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ABSTRACT

SOMEONE SHOT THE RAINBOW: EMERGENT WRITING PATTERNS OF SECURELY AND INSECURELY ATTACHED, INNER-CITY FIRST GRADERS

by

Cindy Matthews
University of New Hampshire, May, 1992

The mother or primary caretaker of an infant establishes a communicative bond which has long-term implications for the child as a symbolizer and learner. John Bowlby's theory of attachment claims the mother is the secure base from which an infant, and later the child, can explore and master her environment, develop a sense of autonomy, and relate to peers. Attachment theory sheds light on the process and products of inner-city, first-grade children's written symbolization, yielding many patterns cogent to the study of emergent literacy.

Fifty-nine first graders participated in a study involving projective measures of attachment and language ability and the collection of their earliest first-grade writing samples and transcripts. Their drawings and early writings showed the influence of secure attachment on literate risk-taking. Gender and language ability showed significant effects on choice of symbols and symbolic configurations.
As the first-grade child begins to acculturate to school literacy she must create increasingly less personal, and more abstract symbols of the culture. This move towards universality of symbolization varies by gender and attachment status. Each child struggles with the conflict of relinquishing personal symbols and appropriating collective symbols. Some children leap too quickly into transcription of environmental print in an effort to form an attachment with their teacher. Meanwhile others explore the self-expression of drawing, conceptual configurations and invented spelling moving gradually toward more interpersonal symbolization.
Chapter 1
ATTACHMENT AND LEARNING

INTRODUCTION

A diminutive six-year-old named Ricardo stands beside his teacher in a basement classroom of an old brick schoolhouse. Wearing a polyester suit which makes him look like child mafia, he narrates the storyline of his drawing. "Someone shot the rainbow," he says. Ricardo lives in a poor, run-down section of a low-rise city fraught with crime, drugs, poverty, violence and insecurity. In fact, Ricardo has moved three times since kindergarten. Though many cannot write their own stories, first-grade children's early drawings and oral storylines tell us how they live, what they value, how they present themselves, how they represent themselves, and what they struggle to understand about their world.

This study documents the reacculturation process from home to school literacy as evidenced in emergent writing patterns of first-grade children in an inner-city school. Attachment security predicts the kinds of symbolization children use and the risks they are willing to take for literacy. The unfolding of conceptual knowledge appears in their crayon drawings. Through their graphic performances these children present themselves in the public arena of school. They manage the separation from home through drawings which reinforce their attachment bonds. Finally, children reveal how they represent
themselves to themselves (and to others) on paper.

Though this dissertation focuses primarily on attachment theory research, the recent research in discourse analysis from the field of linguistics (Gee, 1989; 1990; Heath, 1988; Michaels, 1981; Scollon & Scollon, 1981) contributes to its theoretical framework. Whereas an extensive review of the discourse literature will not be provided, how children's symbolization plays into discourse warrants a limited discussion of discourse communities. These writings chart the reacculturation process from home to school literacy. Essentially the written and oral discourses of young, school-aged children give us access to the discourses which comprise their "identity kit(s)" to use James Gee's phrase. According to linguist James Gee (1989):

These combinations I call "Discourses," with a capital "D" ("discourse" with a little "d," to me, means connected stretches of language that make sense, so "discourse" is part of "Discourse"). Discourses are ways of being in the world; they are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes (Gee, 1989, p. 7).

A child's Discourse is comprised of what he is, says, does, values, and believes. Discourses are not learned through direct instruction but rather through a process of socialization and enculturation. Each person has a primary Discourse which is learned through the socialization in the home which serves as the individual's "home-based sense of identity" (Gee, 1989, p.7). The child's degree of attachment to his home contributes to his notion of who he is. Through inclusion of attachment security as portrayed by John Bowlby (1973) in our conception of the
primary Discourse of the child, we gain insight into how the earliest social interactions frame the child's life experiences, especially his early learning. Attachment refers to the strength and security of the parent-child bond and its effectiveness in fostering the healthy development of the child. This primary social bond can be an asset or a deficit for the child at the juncture of home and school. Depending on how secure those ties are the child may be ill-prepared for the socialization of school.

As a little society, school makes demands of attachment on the child. He will be known by the social bonds that hold him and these bonds will control the boundaries of his social identity. He will be asked to engage or he will suffer the consequences of nonengagement in the social occasions of his classroom. His attachment status will affect his ability to participate in the classroom society.

