care of another such as occurs routinely in day care. If the child is placed in day care employing male caregivers, would the child's representation of father be more likely to be activated? Or would the child's behavior be guided by the model of the mother because of a greater similarity of the teacher's and mother's roles in interacting with the child? Do children acquire representations of early caregiver/teachers that in turn become the guide for their behavior and expectations with subsequent teachers? Questions such as these and others must be asked and may be useful in guiding our search for and to increase our understanding of the secondary caregiver's influence on the
child's internal working model and the influences of early mental representations on subsequent relationships.

Limitations

The limitations of this study involved the data collection, specifically the participant observer role, the selection of participants and the attempts at "interviewing" children.

The data collection methods of this study were in keeping with the nature of the kinds and levels of information that was sought. For the most part, both participant observation and in-depth interviews served their purposes well. As participant observer, I assumed the role of teacher, a role that provided a natural way to develop rapport with the teachers and children and to gain entry into the classroom. However my particular interpretation of the teacher role brought me into conflict with my other role as "research instrument."

For me the role of the teacher included making oneself open available to the children without dominating or imposing on their activity. From the beginning I had decided to severely restrict my own initiatives to allow for greater opportunity for observations and to minimize my impact on the classroom. Even in so doing I immediately recognized the difference between my "teacher role" and the roles assumed by Eve and Mandy. I assumed, incorrectly at first, that my openness to the children had allowed and encouraged the teachers' less attentive behavior. Though I intended not to overtly encourage children to interact with me, their perception of
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my greater availability served that very function. As participant observer I had succeeded in putting myself into a position of being involved in more child-initiated interactions than were their regular teachers. I had come to study their interactions but had succeeded in inadvertently encouraging the children's interactions with myself instead.

To compensate, I began to position myself closer to the teachers, permitting easier observation, and at the same time I became less directly attentive to the children. I was faced with the dilemma of being with children in ways that seemed contradictory to my own teacher ethics. As researcher, and as teacher participant in this particular classroom I was forced to adopt a somewhat different approach than what I had originally intended. The process of "finding my place to stand" between roles of researcher and observer participant may have precluded my observations of some of the more subtle behaviors and brief interactions early in the study, never-the-less I am confident that the data collected does accurately and adequately represent the teacher-child interactions of the classroom.

The "interviews" with the children were not highlighted in the study because the varied specific responses of the children did not support additional interpretation of results. The intent was to gather more information from the child in a semi-structured format so as to confirm observations and to provide one more point of information for interpretation of the data. The interviews were a rather crude
attempt at making the methods of collection from teachers, parents and children somehow "parallel." The interviews were conducted near the end of the observation period so that the children had had time to become familiar with me.

The children's responses to their choice of an adult to accompany them in a variety of activities varied in content and their style of response to the overall experience. Lilly, in a rather lackadaisical manner alternated her answers. Abby played the game by responding to the questions using my name in the place of her teachers. Gerald, intrigued with the idea of pretending with the dolls, interrupted with a detailed plan for his own spontaneously created game and consequently lost interest in the original game. Brent resisted sitting down, and after just few questions asked to return to his classroom. These responses were coherent with the child's behavior in the classroom but did not add new insights to my understanding of the children's relationships with their teachers or their parents. Much information may be gained about children using games, but as a parallel to adult interviews for the express purpose of learning about their relationships, I believe this technique as employed, was perhaps inappropriate for this age child.

Another limitation involved the characteristics of the participants. The teachers were selected on the basis of their willingness to participate and as such they served the study well. Both teachers as it turned out, were young adults with some college education and similar teaching backgrounds, both unmarried without
children of their own and living with their parents. Both had experiences related to insecurity in their early relationships and both now limited their personal availability to the children in their care. The commonality of their experiences and teaching practices precluded the possibility of studying children's interactions with a teacher whose relationship history was secure or with a teacher whose education was more specific to her responsibilities.

Future Research Considerations

Considerations for future research are an outgrowth of the extended research questions and the previously discussed limitations. Continuation of the trend toward expanding the knowledge of attachment behavior across development suggests the need for longitudinal studies during the preschool years. A two pronged effort could be made to study the children's relationships both in the home and in the school/day care systems simultaneously. Studying the relationship between children and caregivers from the very beginning of the relationship offers the possibility for greater understanding of the role and influence of secondary caregivers. Such studies should be designed to include caregivers with different training and attachment histories.

The methodological difficulty in finding a place to stand might be eliminated from a study that included in its design a more active role for the teachers, a role that involved their concerted participation in the collection and interpretation of the data. Another approach to same concern is for the researcher to become even more
of "the teacher" and be truly the researched and the researcher. Another way to accomplish a similar effect would be for the teacher to have a more significant role as co-researcher. Duckworth, (1986) calls for a relaxation between the bounds of teaching and research. Such a design would contain elements of action or participatory research and serve to heighten the benefit to the teacher while increasing her involvement (Brown, 1985). In the process of conducting research the goal of understanding attachment may be accomplished on a global as well as on a very personal and individual level. As teacher/researcher I would be poised to examine my own relationship history with the potential of improving my teaching through a greater awareness of how and why I interact the way I do and at the same time contributing to the overall understanding of attachment in the teacher-child relationship.

