

UDC 159.964.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/70-1-46>**Anton VERTEL,**orcid.org/0000-0003-2247-7443

Candidate of Philosophical Science, Associate Professor;
 Doctoral Student at the Department of Pedagogy
 Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A. S. Makarenko
 (Sumy, Ukraine) antonvertel@ukr.net

MARY AINSWORTH'S ATTACHMENT THEORY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR UNDERSTANDING A CHILD'S EARLY SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In the modern psychological and pedagogical discourse, attachment is a key concept that describes a child's attitude towards an adult. The phenomenon of attachment is a deep emotional bond that arises between a child and an adult as a result of communication and close interaction. Attachment is an individually directed stable emotional attitude, which is based on the experience of an affectively rich relationship of a child with a close adult (usually the mother). As a result of communication with parents, the child forms cognitive ideas about himself and others, an internal working model, and patterns of interaction.

The concept of attachment is closely related to the concept of relationships, but is not identical to it. Attachment is a separate type of emotional connection. Although attachment, being a deep connection, is not identical to interaction, it often influences interaction and manifests itself in its characteristics. At the same time, we are talking, first of all, about the behavior of attachment, the study of which started a whole direction in modern development theory. Attachment theory is one of the most influential explanatory concepts in Western psychology and pedagogy. It arose on the basis of ethology, psychoanalysis and the theory of information processing. As in psychoanalysis, the focus of attachment theory is put on the child's early relationship with a close adult (a mother or a person who replaces her). The experience of interaction with the mother in the first year of the child's life creates attachment to her, which largely determines further mental and personal development.

The article analyzes in detail M. Ainsworth's experiment «Strange Situation», in which she studied the development of interaction between mothers and babies during the first year of life. Based on observations, three types of children's reactions were described, which correspond to three types of attachment of the child to the mother (later a fourth type was proposed). M. Ainsworth called them safe and dangerous types of attachment. The classification system was named «ABC». The following types of attachment are distinguished: secure type of attachment «B», dangerous type of attachment «A», ambivalent type of dangerous attachment «C», disorganized type of attachment «D». Special attention is paid to the internal working model – a complex of internal mental images that are formed in a child during communication with one of the adults. With the help of this model, the child learns to predict the reactions of an adult in response to his own actions, this model will be the basis of interaction with other people in adulthood.

Key words: pedagogy, attachment theory, attachment types, primary attachment figure, internal working model, psychoanalytic pedagogy.

Антон ВЕРТЕЛЬ,orcid.org/0000-0003-2247-7443

кандидат філософських наук, доцент,
 докторант кафедри педагогіки
 Сумського державного педагогічного університету імені А.С. Макаренка
 (Суми, Україна) antonvertel@ukr.net

ТЕОРІЯ ПРИВ'ЯЗАНОСТІ МЕРІ ЕЙНСВОРТ ТА ЇЇ ЗНАЧЕННЯ ДЛЯ РОЗУМІННЯ РАНЬОГО СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕМОЦІЙНОГО РОЗВИТКУ ДИТИНИ

У сучасному психолого-педагогічному дискурсі прив'язаність є ключовим поняттям, яке описує ставлення дитини до дорослого. Феномен прив'язаності є глибоким емоційним зв'язком, що виникає між дитиною і дорослим в результаті спілкування і тісної взаємодії. Прив'язаність – індивідуально спрямована стійка емоційна установка, в основі якої лежить досвід афективно насичених відносин дитини з близьким дорослим (зазвичай матір'ю). В результаті спілкування з батьками дитина формує когнітивні уявлення про себе та оточуючих, внутрішню робочу модель, схеми взаємодії.

Поняття прив'язаності тісно пов'язане з поняттям відносин (взаємин), але не тотожно йому. Прив'язаність – це окремий тип емоційних зв'язків. Хоча прив'язаність, будучи глибинним зв'язком, не тотожна взаємодії, вона часто впливає на неї і проявляється у її особливостях. При цьому йдеться, перш за все, про поведінку прив'язаності, вивчення якої і започаткувало цілий напрям у сучасній теорії розвитку. Теорія прив'язаності є однією з найвпливовіших пояснювальних концепцій у західній психології та педагогіці. Вона виникла на основі етології, психоаналізу та теорії переробки інформації. Як і в психоаналізі, в центрі уваги теорії прив'язаності знаходяться ранні відносини дитини з близьким дорослим (матір'ю або людиною, яка її замінює). Досвід взаємодії з матір'ю на першому році життя дитини породжує прив'язаність до неї, яка багато в чому визначає подальший психічний та особистісний розвиток.

