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ABSTRACT
This study sought to use attachment theory as a lens through which to explore children’s relationships with animal companions in the context of long-term foster care. Inductive and deductive thematic analyses of longitudinal case study data from eight children and their foster families suggested (a) that children’s relationships with animal companions satisfied attachment-related functions in their own right and (b) that animal companions also helped to soften perceptions of foster caregivers, facilitating opportunities for the development of closeness. Animals in the foster home may therefore play an important part in helping children to find and develop secure, warm, and loving relationships.

Background
It is well established that a vital source of resilience and well-being in children is the presence of a stable, secure, and supportive family relationship (Joseph, O’Connor, Briskman, Maughan, & Scott, 2014; Werner & Smith, 1982). One of the cornerstones of the foster care system is the assumption that the provision of a warm, nurturing, stable, and secure relationship with a foster caregiver has the capacity to change the developmental course of children who have experienced inadequate early care (Joseph et al., 2014).

From an attachment (Bowlby, 1969, 1973) perspective, the development of a secure attachment relationship with a foster caregiver can be considered a critical element of foster care (Schofield & Beek, 2005). This is because it has been well established that a secure attachment is central to the development of psychological resilience and well-being (Egeland, Jacobvitz, & Sroufe, 1988; Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Higgitt, & Target, 1994; Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2012). However, for many foster children, early experiences of neglect, suffering, hurt, separation, and loss can significantly impede the formation of secure attachment relationships with foster caregivers (Schofield & Beek, 2005). The internal working model hypothesis in attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982; Bretherton, 1999; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985) suggests that poor early experiences are likely to be internalised, meaning that children bring negative expectations and models of fear, anxiety, and maladaptive defence into
new relationships with potential caregivers. This can make it particularly challenging to develop attachment security.

It is important to build a better understanding of how the foster care system might facilitate the development of secure attachment relationships, despite the challenging expectations and resistance children often bring with them (Lee, 2012; Nowacki & Schoelmerich, 2010). This paper responded to recent calls (e.g., Rockett & Carr, 2014) for further exploration of the ways in which animals in foster family homes might facilitate this process. There is evidence from the animal-assisted therapy (AAT) literature (e.g., Parish-Plass, 2008) that animals can lubricate the development of child–adult attachment security, especially when children present with challenging working models of attachment. Exploring this possibility in the context of foster homes might help (a) reinforce the important role that animal attachment can play in applied settings (Joseph et al., 2014) and (b) expand the idea of developing secure attachment bonds with foster caregivers to include wider aspects of the foster family, such as pets.

**Animals and attachment theory**

One of the central tenets of attachment theory is the notion that early childhood lays the foundation for the development of personality through the lifespan and “...that a secure attachment to a caregiver is one of the first and most basic needs” (Beck & Madresh, 2008, p. 43). The theory has developed from Bowlby’s (1969, 1973) contention that the young of species with an extended period of dependence are biologically motivated to establish and maintain selective bonds with discriminate figures in their environment capable of providing care and nurturance into adulthood.

A major benefit of employing attachment theory in the exploration of human–animal bonds is that it has provided researchers with a detailed conceptual base (e.g., Beck & Madresh, 2008; Kurdek, 2008, 2009; Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011; Noonan, 2008; Woodward & Bauer, 2007; Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2011a). For example, the theory offers a clear conceptual definition of what is considered a secure attachment relationship. Attachment theorists (Hazan & Zeifman, 1994) have suggested that secure attachment relationships reflect (a) a secure base (i.e., a securely attached child roams and explores freely and without anxiety as long as they are aware of where their caregiver is located), (b) a safe haven (i.e., caregivers are experienced as dependable sources of comfort in times of genuine distress), (c) proximity maintenance (i.e., the physical presence of the caregiver results in enjoyment and a sense of safety), and (d) separation distress (i.e., the physical absence of the caregiver elicits anxiety linked to a sense of threat that one’s source of security is unavailable) (Kurdek, 2008).

In relation to these criteria, researchers (e.g., Beck & Madresh, 2008; Kurdek, 2008, 2009) have sought to provide evidence that humans experience animal relationships as secure attachment bonds. For example, Kurdek (2009) tapped into the extent to which dog caretakers reported feelings that their companion animal was a safe haven (e.g., “When I am feeling bad and need a boost, I turn to my dog to help me feel better”), a secure base (e.g., “I can count on my dog to be there for me”), provoked a desire for proximity maintenance (e.g., “I like having my dog near me”), and separation distress (e.g., “I miss my dog when I am away from him or her”) (Kurdek, 2009). The results suggested that companion animals seemed to satisfy these attachment functions.
In an extension of this study, Kurdek (2009) also compared the extent to which people felt that they turned to their dogs as a safe haven when compared to other key attachment figures, such as mothers, fathers, siblings, best friends, romantic partners, and children. The results suggested that dogs were turned to more significantly than all figures apart from romantic partners and that this was moderated by both human (e.g., being male or widowed made it more likely to rely upon dogs) and animal (e.g., the extent to which animals satisfied their caretakers’ relatedness needs also made it more likely) characteristics. Kurdek (2009) concluded that the data were evidence that humans can form attachment bonds with animals in a manner that is consistent with the literature on attachment theory and comparable to relationships developed with humans.