MOTHER AS TEACHER

A child's first teacher is the mother or primary caregiver. The mother and preverbal infant develop a rapport in proximity and familiarity. They share attention and a common focus. The relationship supplies them with mutual feelings of gratification, control, and efficacy. Through a complex communication system they convey attention, intentions and goals. Researchers who have studied mother-infant interactions conclude that this earliest interpersonal rapport lays the foundation for language learning and virtually all other cognitive functions (Bruner, 1975; Trevarthen, 1978; Bradley & Caldwell, 1980;
Not only is the human infant long dependent for survival on the mother, the infant also depends on her for security, a felt sense of being in good care. The infant's goal is to maintain close contact with the mother from whom this security derives. Separation from the mother usually causes the infant to cry and seek to find mother. Early on, the infant requires physical contact to be comforted while later in infancy holding the mother in view or hearing her voice suffices.

Consider the complexity of the learning on the part of the infant in establishing the attachment behavioral system:

The infant has learned to coordinate a wide variety of behavioral responses into an adaptive and flexible goal-corrected response repertoire. It also assumes that the infant has acquired the ability to discriminate attachment figures from others, to anticipate the behavior and goals of the attachment figure, to appraise a wide variety of environmental contingencies, and to coordinate affective and behavioral responses. In addition, it assumes that the infant has acquired a mapping of familiar environments and the ability to estimate the attachment figure's accessibility in terms of his own behavioral capabilities (Sroufe and Waters, 1977, p. 1187).

Clearly the infant practices social cognition, an awareness of the feelings, needs and intentions of oneself and others, from the earliest days of life. Through thousands of hours of contact the infant builds a mental representation of the mother based on her responsiveness and accessibility. John Bowlby termed this the "internal working model" (Bowlby, 1973). Bowlby believes the infant develops working models
also of self and the world. These working models reflect the infant's actual lived experience. Sensing the mother's responsiveness in meeting nonverbally-communicated needs, the infant begins to determine his mother's acceptance of him. The infant bases his perceptions of what is happening and predictions of what will happen on these working models. Winnicott (1965) goes so far as to say that the mother not only physically holds the child but also holds the child in mind, safe-guarding the child's feelings, looking out for the well-being of the child.

The child will develop expectations for mother's availability, both emotional and physical, over the course of the first five years of life, the critical period for the early attachment bonding (Bowlby, 1973). As the infant constructs his own working models, the ability to hold mother in mind will evolve and depending on how responsive or rejecting the relationship is, the child will be more or less equipped to handle separations from the mother by holding her in mind. If she has protected the infant in times of duress, the infant will safely activate the attachment response to draw closer to her. In her absence the infant will rely on his internal mental representation of mother as protector and supporter (Bretherton, 1985). The child will use transitional objects (Winnicott, 1953) such as a stuffed animal or blanket to sustain him in mother's absence. Within a safe, holding environment the child can tolerate the mother's absence with a transitional object reminding him of his mother, the responsive caregiver who reliably returns after any separation.

If instead the mother has been an unresponsive, unpredictable or rejecting mother the infant will show an anxious or ambivalent set of
attachment responses. He may rely on a transitional object but beyond a certain amount of time, the transitional object will cease to work as it requires an association with the mother to sustain its soothing effect on the child.

An insecure attachment may derive from an ill-fit between infant temperament and maternal temperament. An insecure attachment may stem from early separation due to physical illness or death of the mother. Depression or other conditions of emotional unavailability in the mother can result in insecurity of attachment. Researchers also believe that distant mothering may be a result of the mother's original attachment bond with her mother, thus creating a generational trend of insecure attachment. Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985) found a strong correlation \( r = .62, p < .001 \) between maternal attachment security based on the Adult Attachment Interview and infant attachment security as measured in the Strange Situation. The insecurely attached infant's behavior at times of duress or separation will range from strenuously seeking to maintain proximity to alternately seeking and rejecting contact or angrily rejecting the mother (Bretherton, 1985).

Mary Ainsworth operationalized the display of this range of attachment behaviors among one-year-old infants with a procedure called the "Strange Situation" (Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969). The Strange Situation is comprised of eight separation and reunion episodes of one to two minutes in duration between mother, infant and stranger (experimenter) in an unfamiliar laboratory setting. First, mother and infant enter the room equipped with two chairs and some toys. The infant is encouraged to play with mother present. The stranger enters, joins seated mother. Next the mother leaves the room where infant and stranger remain. The stranger speaks with the infant, encouraging the
infant to continue to play. Now the mother returns and the stranger leaves the room. The mother once again leaves the room, this time leaving the infant alone. The stranger returns. Finally the mother returns.