У статті детально проаналізовано експеримент М. Ейнсворт «Незнайома ситуація» в якому вона досліджувала розвиток взаємодії матерів та немовлят протягом першого року життя. На підставі спостережень було описано три типи реакцій дітей, які відповідають трьом типам прив'язаності дитини до матері (пізніше був запропонований четвертий тип). М. Ейнсворт назвала їх безпечним та небезпечним типами прив'язаності. Система класифікації отримала назву «АВС». Виділяють наступні типи прив'язаності: безпечний тип прив'язаності «В», небезпечний тип прив'язаності «А», амбівалентний тип небезпечної прив'язаності «С», дезорганізований тип прив'язаності «D». Особлива увага приділяється внутрішній робочій моделі – комплексу внутрішніх психічних образів, які формуються у дитини під час спілкування з одним із дорослих. За допомогою цієї моделі дитина вчиться передбачати реакції дорослого у відповідь на власні дії, ця модель буде основою взаємодії з іншими людьми в дорослому віці.

***Ключові слова:** педагогіка, теорія прив'язаності, типи прив'язаності, фігура первинної прив'язаності, внутрішня робоча модель, психоаналітична педагогіка.*

Introduction. Early childhood is not the time to acquire book knowledge, most of which is still impossible for a child to comprehend. This is the time of sensory and motor development, which will form the foundation on which the child will be able to build his own worldview.

The psychophysiological features of childhood are such that the child learns from his mistakes, forming an objective picture of the world. Moreover, at this time, the development of his sensual sphere is taking place, which will contribute not only to the formation of a higher intelligence, but also to those personal characteristics that will form the necessary basis of creativity in the future: initiative, inquisitiveness. The experience accumulated during this time will form the basis of the accuracy of perception of the world. One of the first and most important critical periods that a child goes through is formation of attachment. The most important is the critical period associated with formation of attachment (Bowlby et al., 1956). It covers the first one and a half years of a child's life.

Research analysis. The works of I. Bretherton (1992), P. M. Crittenden (2006; 2016; 2017), H. Daniels (2005), M. Main, J. Solomon, E. Meins (2013), L. Rosmalen, F. Van der Horst, R. Van der Veer (2015, 2016), R. Spies, R. Duschinsky (2021), E. Waters, D. Petters, C. Facompre (2013) are devoted to the general methodological, psychological, and socio-pedagogical issues of the theory of attachment proposed by M. Ainsworth (1986; 1990).

The purpose of the article. To reveal the features of M. Ainsworth's theory of attachment, to show the importance of this theory for understanding the early socio-emotional development of a child.

Research results. The quality of attachment directly depends on the mother (parents) of the child, who show their care for the child in different ways (Bowlby & Ainsworth, 1965). She investigated the qualitative characteristics of children's attachment using the "Strange Situation" procedure, which was proposed by M. Ainsworth in a longitudinal study of the development of mother-infant interaction during the first year of life (Spies & Duschinsky, 2021).

She proposed an experiment aimed at assessing the quality of attachment, consisting of eight situations of three minutes each. The procedure consists of several episodes of mother-infant interaction, separation, and meeting, videotaped, and subsequently mother-infant behavior is classified by a trained expert (Rosmalen et al., 2015).

The child was initially with the mother in the experimental room and explored the room in her presence. Then a stranger would come in and just sit in the room for three minutes. Then this person switched places with the mother and offered the child to play with her. Then the mother would go and leave the child with a stranger who tried to comfort the child. The mother returned and offered the child to play. After that, the mother and the stranger walked together, finally the mother returned again. The child's behavior at the time of the mother's leaving and return was evaluated as indicators of attachment.