Kwong and Bartholomew’s (2011) data explored assistance dogs as attachment figures in a sample of individuals with various disabilities. The study employed thematic methods to analyse semi-structured interviews with participants about their relationships with assistance dogs. Findings suggested that the animals were strong sources of comfort during distressing times, and the caregivers reported behaviour that parallels what Hazan and Zeifman (1994) have described as a safe-haven function, suggesting that “…in many cases, the dogs appeared to be so attuned with their owners’ emotions that the owners did not need to seek out the support” (Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011, p. 426). Data also showed that for just over half of the participants, the assistance dogs also fulfilled the role of a secure base. Participants “…described how the security and stability provided by their assistance dog provided a foundation for confidence and exploration” (Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011, p. 427). Overall, Kwong and Bartholomew (2011) demonstrated that animals seem to fulfil attachment figure functions. However, they noted that this may be particularly apparent in their investigation because the sample possessed specific characteristics (e.g., a disability requiring animal-related assistance) that increased the likelihood that the human–animal bond might develop into something that reflects an attachment bond.

Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, and Shaver (2012) utilised an interesting and innovative methodology to further support the notion that animals might be capable of fulfilling safe-haven and secure-base functions. Specifically, the researchers primed attachment responses by getting participants to perform distress-eliciting tasks and measuring levels of distress though blood pressure readings. The results suggested that the physical and cognitive presence of companion animals was enough to heighten self-confidence, lower distress, and increase task performance when compared to the total absence of participants’ companion animals. In conclusion, reviews of the literature (e.g., Rockett & Carr, 2014) on human–animal attachment have identified that there is mounting evidence that for some people, animals seem capable of offering features of a secure attachment relationship.

**Human–animal relationships as relationship facilitators**

In the context of foster care, there is evidence that the quality of caregiving received prior to a foster care placement (such as early maltreatment or a high number of previous placements) may have carry-over effects that hinder the development of new secure attachment relationships with foster caregivers (Milan & Pinderhughes, 2000;
There is also some suggestion that these carry-over effects are particularly prominent when children have experienced longer periods of abuse or have been taken into care at a later age (Rushton, Mayes, Dance, & Quinton, 2003). Hence, as Joseph et al. (2014) have suggested, there is a need for researchers to explore the ways in which secure attachments with foster caregivers are facilitated, especially in the face of carry-over effects that may increase children’s resistance to new attachments. To this end, research into animals and attachment offers conceptual possibilities that may have important implications.

Research (Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2011b) has identified that the quality of attachment relationships that humans develop in the context of human–human bonds is not necessarily correlated to the quality of attachment relationships that they develop with animal companions. For example, people with highly insecure working models of attachment in the context of human relationships are not necessarily predisposed to form similar attachments to animals. Such an assertion hints at the possibility that animals may be able to circumvent some of the relational resistance and biases that are carried forward by an insecure working model of attachment (Rockett & Carr, 2014; Zasloff, 1996). Some of the core components of insecure working models of attachment include a generalised, pervasive belief that others are untrustworthy, unreliable, uncaring, and emotionally unavailable (Bowlby, 1973). It is possible that animal companions can “evade” these assumptions, simply by not being human, or due to their open, unthreatening capacity to both give and receive love, affection, and positivity. In so doing, such animal relationships could offer a pathway towards (re)establishing attachment security in the context of human attachment bonds, where they have been lacking or significantly challenged. In the context of AAT, Parish-Plass (2008) and others (e.g., McNicholas & Collis, 2000; Messent, 1983) have identified that children with a history of abuse or neglect, as is frequently the case for many children in foster care (e.g., Vasileva & Petermann, 2016), can experience features of attachment security in animal relationships that serve to facilitate the development of closeness and attachment security to therapists.

To this end, Rockett and Carr (2014) discussed the idea that companion animals reflect “transitional beings” (Bridger, 1970) in the context of attachment bond formation. The idea of a transitional being is important in therapeutic contexts because it can facilitate new approaches to old problems and has a special gift for behaving without intention and for listening without speaking. Individuals can also project features of deeply ingrained human–human relationships onto transitional beings, providing insight into relational patterns that are carried forward. In this way, attachment-related dynamics ingrained from human–human interactions can be challenged and reworked in the context of comparatively “safe” relationships with a transitional being.