Ainsworth categorized infant response patterns to the Strange Situation as secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant (Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969). The secure infants generally cried upon separation from the mother and sought physical contact at reunion. The anxious or ambivalent infant both greeted and rejected the mother. The avoidant infant literally avoided contact with the mother when she returned to the room. Ainsworth found the insecure responses to reunion significant because they replicated children's reunion behaviors in cases of severe, traumatic separation situations such as those observed by Robertson (1953) and Main et al. (1985). She determined through naturalistic observations in the homes that the attachment patterns between mothers and infants elicited by the Strange Situation were consistent with observed attachment behaviors in the home through the infants' first year of life.

EXPLORATION

The first step in unpacking the significance of attachment to the school-aged child is to look at the part attachment plays in the development of cognition. Though attachment has been conceived of by various researchers as a trait, a response class, a relationship, a social network and an organizational construct (Waters and Deane,
all agree that attachment is learned. It is a cognitive learning experience for the infant which occurs like the learning of a Discourse via socialization. Like a Discourse, "the... attachment bond (or its internal representation) is... reflected in a lawful patterning of a variety of different behaviors (or beliefs)" (Cassidy, 1988, p. 124).

Sroufe claims,

Establishing a secure, adaptive attachment relationship may be viewed as a major developmental task for the first year, having consequences for subsequent tasks such as exploration and mastery of the inanimate environment, achieving a concept of autonomous self, and competence in the peer group. (Sroufe, 1977, p. 1195)

In terms of social cognition three of the primary tasks of childhood have their roots in the attachment relationship: exploration and mastery of the inanimate world, establishment of an autonomous self through self and object constancy, and competence in one's peer group.

First let us consider exploration. Ainsworth (1973) found that secure infants balanced seeking close physical contact with the mother and exploratory behaviors both in the laboratory and home settings. Carr et al. (1975) found that children 18 to 30 months spend more time playing if they can make visual contact with their mothers which corroborates findings of Cox and Campbell (1968) and Maccoby and Feldman (1972). This exploration pushes cognitive development forward. As the child explores, a sense of mastery over the environment gradually evolves.

In Main's (1983) longitudinal study of exploration, play and
cognitive functioning forty white, middle-class one-year-old infants and mothers participated in the Strange Situation. At 20.5 months of age these securely and insecurely attached toddlers were administered the Bayley Scale of Mental Development through a series of test interactions of turn-taking and following directions. This test afforded the examiner the opportunity to assess the child's cooperation and game-like spirit, indicators of the child's exploration and growing mastery of the social (the experimenter) and the physical (play objects) realms.

Another "exploration" component of Main's study was an hour-long play session conducted in a laboratory setting equipped with toys with the mother present. In the videotaped play session the mother was directed not to initiate play but rather to respond to the child's requests only. The session consisted of ten minutes of free play, twenty minutes of "playmate play" with an experimenter and a final twenty minutes of free play. The experimenter in the "playmate" role made several attempts at coaxing the child into playing ball, dolls and other activities which she carried into the room with her. Main tallied the number of utterances mother made to the child, the percent of ignored child utterances and number of mother's instructions. Main also determined the total number of minutes in which the child was engrossed in play as well as "bout length," that is, time spent engaged in one particular type of play or with a particular play object. She discriminated between intense play (involving direct eye contact with the toy, inability to be disturbed, and purposeful movements) and play characterized by lethargic movement, perfunctory handling of toys and lack of concentration.
The last "exploration" task was a puzzle box with shapes to be inserted through the hole in the lid. If the child approached the puzzle box as a puzzle and attempted to put the shapes into the box he received a high score. Children's affect was also rated in terms of how much smiling and laughing occurred while playing with the toys.

Main found securely attached children more cooperative and possessing more game-like spirit with the experimenter in the Bayley testing session. During the playmate play session virtually only the securely attached toddlers approached the experimenter as she entered the room. Only a portion of the secures were willing to engage in the ball game, and only the secures were rated as playful by the experimenter blind to the attachment ratings of the children.