Based on observations, three types of children's reactions were described, which correspond to three types of attachment of the child to the mother. M. Ainsworth called them safe and dangerous types of attachment. Moreover, she singled out two types of dangerous: insecure-avoidant dangerous type and ambivalent dangerous. The classification system was

called “ABC” (Ainsworth, 2013c). The following types of attachment of children were identified:

I. The first type of attachment “B”.

The first type of attachment “B” (securely attached infants), in which infants use the mother as a secure base for exploration, actively wait for the mother during separation, and explicitly welcome her during reunion, smile, vocalize. If they are upset, they are looking for contact, if they have calmed down, they continue to explore the surrounding reality. The main characteristic of children with B-type attachment is the ability to seek and receive support and attention from their mother. When children enjoy communicating with their mother, their research activity is restored. Formation of this type of attachment is associated with the mother’s sensitive and stable response during the first year of life to the child’s distress signals (Ainsworth & Marvin, 1995).

Children with attachment type “B” are self-confident with a sense of their own security and reliable attachment, such children grow up with sensitive and caring parents. This type is observed in most babies of the first year of life from 65% to 70%. When performing cognitive tasks, children of this category are persistent and rely on their own strength. At a more mature age, in social interaction, such children show leadership qualities, contact and friendliness. Children with attachment type “B” show the healthiest pattern of development.

II. The second type of attachment “A”.

Insecure attachment type “A” (insecure-avoidant infants), in which the children actively explore, but they do not have an affective interaction with the mother, they do not use the mother to help them explore toys. The experiment showed that the children did not even approach their mother, it was as if they did not notice their own mother. During the experiment, the mother left the room, and when she returned, the children did not respond to her. Infants even avoided physical contact when the mother attempted to hold, hug, the infant, with the infant looking away from the mother without showing any emotion (Ainsworth, 1979a).

Such children show few visible signs of distress during separation. After the mother’s return, they do not greet her, rather actively avoid the mother, often turn to toys to avoid contact with her. When children are upset, they prefer to be at a distance from their mother. The main feature of the behavior of these children is the desire not to turn to their mother in a situation when they feel uncomfortable. In this situation, type “A” children cope with distress with the help of toys. Type “A” attachment formation involves the mother’s predictable (but nonthreatening) disre-

gard of the child’s need for emotional reassurance in situations where the child is anxious (Ainsworth, 1979b).

This pattern of behavior is found in approximately 20% of babies in the first year of life. M. Ainsworth interpreted this behavior of the child as her fears that in an unusual, unfamiliar, non-standard situation, the mother will not provide the necessary support, so they chose a defense strategy. Restrained, indifferent behavior is a defense mechanism. The negative, traumatic experience of rejection by its own mother is repressed by the child, it tries to block its own need for maternal care in order not to experience trauma (disappointment) again. Such patterns of behavior can be fixed in adulthood and become the core of the personality, which is expressed in self-confidence and alienation, forms mistrust of the surrounding people and the world as a whole (Rosmalen et al., 2016).

III. The third type of attachment “C”.

Ambivalent type of insecure attachment “C” (insecure-ambivalent infants), in which children are very worried, being in an unfamiliar room, often irritated or passive, do not explore the surrounding reality. They are very nervous when separated from their mother, when they meet, they show ambivalent signals of desire and active rejection of contact, they cannot calm down for a long time. A common feature of children with type “C” attachment is the use of negative affect (anger, fear) to achieve closeness with the mother. Formation of this type is associated with the mother’s unpredictable response to the child’s distress signals (Ainsworth et al., 2015).

This type of attachment is formed in children whose mothers show unpredictable and inconsistent reactions. The relationship between the child and the mother is tense, unstable, and disturbing. The mother’s attitude towards the child is characterized by inconsistency, the mother did not always show sensitivity and care for her own child. Such inconsistent behavior is apparently formed as a result of the child’s lack of confidence that his mother will be with him in an unfamiliar, dangerous situation. The presence of the mother, in a situation of uncertainty, is always desired by the child. Children of this type were nervous when the mother left the child alone, and tried to re-engage with her when she returned to the playroom, showing aggression towards her.