Animal relationships can also lubricate the construction of human attachment relationships (Parish-Plass, 2008; XXXX, in press). For example, in the context of AAT, animals often facilitate a therapist–client relationship by reworking an individual’s perceptions of the therapist’s actions and intentions on a relational level, based upon observing his/her interactions with an animal (Noonan, 2008). Parish-Plass (2008) has highlighted that children often strongly identify with the animals in an AAT context, meaning that therapists’/caregivers’ interactions with an animal are often “related back to the self” in children’s minds. As such, children are afforded an opportunity to rework or challenge ingrained perceptions of adults and experience more positive models of the other
person. Through observation of the ways in which a consistent, supportive human
caregiver interacts with an animal, it has been suggested that children are often
moved to trust new adults (Noonan, 2008). This has been described as a “softening”
of the relational environment (Levinson, 1984) that reduces anxiety around direct
human–human interaction for children with attachment-related resistance. Noonan
(2008) has suggested that AAT clients invariably put themselves in the position of the
animal to interpret the therapist’s likely responses. That is, observing one’s therapist
caring for an animal who is expressing a need for affection allows one to hypothesise
with more confidence that the therapist might be capable of offering the same in one’s
own interaction and to process the cognitions and feelings this arouses. Subsequently,
clients are able to work through feelings of being tolerated, rejected, scolded, or
embraced, were they to be in the animal’s position. In time, this can facilitate a working
connection (Parish-Plass, 2008, p. 17) with a new adult.

In summary, this paper sought to qualitatively explore children’s relationships with
animals in the context of foster care using attachment theory as a theoretical lens. It
should be noted that animal relationships cannot replace a secure attachment to
caregivers in the context of foster care. Clearly, animals are unlikely to be able to
completely fulfil the caring, protective role of a secure attachment relationship with a
caregiver. Nonetheless, we were interested in exploring how children experienced their
relationships with animals, both independently of and in relation to their relationships
with foster caregivers. Ultimately, we sought to explore whether animal relationships
might play a role in re-establishing a sense of relational security for children in foster
care who may (at least initially) have difficulty trusting and/or feel threatened by close
relationships with foster caregivers. In this sense, we were interested in exploring ideas
about animals as transitional beings that might play a critical role in lubricating the
development of secure attachment relationships with adults in an applied setting such
as foster care. Two key questions guided the investigation: (1) Do children’s relationships
with animals in foster homes reflect features of a secure attachment relationship? (2) Do
animals in foster homes have the potential to facilitate attachment relationship devel-
opment between children and foster caregivers and how can this be understood?

Method

A qualitative methodology was adopted for the following reasons. First, qualitative
methods are particularly well suited (a) to providing new perspectives on old phenom-
ena in order to open up new ways of thinking and (b) to providing understanding of
new phenomena about which little is currently known (Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011).
While there is a growing literature base related to animals as attachment figures (see
Rockett & Carr, 2014 for a review), little is currently known about their potential to serve
as attachment figures in the context of long-term foster care. Furthermore, their poten-
tial to facilitate attachment-related development in the context of child–foster caregiver
bonds is currently not well understood. Hence, we reasoned that qualitative methods
were well suited to facilitating a richer understanding of the ways in which animals in
foster homes are experienced and they would allow us to consider the meaning of these
relationships in the context of attachment theory. Given the nature of the investigation,
case study was considered appropriate. It is widely accepted (e.g., Rowley, 2002; Stake,
that a key strength of case study research is the utilisation of multiple research tools to ascertain a rich, wholesome, and intricate understanding of a given phenomenon. The approach is also well suited to the investigation of phenomena within real-life contexts (Yin, 1994).

**Participants**

Eight children were identified as suitable cases through liaison with a leading private foster agency in the UK. Children were identified as suitable for the study if the agency considered (a) that they had a history of significant attachment difficulties in foster care to date, (b) that they had experienced a significantly high volume of placement turn-over, (c) that they were currently settling into a new placement (i.e., that had started within the last year), and (d) that the current placement they were settling into also contained a family dog. These sample characteristics helped us to ensure, as far as possible, that the samples were likely to have experienced significant challenges in terms of developing an attachment relationship with foster caregivers and that the presence of a dog was part of the foster family dynamic.

Participants (three boys and five girls) were all living in long-term foster care at the time of the study and were under the legal protection of the agency. Table 1 provides a detailed description of each participant based upon agency case notes and interviews with foster families and case workers.

Their ages ranged from 10 to 16 years and all were literate and able to communicate verbally (all were of Caucasian descent with English as their primary language). Seven participants had histories of neglect and/or abuse while living with their biological parents (the reason they had initially been taken into care) and one had been taken into care due to death of his biological mother. The agency reported that the children experienced a broad range of psychological and social challenges, ranging from violent anger outbursts ($n = 3$), withdrawal ($n = 3$), extreme lack of confidence ($n = 3$), extreme distress over biological parents missing scheduled contact meetings ($n = 4$), and self-harm ($n = 1$). All participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of time in foster care</th>
<th>Time in current placement</th>
<th>Number of foster placements to date</th>
<th>Current foster family make-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foster mother, foster father, and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Foster mother, family dog, and cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foster mother and family dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information provided is derived from case notes provided by the foster agency and from basic demographic interview data provided by foster families and social workers.
were educated in mainstream schools in the UK, and most (seven of eight) attended regular contact meetings with biological parents. Foster carers were all of Caucasian descent, spoke English as their first or only language, and self-identified as “working class”. During the period of study, three of the children moved schools (although their foster placement remained the same), and three were forced to cease contact with their biological parents due to inconsistent attendance at meetings. Aside from this, all living, schooling, and contact arrangements remained consistent throughout the 7-month longitudinal investigation. Participants were all living in homes where dogs were present. All homes had one dog and several homes had other animals too, including cats, parrots, hamsters, rabbits, and fish.