With regard to exploration, Main found the insecurely attached children played with less intensity of interest and focus. The secures showed more pleasure in playing with the toys and spent longer periods of time doing so. The play objects were the main focus of the attention of the secure children. It is interesting to note that although all the mothers gave the same number of instructions to their toddlers, the mothers of insecurely attached children tended to talk more to their toddlers but ignored the utterances their children made.

AUTONOMY, ATTACHMENT AND COGNITION

In an attempt to document the relationship between attachment and cognition, Schneider-Rosen and Cicchetti (1984) looked at maltreated two-year-olds in the Strange Situation and the "mirror and rouge" experiment. The mirror and rouge task entails placing the toddler
before a mirror and observing whether the child recognizes herself. Then the child is turned away from the mirror, a bit of rouge is daubed on the child's nose and once again she is turned toward the mirror. The researcher watches for the child's self-recognition demonstrated by her touching her nose. Self-recognition is a component part of the cognitive task of differentiation of the self from others, especially the mother. The researchers found a significant relationship between attachment security and self-recognition with a full 73% of the securely attached toddlers displaying self-recognition as compared with 27% of the insecurely attached children. Schneider-Rosen and Cicchetti conclude that a secure attachment bond likely facilitates the child's differentiation of self and other, an early sign of development of the child's incipient sense of self.

Erikson characterizes the early childhood period, 17 to 36 months, by the crisis of autonomy versus shame or doubt. The toddler seeks to gain control of his body and his actions to assert his autonomy. Erikson contends that if he fails in this endeavor or is thwarted by frequent rebuffs for his attempts, he will likely develop a sense of shame and doubt in his activities.

McDevitt and Mahler (1980) offer a parallel construct to Erikson's autonomy versus shame and doubt from object relations theory. Seeking to account for Erikson's neglect of gender issues in personality development, they reformulate this stage as "object and self constancy versus loneliness and helplessness" (cited in Franz & White, p. 248). The development of a strong internal working model which soothes the child like the presence of the mother, provides the child the ability to healthily attach to mother while achieving some individuation through a
sense of self constancy. This stage clearly lays a foundation for the child's relational abilities. It is through his secure attachment relationship that he can venture to separate and experience autonomy.

A child's sense of self is socially constructed mainly within the family context. Bowlby hypothesized that a child who receives responsive care from the mother necessarily develops a sense of self which is valuable and worthy whereas the sense of self to emerge in the child of a rejecting or unpredictable mother is one of worthlessness and lack of value. Bowlby's hypothesis rests on his notion of the "internal working model" which the child has constructed of self.

Between the ages of three and six years, Erikson believed the child faces the crisis of initiative versus guilt wherein the child initiates exploration of the physical environment and the use of language. Failure to initiate due to conflicts with parents would result in overdependence on adults. Franz and White (1985) extend this stage to include "playfulness versus passivity or aggression" (p. 248). The child's cognitive abilities which now allow him to see others as psychologically separate transform his play. The play represents not just a mastery of the physical environment but also imaginative representations of who the child will be like. He role plays parents. In play with other children he moves from parallel play to cooperative play.

The social environment of school, which he enters between ages five and six, will make social demands on the child. Developmentally, he will negotiate his capacity to "empathize and collaborate versus (exercising) excessive caution or power" (Franz and White, 1985, p. 252). He realizes: "The self and other can be viewed as self-reflective and reciprocal" (Franz and White, 1985, p. 252)—both are autonomous
but interdependent.

Cassidy (1988) looked at the connection between attachment and the self among six-year-olds. His study is based on Bowlby’s premise that a child's attachment relationship impacts the child's representation of self and self-esteem. How the child represents himself is a function of his level of autonomy. That is, as he perceives himself differentiated from his mother, he can assess his own worth. Clearly, the child develops his sense of self in the context of his attachment relationships. Yet the underlying premise it seems is that the child must function autonomously to refer to himself as an object of discussion.

In his study, Cassidy assessed attachment status via a modified Strange Situation for older children (Main & Cassidy, 1985) which derives its validity from a sample of six-year-olds who had been coded in Ainsworth's Strange Situation as one-year-olds. To evaluate the children's sense of self-esteem Cassidy used a set of five measures: (1) the child's view of the self within the relationship with the attachment figure assessed through an incomplete doll stories procedure; (2) assessment of the child's perceptions of how an unspecified "other" views him through use of a puppet interview; (3) direct assessment of global self-esteem measured with a subscale of global self-esteem from Harter's Perceived Competence Scale for Children; (4) a second direct self-esteem assessment in the form of an interview with the child; and (5) Harter's Scale of Perceived Competence and Social Acceptance for Young Children assessed feelings of competence and acceptance in specific domains—feelings believed to be precursors of self-esteem.