The ambivalent type of dangerous attachment “C” is called “resistance” in the psychoanalytic literature, because children not only try to establish and maintain contact with their own mother as soon as possible, but also resist it. This pattern of behavior is found in approximately 10–15% of babies in the first year of life.

A number of subsequent studies have shown that not all children have qualitative characteristics of attachment that can be assessed using the assessment criteria of M. Ainsworth's "ABC" classification (Waters et al., 2013). There is a specific category of children who demonstrate such behaviors as joy during separation and fear when meeting their mother, numbness, freezing – during play and interaction, the presence of stereotypical behavior, etc. A fourth type of attachment has been proposed – disorganized/disoriented attachment. In this case, the unusual, contradictory behavior of children is regarded as the collapse of the organized attachment strategy of the child in the first year of life in the face of the terrible, extremely contradictory behavior of the object of attachment – the mother, or the person who replaces her (Main & Solomon, 1986, 1990).

The reason for the collapse is an inability of the child at this age to resolve the internal mental conflict between the desire to attract attention and feel care from the mother and the fear of her. In the case of stress, when, according to the basic premise of attachment theory, behavior is aimed at seeking protection and comfort, this conflict is activated and manifested at the behavioral level. For example, the child cannot complete closeness to the mother (as a child with a secure attachment does), freezes, is also unable to play, avoiding contact with the mother, as a child with an avoidant attachment type does.

IV. The fourth type of attachment "D".

P. Crittenden offered a different perspective on the unusual behavior of children during the "Strange Situation" procedure. Her approach makes it possible to interpret complex attachment strategies that are formed in a child in response to the dangerous, contradictory behavior of the mother (parents). P. Crittenden notes that the experience of danger in relations with the mother does not cause a collapse in the child, but stimulates him to seek more complex types of adaptation (within attachment strategies "A" and "C") in order to reduce the physical or psychological threat, and also increase the mother's emotional availability.

A new type of attachment and its theoretical conceptualization was identified – *disorganized type of attachment "D"*. There is an assumption that many children who had a disorganized type of attachment as infants (up to one year) and at an early age (up to three years) form special types of attachment that include both caring and aggressive behavior in relation to the object of attachment (Crittenden, 2017).

The following types of complex attachment are distinguished:

1. Compulsive (forced) caring and obedient behavior in relation to the mother/parents (type "A"),

in which the child shows increased attention to the wishes of the mother/parents, while his own initiative in the game and demonstration of his own needs (seeking support from the mother after separation) is reduced. Avoidantly attached children are usually obedient, but this obedience is compulsive in nature, allowing them to cope with the fear of rejection by parents and close adults. The following variants of the avoidance strategy are distinguished:

a) socially compliant type: the child adapts to an adult, displacing from his consciousness the facts of inattentive, contemptuous treatment by his mother/parents; high social loyalty;

b) the isolated type is characterized by isolation of behavior, external indifference to the attention of an adult;

c) obsessive-caring type: the child, due to various reasons, feels that he is not good enough for his parents, did not deserve their love, therefore he strives to achieve success, to be useful (in adulthood, this pattern of attachment is often observed in representatives of helping professions: teachers, psychologists, social workers, doctors);

d) the compulsive-obedient type is characterized by passive behavior, lack of initiative, external indifference to the attention of others, refusals from tasks that are difficult, reluctance to make efforts to overcome difficulties.

2. Aggressive and pretend-helpless behavior (type "C"), in which the child shows either increased aggressiveness during the "Strange Situation" procedure, or is extremely worried or passive, research activity is absent; behavior that combines "A" and "C" attachment strategies. Ambivalent (anxious-protesting) attachment is characterized by the child's desire to control the adult, to manage him. As a rule, this behavior strategy is implemented in two related options. In the case of a threatening strategy of influencing parents, the struggle for their attention is conducted by such means as whims, shouting, threats, aggression, blackmail, stubbornness. In the case of a peaceful strategy, there is a demonstration of helplessness, dependence on parents, the inability to survive without their care and attention, an appeal to pity. With the help of such protection strategies, the child has the illusion of predictability, controllability of adults, who are perceived by the child as unreliable.