**Data collection and procedures**

Initially, written consent was obtained from the foster agency and from foster families themselves. Subsequently, children were visited by a familiar social worker who, together with foster caregivers, explained the nature of the research project to them. After giving their consent, participants were then introduced to a researcher who conducted an informal familiarisation interview with them, where they talked generally about the people and animals that formed part of their current foster family and learned more about the aims of the study.

One of our key objectives was to discuss with children the attachment-related features of the relationships they shared with both foster caregivers and animals in their foster home. In order to facilitate these discussions, an initial semi-structured interview (during the first month of the study) with each child was conducted in their current foster family home without the presence of foster caregivers. These interviews (example questions are provided in Table 2) were guided by the attachment literature and enabled children to discuss, explain, and explore key features of the relationships they felt they shared with their foster caregivers and animal companions. The key constructs of Hazan and Zeifman’s (1994) features of a secure attachment relationship (i.e., viewing the other as a secure base and/or safe haven, desiring proximity maintenance, and experiencing separation anxiety or distress) were used to guide the conversation.

Furthermore, children had the opportunity to discuss their relationships with both foster caregivers and companion animals in relation to each of these relational features. As part of this interview, rather than simply discussing each relationship in isolation, participants were also asked to think about their relationships in relation to each other, to facilitate a sense of relativity and help them compare, contrast, and explore the extent to which they felt that each relationship was characterised by a specific attachment-related feature. We did not ask children to numerically rate any of the constructs under discussion but a 10 cm line upon which they could place representative faces of caregivers and animals was provided, as each construct was discussed, and children would place the relationship referents on the line, moving them up and down as they thought about, considered, and explored each relationship in relation to the dimension. Rowe and Carnelley (2005) have argued that such diagrammatic representations can help to elicit qualitatively different information during attachment-related interviews because people can relate different relationship referents to each other, and this can invoke helpful thoughts and feelings.
To further understand and “capture” the ways in which children’s relationships with foster caregivers and animals developed and unfolded, children were also asked to maintain a guided diary for a 6-month period. Weekly diaries completed by participants recorded what they perceived to be prominent events in their lives and their subsequent thoughts and feelings about these events. The diaries were semi-structured and guided participants to think about the events in relation to how they made them feel, who they wanted/did not want to share the event with, whether they felt sad, happy, ashamed, or angry, whether they sought comfort from another, who they sought comfort with, how it played out, and how they felt about it. At the end of the initial interview, the researcher explained the requirements for the diaries to each of the children and left them with the diary and necessary information/knowledge to ask for help if they needed it. Weekly contact was made with each of the foster caregivers to ask how children were progressing with their diaries and to help with any concerns or issues that arose.

At the end of the study, after 6 months, a researcher again visited each child in their home and conducted a second semi-structured interview like the initial interview described above (with attention paid to how things might have changed over time) and also discussed in more depth the diaries children had kept and the specific issues raised in them. Following these final interviews, foster carers were also interviewed in relation to how they felt about children’s observable relationships with them and with the animals in the foster home. These interviews sought to triangulate and further explore concepts related to attachment behaviours and relationships in the children. The interviews also sought further clarification on issues raised through the diaries over the course of the 6-month data collection period.

Table 2. Examples of interview questions that guided our conversations with children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you able to tell me a few words that you feel describe who you are? What sort of person are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you describe the relationship you have with [foster carer’s name]? And with [dog’s name]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has [foster carer’s name] ever had to tell you off for something? What happens when they do that? How do you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can you tell me about a time when you felt really happy here [in foster home and in general]? What was happening then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What about a time when you felt really upset, or maybe like you needed help [in foster home and in general]? Can you tell me about a time like that? Who was it that helped you to feel better? What did they do for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you feel that [foster carer’s name] loves you and cares about you? What makes you feel that way? How about [dog’s name]? What makes you feel that way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think anybody here [in the foster home] knows how you feel? Do they know when you’re upset or not feeling quite right? What do they do if they notice this? If they notice you’re unhappy, how do you feel? How do you think they feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can you tell me what tends to happen if you get hurt or if you feel ill?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has anything else happened to you that might have upset you, or made you feel scared or confused? Who is it that you turn to when you feel that way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there anyone that you’ve really cared about who isn’t around any longer? How do you feel about that? Who would you really miss (if they weren’t there to comfort you) if you were feeling scared or upset?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How do you feel when [foster carer’s name] isn’t around? How about when [dog’s name] isn’t around? Can you think of a time when that has happened?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These example questions were a loose guide that served to facilitate in-depth conversations with children about their relationships with foster caregivers, animals, and attachment-related themes. Many other questions and issues arose during the conversations that meant each interview had a different structure and flow and the general questions above were supplemented, extended, and explored using further relevant lines of questioning.
**Analysis and interpretation of data**