Cassidy's methods germane to the current study include an incomplete doll stories task, puppet interviews and the direct
interviews. The incomplete doll stories task involved asking the child to act out six brief stories dealing with minor family conflicts with a set of dolls. Thus the experimenter gained access to the child's internal working model of self and attachment figures. Classification of the verbatim transcripts ranged as follows: "secure/confident" for stories in which the protagonist engages in warm and fair negotiation of conflict with the mother; "avoidant" for stories in which the doll protagonist is rejected for her attempts to rectify conflict; "hostile/negative" for stories characterized by violent or bizarre interactions between the protagonist doll and the mother doll. The correlation between attachment security and doll stories' classification was significant (r = .46, p < .001). Securely attached children narrated "secure/confident" stories more often than their insecurely attached peers. Thus Cassidy established a baseline of data pertaining to the child's sense of self in relation to his family. Projected problem-solving of conflict represents the child's mastery of the social realm which leads to autonomy.

Cassidy's puppet interviews engaged the child and the experimenter equipped with an animal puppet in an indirect interview. The experimenter directed interview questions about the child to the puppet. For example, the experimenter asked the puppet, "Do you like (child) the way he is, or do you want to make him better?" The experimenter focused only on the puppet, the child responded as though he used the puppet as his mouthpiece also. The puppet was used to give the child the sense of an "unspecified other" (Cassidy, 1988, p. 125) to elicit how the child believes he is perceived. The child refers to himself as the object of conversation thus acknowledging his autonomy.

The child's responses to the puppet interviews received one of three
codings: "perfect": the child states he is perfect as he is; "negative": the child makes negative statements about himself; and "open/flexible": the child makes positive statements about himself but acknowledges he has flaws. Cassidy documents securely attached children's interviews as "open/flexible" or "perfect" while insecurely attached children's interviews fell into either the "perfect" category or the "negative" category.

In the self interviews, a direct assessment of self-esteem, children were asked questions about themselves directly e.g., "Can you tell me something you like about yourself? What do you think is not so good about you? Do you think you're special?, etc." (Cassidy, 1988, p. 126) These responses were coded as: "open/flexible" - positive, realistic self-image; "avoidant/perfect" - child claims to be perfect, unaffected by relationships to others; "negative" - child made negative self statements; "body-preoccupied" - child referred to sense of body only. Results again followed the same pattern as the puppet interview data, securely attached children made a preponderance of responses classified as "open" while the insecurely attached children responded in "avoidant/perfect" and "negative" ways. Cassidy posits that such exploration of one's own strong and weak qualities, the focus of the questioning, demonstrates a child's sense of worth--that he will be accepted in spite of his faults. Securely attached children gave balanced perspectives of the self, while insecurely attached children tended toward more categorically perfect or negative self perceptions.

In summary, the secure six year olds in Cassidy's modified Strange Situation warmly greeted their mothers upon reunion, referred to themselves positively across all interview formats and verified the
importance of their mothers in the doll stories.

On the other hand, the insecure six-year-olds either avoided or showed ambivalence in reuniting with mothers. These children claimed to either be perfect in the interviews (which Cassidy and Ainsworth believe to be a defensive stance) or they made generally negative statements about themselves. With the family of dolls these children had difficulty conjuring up ideas of what mothers do in conflict situations, many of them had confused or disorganized concepts of roles, still others gave responses which depicted hostile interchanges. A child's sense of self and self-esteem, virtually created in the attachment relationship, predisposes him to autonomy or overdependence upon others for his own self worth. Secure children demonstrate early their confidence in their worth. Thus freed from complete dependence upon others, they explore physical, social and imaginary realms in the flow of experience.

LITERACY AND ATTACHMENT

Several researchers in the Netherlands have investigated IQ and attachment in a longitudinal study designed to tap into the relationship between cognitive development and attachment. Ijzendoorn and Vliet-Visser hypothesized that secure children who engaged more enthusiastically with their environment through exploration, play and social interaction would show higher cognitive development on a standard IQ measure. Attachment codings were accomplished with 77 two-year-olds via the Strange Situation procedure. Three years later
researchers followed up with the then, five-year-olds, by administering the Leiden Diagnostic Test a standardized IQ test for Dutch children. Results indicate that the securely attached children outscored the insecures primarily on the verbal ability subtest of the Comprehension portion of the test. Ijzendoorn and Vliet-Visser feel they have demonstrated a high association between attachment security and cognitive competence.