Also, each type may have additional characteristics such as depression (Dp), disorientation (Do), and intrusion of negative affect (INA) (Crittenden, 2006; 2016; 2017). P. Crittenden's approach expands the "ABC" model of M. Ainsworth, but does not introduce new categories in the assessment of attachment.

Two concepts are important for M. Ainsworth's theory – the figure of primary attachment and the internal working model. A figure of primary attachment is a person with whom a child forms close contacts and relationships of mutual attachment at birth. Based on the experience of communication with loved ones, the child creates his "internal working model" of interaction, which then develops and improves throughout his life.

An internal working model is a complex of internal mental images that are formed in a child during communication with one of the adults. With the help of this model, the child learns to predict the adult's reactions in response to his own actions. When the child grows up, this model will form the basis of interaction with other people. An individual working model is formed for each person with whom the child communicates. The more people a child communicates with, the richer the experience.

The internal working model is a complex of connections between the adult's signals and the newborn's reactions, and vice versa. Infants unconsciously assign meaning to the objects of their social world, orienting themselves to the behavior of adults and the context in which these interactions with them occur. An internal working model allows the child to create expectations of the causes and effects of current interactions, and then future interactions. It includes first the emotions about the "attachment figure", and then the ideas and thoughts that are formed gradually. Looking at an adult, as in a mirror, a child gets to know himself. That is why, in the internal working model, the self-image is derived from the image of the primary attachment figure.

An internal working model reflects an internal representation of the range of changes in reality, oneself and one's interactions with others. The choice of words in the concept of "internal working model" is not accidental and emphasizes the fact that the child's ideas about relationships are active and constantly constructed in the process of development, so the models formed in childhood are later reconstructed at a higher level of complexity. These representations are at the unconscious level, but affect thoughts and behavior at the level of consciousness. Thus, the internal working model reflects the genetic need to give meaning and remember action that is associated with primary attachment figures. Infants assign meaning to various objects in their social world based on how their parents relate to those objects. Moreover, they give importance to themselves, taking into account the attitude of their parents towards them.

In optimal conditions, the primary attachment figure (or figures – mother and father) is physically and

psychologically available and sensitive to the child's needs. The main function of primary attachment figures is not to satisfy the need for love, as in classical psychoanalysis and the psychoanalytic theory of object relations, and not to satisfy the child's physical needs, as in behaviorism, but to provide protection and safety. Therefore, effective attachment provides the child with initiative, the development of research behavior, and the desire for knowledge. On the basis of interaction with loved ones, the child forms a protective base that explains the world as safe, and a sense of identity with the primary figure (Meins, 2013).

Reliable (secure) attachment is important for a sense of identity – a sense of belonging to a family. The child's "Ego"/"Self" system is formed from this feeling. The child will rely on this feeling during the crisis periods of his personality formation. Creating himself, the child will push away from the figures of primary attachment. That is, the behavior of people with whom the child identifies himself, namely parents and relatives during the crisis, will allow him to understand the limits of his capabilities. Therefore, if there is no primary attachment figure, and there is no identity with it, the crisis situations of development are weakened and there is a slower and simplified formation of the personality (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991).

A child can create no more than ten attachments, among them a hierarchy emerges, when the relationship with the mother and father becomes the most significant, and with the grandmother – less significant (or vice versa, if the grandmother is engaged in upbringing). The number of these attachments cannot be infinite, just as there is a limit to the number of emotionally intense interactions in natural settings that require a return and a corresponding resource. Each interaction with a specific person leads to the creation of a separate internal working model that is constructed independently, which is proved by empirical studies (Bretherton, 1992).

The difference between attachment theory and domestic research is that in the Ukrainian tradition (which is partly a legacy of Soviet pedagogy and psychology), the emphasis was on the joint activity of a child and an adult or on communication, which is understood as activity. In this, an adult is a certain factor in the formation of a child's self-awareness (Daniels, 2005). In M. Ainsworth's theory of attachment, attention is focused on the relationship between a child and an adult, which exist and are realized in an inseparable unity. The adult seems to internalize (accept) the child and begins to live in it (Ainsworth, 1979a).