Analysis of the data began with a complete transcription of all data (interviews and diary extracts were considered together, as a part of one, total data set). Data were interpreted in terms of the information they provided about our two main research questions: (1) whether children’s relationships with animals reflected features of a secure attachment relationship and (2) whether and how animals facilitated attachment relationships between children and foster caregivers. We adopted a hybrid approach that incorporated both deductive and inductive thematic analyses (Boyatzis, 1998). Deductive analysis was employed to determine whether key features of attachment relationships (we defined codes in accordance with attachment theory, looking for evidence of safe haven, secure base, and separation anxiety) seemed to be present in children’s relationships with animals. We then examined the data in detail to identify passages that appeared to be consistent with these themes. An inductive method was used to address the second, more exploratory question (and any subthemes that we felt emerged under the theoretical themes outlined as part of the first question). Passages of text and quotes that were relevant to a given theme or issue were identified and conceptually organised into meaningful themes.

For clarity, paralanguage (e.g., umms and errs) was edited in situations where it did not contribute to the “tone” or “meaning” of the text. As Stevens and Andersen (2007) have suggested, the use of audio-taped recordings of interviews allows researchers to enhance the trustworthiness of their data simply because questions, answers, and ambiguities remain available throughout the process of analysis. To ensure that our data were interpreted judiciously, a third member of staff (in addition to the authors) with an intimate knowledge of attachment theory checked the validity and feasibility of the data interpretations against the original transcripts and recorded interviews so that consensus was reached three ways.

Sparkes (2002, p. 199) has outlined that, “any kind of research can be dismissed, trashed, and trivialized if inappropriate criteria are imposed on it”. Readers are requested to judge the legitimacy and quality of the dialogues and interpretations made in accordance with whether or not they shed light on the aims of the paper.

**Ethics**

Ethical approval was granted by the authors’ institutional ethics committee and the foster agency, foster families, and children provided both verbal and written consent. The foster agency’s “psychology team” and “head of children’s services” were also satisfied with the aims, motivations, and proposed methodology of the project and that the welfare of the animals involved was respected. Participants are protected by confidentiality and the use of pseudonyms throughout. Only the authors are aware of their identities.

**Results and discussion**

Results are discussed in accordance with the main themes identified by the qualitative analyses. Table 3 displays the themes identified, the research question to which they related, and the extent to which each theme occurred within the case study sample.
In what follows we briefly identify and discuss each theme, providing illustrative examples of data from participant interviews and diaries for each. The theme of suspicion, mistrust, and projection is discussed first because it helps readers to appreciate the degree of resistance that was frequently the starting point from which children’s relationships with their foster carers began. Subsequently, we present data relating to the themes of safe haven, secure base, and separation distress in children’s relationships with animals before discussing the ways in which animal relationships were often a bridge that served to facilitate closeness and trust with foster caregivers.

**Suspicion, mistrust, and projection**

A key theme was that foster caregivers were frequently viewed with suspicion by the children. There were strong feelings around the idea that caregivers were somehow colluding with a world that children had come to experience as threatening and potentially painful. We felt that this theme was a clear reflection of children’s proneness to resist trusting new adult relationships and frequently to project fears and anxieties onto them (e.g., Lee, 2012; Nowacki & Schoelmerich, 2010). For example, Jake explained that

> I can still find it hard being really close with Trudi [foster caregiver] cos everyone in the past has been horrible to me and eventually everyone has got rid of me, and I guess there’s still a chance that Trudi might do that, so I don’t feel totally safe with her. I mean, I would if I were like adopted or something but I’m still in foster care which is why the social worker comes around and checks on me, cos they like, own me or something like that. Nobody wants to adopt me so I can live there all the time without having to move to new homes … I don’t mind being really close with Zak [dog] cos he won’t get rid of me, so I feel really safe with him. I think that he’s my friend because he wants to be and not just because he has to be.

Jodie expressed strong feelings of anger, suspicion, and alienation when her meetings with her biological mother were terminated (her mother frequently failed to attend) during the course of the study. Many of these feelings were projected onto her foster caregiver, making it difficult for her to trust and establish a connection with her:

> … she [foster caregiver] told me I can’t see my mum again. I am dead mad about it and she won’t let me go and see her at contact any more. I think it’s dead cruel and she knows it...
makes me angry – so I put her right down here [indicates graphically that she clearly does not view her foster caregiver as a safe haven or source of security] and now she only gets more angry, with me (Jodie).