Ijzendoorn and Bus (1988) conducted a cross-sectional study with 1-1/2, 3-1/2 and 5-1/2 year-olds to determine the association between attachment and emergent literacy. Their premise was: "foundations for the development of reading abilities in school are already present during early childhood" and that "(t)he origins of emergent literacy are.. to be found in early mother-child interactions during activities related to the written words on television (Sesame Street, commercials), in picture books and in reading books (Bus & Ijzendoorn, 1988, p. 1262). The researchers were mindful of the differences in mother-child interactions with print between the ages of 1, 3 and 5 years of age (Heath, 1983; Ninio, 1980; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). Ijzendoorn and Bus hypothesized that the quality of the attachment bond would be reflected in the efficacy of the mother-child tutorial around print material. They believed in the reciprocal nature of emergent literacy. As the mother emphasizes literacy learning, children will focus on it and as children focus on literacy learning, mothers will pay more attention to it. This stands in contrast to the studies which link children's reading ability in school with frequency of exposure to written language experiences in preschool (Durkin, 1966; Wells, 1985; Teale, 1986). Rather, Ijzendoorn and Bus contend that the content and atmosphere of the mother-child tutorials will more strongly effect the child's early
reading behaviors. Based on the attachment literature these researchers formulated the hypothesis that securely attached children would be more positive and receptive toward their mother's instruction than insecurely attached children. The insecurely attached children were believed to be less secure in their own abilities, distrusting of their mothers, and less equipped to handle the challenges one faces in learning to read.

The study engaged mothers and children in four tasks. First, all participated in a Strange Situation task. Second, mother-child pairs watched a selected Sesame Street segment while at the same time reading a picture book and a letter book. This situation replicated a common home experience for the participants. Researchers coded six variables of the mother-child interactions: narration - all of mother's explanations, questions and comments regarding the meaning of things; story exploration: children's explanations, questions and comments about meanings; reading instruction - mother's explanations, comments and questions on the "formal aspects of written language;" proto-reading - children's efforts at spelling, letter naming, etc.; disciplining - mother's verbally- and nonverbally-communicated signals to get the child back on task; distraction - children's off-task behavior, conflicts or problem behavior.

The 3-1/2 and 5-1/2 year olds were also given tests of emergent literacy which consisted of: 1) A test of emergent reading behaviors wherein the child was asked by the experimenter to "read" her favorite book. Sulzby's (1985) scale was used to code the children's performance (refusals; attempts governed by pictures, stories not formed; attempts governed by pictures, stories formed-oral style;
attempts governed by pictures, stories formed, literate style; attempts governed by print). 2) A test of word construction in which children were asked to make eight three-letter words from a set of ten letters. The "words" children constructed were categorized as either correct, partially correct, word-like, or figurative (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982). 3) A test of letter names whereby the children were asked to name twelve letters of the alphabet. 4) A print awareness task after Hiebert (1981) in which the child was asked about the function of printed text in several different story situations. 5) A concepts-of-print test in which the examiner posed six questions to the child regarding how to hold a book, etc.

Ijzendoorn and Bus found that mothers of 1-1/2 year olds focused more on clarifying and interpreting stories, while they emphasized formal aspects of print with the older children. As predicted secure children received more positive regard from mothers during the Sesame Street and reading session. Generally the secure tutorials were more harmonious and task-oriented than the insecure mother-child pairs. In addition, researchers found that mothers of securely attached children engaged in more instruction of reading paying more attention to the formal aspects of print than mothers of the insecurely attached children. The result of this was that secure children attempted more reading. The secure children focused on stories and illustrations in a more exploratory manner. Their insecure counterparts received more discipline as they displayed more off-task behavior.

The finding that the atmosphere of the mother-child tutorials was associated with quality of attachment corroborates findings by other researchers that differences in mood and attitude exist between secures and insecures engaged in difficult problem-solving situations (Matas,
Arend & Sroufe, 1978; Sroufe, 1983). Ijzendoorn and Bus assert that the securely attached children have a greater sense of trust in their mothers' responsiveness and aid with problems, thus their mothers can make greater literacy demands on them. Whereas the insecurely attached children find it difficult, if not impossible, to move beyond the troubling dynamics of the relationship to take the risk of literacy learning.