Conclusions. The analysis of M. Ainsworth's theory of attachment and her experiment "Strange Situation" allows us to draw the following conclusions:

1. M. Ainsworth's attachment theory converges with psychoanalytic theories of early child development (British school of object relations). Psychoanalytic theories of M. Klein, W. Bion, D. Winnicott are the basis of M. Ainsworth's theory of attachment, although her theory has a more positivist orientation and methodology.

2. Qualitative characteristics of attachment are long-lasting and allow, as numerous longitudinal studies show, to predict a child's sense of confidence, in particular, when he enters school.

3. Attachment modalities can be predicted based on the quality and synchronicity of early interactions between the child and his mother. In cases of interaction observed in infants aged one, three, and nine months, the synchronicity of early interactions predicts that at the age of one year, the infant's attachment to the mother will be a secure attachment (type "B").

4. The typology of early interactions can be changed with psychological and pedagogical counseling of the mother.

5. This allows us to state about a stable relationship between the mother's attachment model and the type of attachment that is formed in her child. This type of attachment will undoubtedly be stable in nature. Based on the theory of M. Ainsworth, it is theoretically possible to predict that it will be passed on to the next generation: thus, such a complex concept as transgenerational transmission turns out to be

reduced to this simple connecting link – the transmission of the attachment model.

6. Internal working models of attachment are understood as mental representations of aspects of the world, others and oneself or relationships with others that are of particular importance to any individual.

7. M. Ainsworth noted that mothers, who were sensitive to the needs of a newborn child, had children who cried less; these children had the best communication with their mother by the end of the first year of their life. This observation formed the basis of her experimental studies and her classification of attachment. Hence there are the following definitions of internal working models of attachment: a) working models are mental representations that contain both cognitive and affective elements; b) they are formed on the basis of the generalization of events representations; c) they exist outside consciousness and are endowed with a certain stability; d) events, on the basis of which working models of attachment are formed, related to events referred to as attachment; these latter are the "result" of the "instinctive" principle of the desire for closeness; e) infants who try to secure the greatest intimacy with the person who cares for them and who are accepted by her do not form the same working models as infants who receive "blocked" or "unpredictable" responses; f) these working models can be formed from the beginning of life and are explained in the paradigm typology of M. Ainsworth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ainsworth M. Attachment as Related to Mother-Infant Interaction. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. New York: Academic Press, 1979. Pp. 1–51.
2. Ainsworth M. Infant-mother attachment. *American Psychologist*. 1979. № 34 (10). Pp. 932–937.
3. Ainsworth M. An autobiographical sketch. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2013. № 15 (5–6). Pp. 448–459.
4. Ainsworth M., Blehar M. C., Waters E., Wall S. N. Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. New York: Psychology Press, 2015. 466 p.
5. Ainsworth M., Marvin R. S. On the shaping of attachment theory and research: An interview with Mary Ainsworth. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 1995. № 60 (2/3). Pp. 2–21.
6. Ainsworth, M., Bowlby, J. An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*. 1991. № 46 (4). Pp. 333–341.
7. Bowlby J., Ainsworth M. Child Care and Growth of Love. London: Penguin, 1965. 254 p.
8. Bowlby J., Ainsworth M., Boston M., Rosenbluth D. The effects of mother-child separation: A follow-up study. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*. 1956. № 29. Pp. 211–247.
9. Bretherton I. The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental Psychology*. 1992. № 28 (5). Pp. 759–775.
10. Crittenden P. M. A dynamic-maturational model of attachment. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*. 2006. Volume 27. Pp. 105–115.
11. Crittenden P. M. Raising parents. Attachment, representation, and treatment. London; New York: Routledge, 2016. 349 p.
12. Crittenden P. M. Gifts from Mary Ainsworth and John Bowlby. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2017. Volume 22 (3). Pp. 436–442.
13. Daniels H. Vygotsky and educational psychology: Some preliminary remarks. *Educational & Child Psychology*. 2005. Volume 22. № 1. Pp. 6–17.
14. Main M., Solomon J. Discovery of a new, insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment patterns. *Affective development in infancy*. New York: Ablex, 1986. Pp. 95–125.