Conclusion

In this study of relationships the "meaning" of relationship for individual children and teachers depended in part on their relationship histories particularly their earliest and primary relationships with their mothers. This relationship within the context of the family system of relationships provided a representational model for guiding the interactions between the children and their secondary caregivers, the child's day care teachers. Each individual in these teacher-child relationships constructed separate but complimentary "meanings" of this relationship through their recurrent interactions. The meanings or
representations of the teacher-child relationship reflected both the child's and the adult's models. Neither one alone was sufficient to predict the relationship outcome. The teachers' expectations of interactions in this teacher-child relationship were further defined by the context of child day care in general and their own interpretations of the role of teacher in particular.
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Teacher Agreement

As a teacher at the __________ Day Care Center in the three-year-old classroom, I agree to participate in the teacher-child relationship dissertation research study conducted by Doris Martin during the spring of 1990.

I understand that my role is to continue as usual in my classroom responsibilities during the observation periods. I realize that my participation in the research is important and that my own shared observations and reflections of the teacher-child relationships are valuable contributions to the project.

In addition to the classroom observations, I agree to several interviews conducted during non-working hours. The total interview time will not exceed four hours.

I am also aware that I may terminate this agreement at any time, for whatever reason I choose.

Signature__________________________

Date__________________________
Dear Parents,

I am a doctoral candidate in Family and Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. I am conducting my dissertation study at ____________Child Care Center.

The purpose of my study is to explore the nature of the teacher-child relationship. Despite the increased number of children in day care, the factors that influence the development of preschool-teacher child relationships have not yet been thoroughly studied. The findings of this study can provide important information to parents, teachers, and teacher educators/trainers in promoting positive development of this relationship.

The quality of the teacher-child relationship may significantly influence the quality of the child’s day care and subsequent school experiences. Thus, there is a need to further examine this very important relationship.

My plan is to observe and participate in the classroom approximately three days per week for approximately ten weeks. As participant observer I will take on the role of volunteer teacher. My intent is to be as unobtrusive, yet supportive of the teachers and the children as is possible.

All the information gathered, related to the center, the teachers, the children and their families will be kept strictly confidential. Parents whose children have participated in the study will be provided a summary of the findings.
I sincerely hope that you will consent to your child's participation. Thank you for considering my request. Please sign the enclosed consent form and place it in the box provided for them on the table by the day care office. You are invited to call either Dr. Victoria Fu, my advisor, at 231-4796 or myself, at 951-1703 with any questions concerning this study.

Sincerely

Doris Martin
[Given to all 24 of the children]

Consent Form

I give my permission for _________________________ to be
(Child's Name)
included in the observations of the teacher-child relationships study
at ________________________ Day Care Center. This study will be
conducted during the first three months of 1990.

____________________________
Signature of parent or guardian

____________________________
Date

*************************

I prefer that ________________________ not be included in the
(Child's Name)
teacher-child relationship study.

____________________________
Signature of parent or guardian

____________________________
Date
February, 1990

Dear Mr. and Mrs. ____________.

Thank you for consenting to your child's participation in my dissertation study of teacher-child relationships. (Child's name) has been selected as one of four children that I would like to include in part II of the study. Gender, age and relationship patterns were among the criteria used for the selection.

Part II represents an effort to provide an in-depth exploration of the teacher-child relationship including patterns developed with the child's first and primary caregivers. Part II which will take place during March involves a visit with you and your child in your home (approximately one half hour) and an interview with each parent to be scheduled at each of your convenience. In addition, one brief, 5-10 minute, individual play session using puppets, pictures, or dolls will conducted with your child during the day at the (day care center name). The child's desire not to participate in this activity will be honored and will not affect the rest of your or your child's involvement in the study.

Your own and your child's confidentiality will be honored at all times. Names and other identifying information will be changed in the final report to assure your anonymity.

Thank you for considering my request. I sincerely hope that you will be able and willing to participate further in the study. I have thoroughly enjoyed getting to know ____________ and I look forward to talking with you soon. Please return the enclosed consent form to the box by the day care office. Dr. Victoria Fu, my dissertation advisor (231-4796), or I (951-1703) will be happy to respond to any further questions.

Sincerely,

Doris Martin
[for four focus children only]

Consent Form

I hereby give my consent for my child and myself to be included in Phase II of the teacher-child relationship study as described in the cover letter.

__________________________  ______________
Signature of father or male guardian     Date

__________________________  ______________
Signature of mother or female guardian     Date

OR

I do not wish for my family to take part in Phase II of the teacher-child relationship study.

__________________________  ______________
Signature:     Date: __________

**************

If you have agreed to participate, please provide the following information:
Telephone number by which you prefer to be contacted to arrange the visit:
( ) ____________ home number
( ) ____________ father's work number
( ) ____________ mother's work number
( ) All of the above are satisfactory
( ) I prefer to be contacted directly at the day care center,
( ) mother, ( ) father.
Doris M. Martin

57 Grandview Drive
Harrisonburg, VA. 22801
(703) 433-3936
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