I hate it! Hate it! Why can’t I see Mummy?! It’s not fair. She won’t take me anymore! (Jodie’s diary)

It was particularly interesting to note that animal companions frequently slipped under the radar of the mistrust and suspicion children felt towards their foster caregivers. As Jake noted in the quote above, he did not feel implicitly threatened by being close to Zak (the dog) because “he won’t get rid of me, so I feel really safe with him. I think that he’s my friend because he wants to be and not just because he has to be”. In the midst of Jodie’s powerful emotional responses to losing contact with her mother, she found Storm (the dog) to be a relationship she could trust. Her foster caregiver recalled the moment she broke the news about ceasing contact with her mother:

She didn’t look shocked. She just shrugged her shoulders and kept colouring in. Then she stopped and asked why, but I don’t think she was listening. She looked real empty, like her eyes went hollow. She was really angry and I could see her sitting there shaking. She definitely blamed me. She just wouldn’t let me in though. She just went and sat with Storm [the dog] for hours and hours. She would get upset and come crying to me but whenever we tried to talk about it the anger would come back again. (Interview with Jodie’s foster caregiver)

Animals as a safe haven

Previous attachment-related research has suggested that animal companions can satisfy the need for comfort, reassurance, assistance, and protection in times of danger or distress (Zilcha-Mano et al., 2012). Data suggested that the children in this study frequently turned to animals as safe havens. In accordance with previous research (e.g., Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011), there was a suggestion that contact comfort (skin-to-skin physical contact) was a significant part of this process:

I like spending time with him [the dog] and I used to hide in the living room with him when there was a knock at the door. I used to worry it was the social worker coming to take me away. I didn’t feel safe without him and when I was with him, just holding his ears, I felt relaxed and I wouldn’t have the big thumping in my body. (Evan).

He [the dog] was the only person that would stop me from feeling worried at night. I didn’t like being alone at night in my room. I felt embarrassed crying in front of Sheila [foster caregiver] but I could cry and feel safe with the dog on my bed. When I cry he wiggles into my neck and I rest my face against his belly. Then I cry more, but I feel better after I cry. Like the tears help get the worry out my head. I feel safe with him there beside me. Like he wants to help me and stop my bad thoughts. (Jane).

When they found out at school that she [foster caregiver] isn’t my mum and I don’t actually have a mum I wanted to run away and come back to be here with him [the dog]. When I am with him I feel better and happy again. (Evan)

Children also felt that they often preferred their animal companions as a safe haven, over and above their foster caregivers or other human relationships. This was frequently attributed to the fact that the animals did not require them to verbally communicate feelings they did not feel able or want to express. For example, as Jake explained:
When I feel sad I go to him [the dog] but I do go to her [foster caregiver] more now. It’s just I find it easier going to him [the dog] because I don’t have to talk about stuff as much, I can just think about it and he makes me feel really calm and he empties my head of stuff when I get confused and worried. I go and sit with him and then everything slows down and I like that. I can’t do it with people because they’re always waiting for you to say something or waiting to say something to you. I like that he [the dog] is more easy than that.

When she [foster caregiver] asks me what’s wrong it’s hard cos I can’t like explain it and stuff. I don’t know how to explain what I’m thinking about and feeling. That’s why I don’t really talk to anyone. I just like to lay with him [the dog] when I am confused and feeling funny. (Pete)

Previous studies (e.g., Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011) in the context of attachment theory have suggested that people often report high levels of emotional attunement with their animal companions, to the extent that they often feel that they do not have to “seek animals out” during distressing episodes because the animal “comes to them” first. Children alluded to this on a number of occasions:

He [the dog] comes to find me and when I am feeling a bit worried it’s like he can tell because he is really gentle and he wants to cuddle up to me and stuff like that because he makes me feel much better and … he stops me worrying. (Jake).

If I’m sad she [the dog] follows me round. I like getting back [from school] and being with her if people have … say … said mean things. I feel much better when I am with her. (May)

Animals as a secure base

Kwong and Bartholomew (2011) have suggested that it can be difficult to distinguish between secure-base and safe-haven features of human–animal attachment relationships. They argued that safe-haven and secure-base features sometimes coincide because “felt security” (i.e., a secure base) clearly develops from having a reliable source of comfort (i.e., a safe haven). In the current study, children were able to identify evidence of secure-base features in their relationships with companion animals, although perhaps not as readily as they could identify examples of a safe haven. Nonetheless, there was evidence that children viewed their animals as a secure base from which to gain a sense of confidence in the world around them.

I do feel more confident when he [the dog] is around, like when people ask me what I think about stuff and when talking to people I feel better if he [the dog] is just “around,” but I don’t need him all the time – just when it’s difficult. (Katie)

When school is bad or I’m away from home I do think about him [the dog] and where we can walk that evening. I like that I can always go back to him and he’s the first to say hello. I feel more confident knowing he is around and will be there when I get home cos if it’s a good one or a bad day he still wants to see me. (Pete)

The notion of a secure base was also evident in the things children did with their animal companions. For example, Katie spoke about feeling more confident to go for walks “alone”:

I feel much more confident with him [the dog] and like I can do a lot more. I don’t know why but I don’t worry so much and I take him when I go to the shops because I can go on my own and I know that he’ll be there with me.
Separation distress

There was evidence that some of the children experienced a sense of distress linked to separation from their family dog. For example, while on holiday with her foster caregiver (and dog), Jane’s dog was required to sleep in the car, away from the building in which the family was staying. Jane and her foster carer both commented on how this significantly affected Jane’s emotional state.