ATTACHMENT, EXPLORATION, PLAY AND RISK

As Main (1985) and Ainsworth (1969) found, quality of attachment predicts the degree to which the infant will venture away from the mother to explore the environment. The ability of the secure infant to hold the mother in mind even when she is not visibly present affords the infant a felt sense of security which allows such exploration to occur. Exploration serves as the means by which the infant gains mastery over the inanimate environment. Through physically exploring the environment the infant learns to adapt goals, to problem-solve, to recover from failed attempts, and to request help when she reaches the limits of her capabilities secure in the knowledge that a responsive mother will assist her.

The scenario is markedly different for the insecurely attached infant. Too often this infant has experienced unmet needs and consequently has come to expect her needs to be denied or to be unpredictably met. In this event the insecure infant responds with heightened attachment behavior—crying, clinging, etc., not feeling safe to let the mother out of
sight. Depending on the severity of the rejection, the infant may be demanding or inconsolable. This infant does not feel safe to explore the environment for very long or at any distance from the mother. The implications of such inertia for the infant's cognitive development through exploration, play and social interactions are many. This child may not master the environment rather, she may live in fear of all things. This child may not develop an autonomous self given her desperate need to maintain proximity to the mother. This child may not make the developmental progress via play and language that the securely attached child will enjoy. The gradual accretion of limited engagement with the world around her may engender the child's lack of trust in her own abilities.

If the atmosphere of the mother-child relationship is punitive, negative or unfair, instances when the child requires instruction will be fraught with problems. As Ijzendoorn and Bus (1988) discovered the secure mother-child pairs were characterized by trust which fostered the risk-taking venture of literacy learning. The insecure children were distracted, off-task, easily frustrated, and often verbally reprimanded by their mothers. The insecures unwillingness to take risks makes sense in light of their attachment relationships.

Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984) claim "risk-taking is central to cognitive processing. In order to learn we must allow ourselves to be vulnerable to the situation, to others' perceptions, and to our own past experiences" (p. 130). For the secure child this vulnerability characterizes the teaching-learning relationship between her and her mother. For the insecure child to risk vulnerability may be an altogether too familiar situation ending with the child being rebuked, rejected or unsatisfied in some way.
The child's stance toward risk-taking affects his role when he plays. Play can be considered the child's work. In this realm of play the child works out such issues as object relations, autonomy, language development, peer relations, problem-solving and mastery of the environment. Piaget (1952) posits that both language and play emerge because of the development of the "semiotic function" -- the child's dynamic ability to symbolize things and people not visually present through mental representation and to formulate ideas. Gradually the child moves from global and context-bound symbols and meanings to more differentiated, specific and decontextualized symbolic meanings. Patricia Monighan outlines the progression of the semiotic function through play:

The functional play of the preschooler closely resembles the sensorimotor play of infancy, with little symbolic transformation evident. Constructive play, with blocks or sand, for example, involves symbolic transformation but is tied to the concrete objects available in the context. In dramatic play, rule-based behavior appears, with objects and roles purely imagined and rules of behavior negotiated "as you go." Games with rules appearing near the end of the preschool years, involve both rule-based behavior and planning strategies to negotiate successful play with prearranged rules. (Monighan, 1985, pps. 3-4)

Vygotsky asserted that through the "planning function of language" the child no longer relies on the visual field to supply the contents of his thoughts. He assumes the power of guiding his own actions, solving
problems by using alternatives. He can plan because he can see an immediate future. He relies on speech to facilitate his mastery of the inanimate world, he can mentally represent hypothetical solutions to problems rather than necessarily manipulating objects to find solutions. And he can use speech to guide his own behavior. "With the help of speech children... acquire the capacity to be both the subjects and objects of their own behavior" (Vygotsky, 1978; p. 26).

George Herbert Meade (1934) believed that social objects (people) as well as physical objects derived their meaning for the child through social interaction. Via exploration of first the social, and then the physical or inanimate realms the child seeks responses to his communications and actions. It is through this social interaction with people and things that the child gains a sense of self-as-subject and self-as-object. Consider Monighan's argument:

The child formulates meaning for social objects before s/he formulates meaning for physical objects. The responses to physical objects are social in the sense of emotional attachment or affective response to an object. The child also assigns the attitude of the other to inanimate objects. In the process of calling out in the other the same response s/he would call out in the self, the child comes to see physical objects as those that return no social response. In each case, the formation of meaningful objects (both social and physical) is based on the response of the object to the child's action, and the subsequent readjustment of that action, completing the response and mentally coding it for future interaction.