15. Main M., Solomon J. Procedure for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research and intervention*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990. Pp. 121–160.
16. Meins E. Sensitive attunement to infants' internal states: operationalizing the construct of mind-mindedness. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2013. № 15 (5–6). Pp. 524–544.
17. Rosmalen L., Van der Horst F. & Van der Veer R. From secure dependency to attachment: Mary Ainsworth's integration of Blatz's security theory into Bowlby's attachment theory. *History of Psychology*. 2016. № 19 (1). Pp. 22–39.
18. Rosmalen L., Van der Veer R., & Van der Horst F. Ainsworth's Strange Situation Procedure: The origin of an instrument. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*. 2015. Volume 51 (3). Pp. 261–284.
19. Spies R., Duschinsky R. Inheriting Mary Ainsworth and the Strange Situation: Questions of Legacy, Authority, and Methodology for Contemporary Developmental Attachment Researchers. *SAGE Open*. 2021. № 11. Pp. 1–13.
20. Waters E., Petters D., Fagot C. Epilogue: Reflections on a special issue of attachment & human development in Mary Ainsworth's 100th year. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2013. № 15 (5–6). Pp. 673–681.

REFERENCES

1. Ainsworth, M. (1979). Attachment as Related to Mother-Infant Interaction. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. New York: Academic Press, 1–51.
2. Ainsworth, M. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. *American Psychologist*, 34 (10), 932–937.
3. Ainsworth, M. (2013). An autobiographical sketch. *Attachment & Human Development*, 15 (5–6), 448–459.
4. Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., Wall, S. N. (2015). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. New York: Psychology Press, 466 p.
5. Ainsworth, M., Marvin, R. S. (1995). On the shaping of attachment theory and research: An interview with Mary Ainsworth. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 60 (2/3), 2–21.
6. Ainsworth, M., Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, 46 (4), 333–341.
7. Bowlby, J., Ainsworth, M. (1965) *Child Care and Growth of Love*. London: Penguin.
8. Bowlby, J., Ainsworth, M., Boston, M., Rosenbluth, D. (1956). The effects of mother-child separation: A follow-up study. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 29, 211–247.
9. Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental Psychology*, 28 (5), 759–775.
10. Crittenden, P. M. (2006). A dynamic-maturational model of attachment. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, Volume 27, 105–115.
11. Crittenden, P. M. (2016). *Raising parents. Attachment, representation, and treatment*. London; New York: Routledge, 2016. 349 p.
12. Crittenden, P. M. (2017). Gifts from Mary Ainsworth and John Bowlby. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Volume 22 (3), 436–442.
13. Daniels, H. (2005). Vygotsky and educational psychology: Some preliminary remarks. *Educational & Child Psychology*, Volume 22, № 1, 6–17.
14. Main, M., Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of a new, insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment patterns. *Affective development in infancy*. New York: Ablex, 95–125.
15. Main, M., Solomon, J. (1990). Procedure for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research and intervention*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 121–160.
16. Meins, E. (2013). Sensitive attunement to infants' internal states: operationalizing the construct of mind-mindedness. *Attachment & Human Development*, 15 (5–6), 524–544.
17. Rosmalen, L., Van der Horst F. & Van der Veer, R. (2016). From secure dependency to attachment: Mary Ainsworth's integration of Blatz's security theory into Bowlby's attachment theory. *History of Psychology*, 19 (1), 22–39.
18. Rosmalen, L., Van der Veer, R., & Van der Horst, F. (2015). Ainsworth's Strange Situation Procedure: The origin of an instrument. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 51 (3), 261–284.
19. Spies, R., Duschinsky, R. (2021). Inheriting Mary Ainsworth and the Strange Situation: Questions of Legacy, Authority, and Methodology for Contemporary Developmental Attachment Researchers. *SAGE Open*, 11, 1–13.
20. Waters, E., Petters, D., Fagot, C. (2013). Epilogue: Reflections on a special issue of attachment & human development in Mary Ainsworth's 100th year. *Attachment & Human Development*, 15 (5–6), 673–681.