I was worried because he wasn’t in the house. He usually sleeps beside my door and I didn’t like sleeping in a strange place and not having him there too. I was worried because he wasn’t in the same place as me when I went to sleep. (Jane)

She was always within eye sight of him [the dog] and when she wasn’t she was wondering where he was, and I mean all the time. (Jane’s foster carer)

Furthermore, Trudi (Jake’s foster caregiver) explained how

He [Jake] would obviously let go of a lot of tension after school … he didn’t appear to put up too much protest when we dropped him off but as soon as we collected him he would ask about the dog, check that he was OK, that he was still at home, and check what I had been doing all day, and then he would come in and rush upstairs to check his stuff was still in his room and that it hadn’t been packed away for him. He had a real issue being separated from Zak. (Jake’s foster carer).

In the context of attachment theory, it is important to understand that the direction of the concern generated by separation anxiety is an indicator of the nature of the attachment relationship. For example, Kwong and Bartholomew (2011) noted that many participants in their study of human bonds with assistance dogs indicated that separation anxiety in relation to the animals was most significantly linked to concerns for animals’ welfare during the separation (indicative of a caregiving bond as opposed to an attachment bond). As Kwong and Bartholomew (2011) noted, “within an attachment relationship, separation anxiety serves to maintain proximity [to the attachment figure] for protection and safety. Therefore, the focus of concern would be on one’s own well-being” (p. 428). In the current study, some participants felt anxiety during separation with animal companions due to the negative impact upon their own emotional regulation.

Animals as a bridge

The animal companions in the current study frequently seemed to offer children a bridge via which they could begin to experience and believe in their foster caregivers as “caring others”. For example, Jake’s diary indicated that he had come to view his foster caregiver as caring and trustworthy based upon his observations of her interactions with the family dog:

Trudi [foster caregiver] was a nice person who wasn’t being fake. She took real good care of Zak [the dog] all the time and never got angry or fed up. She was really nice to him and always made sure that he was ok. I like Zak so much. He is really nice and wants to spend time with me. I think I was wrong about Trudi because actually she seems nice too. Zak must love her and I know he wouldn’t do that if Trudi wasn’t really nice. (Jake’s diary)

Similarly, Evan also suggested that how his foster caregiver treated the family dog played a role in shaping and constructing his expectations of her as a caregiver:
It was like she [foster caregiver] was a person I could trust and she would take care of me too. Like, Socks [the dog] hasn’t got a Mum or a Dad either and Rose [foster caregiver] looks after us both the same. She is a nice person because she is always really nice to Socks and does lots of things for him. (Evan)

I heard her [foster caregiver] talking to him [the dog] about things about me. I heard her telling him to be nice to me and not to feel jealous because she still loved him. She said that I seemed really nice and that she wanted to get to know me. I sat on the stairs and listened and watched her through the rails. It made me feel funny in my tummy when she said those nice things, and when I saw that she was talking to the dog I liked it so I started talking to him too. (Evan)

Pete and his caregiver also alluded to something similar:

She [foster caregiver] was always nice to him [the dog], so I knew that she’d be nice to me too. Even when he’s bad, like barking or biting things, she doesn’t hate him, or get rid of him. I liked her because she was dead kind to him all the time. After, when I liked the dog, that’s when I liked her [foster caregiver]” (Pete)

“I felt judged. He was like a shadow for the dog. When I was with the dog he watched my every move … with eagle eyes. (Pete’s foster caregiver)

Bridger (1970) discussed the way in which animals can often serve as “transitional beings” that help soothe and divert anxieties within human–human relationships until a trusted rapport has been established. This seemed to be the case in the context of the foster families in the current study (this is not to say that animals functioned only as transitional beings).

**General discussion**

The current study supported the contention that children’s relationships with animal companions in the context of long-term foster care offer important benefits that are linked to attachment security. The majority of children reported experiencing their animal companions as available, reassuring, and comforting during times of distress. Furthermore, they often felt that their animal companions provided them with a sense of security, confidence, and a general sense that they were being cared about and looked after in a context that many experienced as extremely threatening. There was also evidence that separation from animal companions provoked a sense of anxiety in some children that seemed to be linked to feeling less safe in the animal’s absence.

Furthermore, data also identified that animals had the capacity to strengthen, reinforce, and lubricate the development of relational closeness between children and their foster caregivers. Winnicott (1953/1986) and Bridger (1970) discussed the importance of “transitional objects/beings” in therapeutic contexts as providing a safe haven to hold on to and divert anxieties, while clients work through and face the challenges and threats posed by human relationships. Furthermore, Parish-Plass (2008) has highlighted the incredibly important therapeutic function that caregiver interactions with animal companions can have in AAT, as children simply observe these interactions and relate them back to the self in their minds. There was evidence in the current study that this can be a particularly important aspect of the presence of animal companions in foster homes and that it can “soften” the idea of closeness with foster caregivers in children’s minds.
In the context of attachment, it is important to reflect upon the meaning of these findings in a conceptual sense and in relation to the relational goals of the foster care system. As we noted in our introduction, it would be unwise to suggest that animals in the foster home can (or should) fulfil the role of an attachment figure in any complete sense, to the extent that they can be said to fulfil the role of the caring, protective caregiver conceptualised by Bowlby (1973). It is important to keep in mind that the development of secure attachment relationships with foster caregivers is clearly one of the most important relational goals for children. Our findings suggested that the animal relationships (and the features of attachment security that animals provided) played a critical role in establishing a “holding environment” (Winnicott, 1965) that may be particularly important in the context of attachment facilitation in the child–foster caregiver bond.

In their exposition of a secure-base parenting model for foster care, Schofield and Beek (2009) highlighted the critical importance of establishing a secure base in foster caregiver relationships while simultaneously acknowledging that the development of a secure base can be extremely hard work for foster families because of the challenging expectations and models of relationships that children frequently bring with them. They noted that in order to facilitate the development of a secure base with foster children, the foster care system must try to ensure that caregivers initially “feel” friendly, caring, and approachable for children and that they offer them a safe, non-threatening environment as far as possible. It is to this end that our data suggested that animal relationships in the foster home may be particularly important. Animals seemed to play a role in reducing children’s anxieties; they showed sensitivity to children’s feelings, helped regulate these feelings, provided a sense of unconditional acceptance, and facilitated a sense of belonging. While these sorts of relational benefits may not make the animals attachment figures in their own right, they should be appreciated as a critical part of the therapeutic process of rebuilding a sense of attachment security in the foster home.

All of the animal companions in the current study were dogs. Morey (2010) has speculated that dogs have been selectively bred for thousands of years because of their very capacity to connect with human beings and to engage in mutually responsive relationships with them. As such, it is plausible that animals such as dogs have a powerful capacity to trigger and respond to attachment-related behaviour in human beings (Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011). These findings lend support to this contention and to an expanding literature base (e.g., Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011; Rockett & Carr, 2014; Zilcha-Mano et al., 2011b) suggesting that relationships with animals can satisfy attachment functions for humans.

There are, of course, many further questions to be answered and some limitations and caveats to acknowledge and address in future research. First, practitioners are beginning to acknowledge and tap into the potential therapeutic benefits of dogs in the context of long-term foster care. In a recent Good Practice Guide relating specifically to Dogs and Pets in Fostering and Adoption (Adams, 2015) the British Association of Adoption and Fostering recognises that wider features of the fostering environment such as pets can be important parts of the foster system. However, the guide also raises important practical issues for families to consider such as the potential relevance of factors such as dog breed, child and dog “matching” and/or compatibility, and safety and ethical treatment of dogs and
children in foster homes. Most of the children in this study came from backgrounds involving significant abuse and/or neglect. It is significant that research (e.g., Ascione, 1997; Currie, 2006) has identified a connection between exposure to such familial abuse and violence and the likelihood of children behaving cruelly towards animals. During this study, we did not identify any incidents of cruelty towards animals. However, it may be an important ethical issue for researchers, practitioners, and foster carers to consider. Such issues require careful attention as policy in relation to dogs in the context of foster care is further developed. Second, there is a need for larger scale research that utilises more objective measures of attachment to verify the attachment-related issues we raised. Such studies would help to further corroborate some of the processes at which our data hinted and could help to establish how these processes unfold longitudinally.

It would be foolish to suggest that all foster homes ought to incorporate animal companions as part and parcel of the fostering process. Clearly, the processes highlighted in this study are likely to be dependent upon a number of complex factors that need to be carefully considered. Some children are scared of dogs, not all children are likely to respond positively to dogs, some children may have a history of abuse towards animals (as noted above), and not all caregivers relate to their animals in the same way. It was not the purpose of our study to suggest that animals in the foster home can provide a one-size-fits-all solution to the challenges of long-term foster care. Rather, we sought to highlight the potential that animals can hold in relation to helping children experience the benefits associated with warm, secure, safe, and nurturing relationships in foster care.

Ultimately, we believe that this study is interesting because it extends ideas about human–animal attachment into an applied context where it may have particularly important implications. Children frequently face significant challenges developing secure attachment bonds in foster homes, due to carry-over effects that can increase their resistance to and trust in new relationships (Milan & Pinderhughes, 2000; Strijker et al., 2008). Recent studies (e.g., XXXX, in press) suggest that animal relationships hold significant potential to circumvent such relational challenges, and our data suggest that this may be particularly helpful for children to develop a sense of safety and security in the context of foster care.
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