Parallel to the process of constructing social and physical objects, the child also constructs meaning for him/herself as a social
object. Mead (1934) notes: The importance of communication lies in the fact that it provides a form of behavior in which the organism or the individual may become an object to him(her)self. (p.139)

Communication, then, presupposes two forms: communication with oneself and communication with others. In order to communicate with the self the child must develop a stable unified concept of the self. Differentiation of communicative intent requires a clear discrimination between self and other. (Monighan, 1985, pps. 11-12)

Vygotsky characterizes this preschool period by the transition of the child's gradual internalization of socialized speech to become inner speech. The behaviors the child once used to control the activities of the mother are now used to organize his own actions. As Vygotsky puts it the child succeeds in applying a social attitude to himself (Vygotsky, 1978).

It seems clear that language and play serve as mechanisms through which the child can demonstrate autonomy. The differentiation of intent in communication requires the child to clearly distinguish between herself and others. Language and play also set the stage for two subsequent developmental tasks: early literacy and peer relations. First, consider the association of play and literacy. Pellegrini et al. (1991) state "the ability that develops in symbolic play (is) to divorce meaning from objects and to use language to redefine meaning" (p. 221). The child originally imbues objects with meaning and gradually learns to extract their meaning in the service of a second-order symbol system, words. These researchers conducted a longitudinal study in which they sought to investigate the relationships between symbolic
play, that is object and ideational transformations, linguistic verb use, and measures of emergent literacy. The study is founded in Vygotsky's (1967, 1978) theory which claims that a relationship exists between representational facility and early writing. According to Pellegrini et al. it is "through symbolic play, or the substitution of one object or action for another, preschool children come to separate meaning from specific objects and actions; words eventually come to represent meaning." (Pellegrini et al., 1991)

Pellegrini et al. observed twelve children in nine 15-minute play sessions per year over a two-year period. The children's talk was recorded with wireless microphones. From observational notes and audiorecordings, researchers coded children's symbolic play transformations and use of linguistic verbs believed to be "metarepresentational". For example, in playing house a child might say to another child, "You're the mommy so say 'it's time for dinner'." This metarepresentation, or talking about words, was found to predict emergent reading. Children's literacy assessments were based on: the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPT) (Dunn & Dunn, 1981); The Concepts of Print Test (Clay, 1972) which is a measure of the child's awareness of the lexicon of reading material; reading or attempted reading of two books after an experimenter reads the book to the child; and a sequence of telling, dictating and writing about a series of pictures. Reading attempts were coded along a developmental continuum from attempts governed by elements of the pictures to attempts governed by elements of the printed text. Writing sample codings also treated classifications as a developmental continuum from drawing, scribbling, and letter-like units to standard orthography.
Results confirmed the researchers first hypothesis that symbolic transformations in play, both object and ideational transformations, predicted children's emergent writing with correlations of .63 and .62, p<.05. Use of linguistic verbs predicted children's performance on the Concepts of Print Test, which Pellegrini et al. maintain constitutes a measure of the child's knowledge of the language of literacy. Talking about words may derive from the earliest mother-child tutorials around print.

The attachment relationship between mother and child lays the groundwork for further development of social cognition, specifically early symbolic play and literacy learning. As children grow they carry their primary knowledge of usage of linguistic verbs and literacy learning into other contexts of play and school.

ATTACHMENT TO HOME

Home has many meanings. Enfolding, safe, strong, and warm, it is a parental representation. . . these meanings seem . . . evokative of the "holding environment" conceptualized by Winnicott (1965) to represent the benign maternal presence that fosters integration in the infant. (McCollum, 1990, p. 96)

Children bear strong attachments to their homes (Schiavo, 1987). In Schiavo's study children ages eight to eighteen were interviewed about the significance and usage patterns of their homes. They expressed greatest fondness for areas of the home where they enjoyed
playing alone and second, where they had positive interactions with others.

A child's attachment to place, like her attachment to mother is sustained by her working models. Proschansky et al. believe the working model of place to be a "sub-structure of the self-identity" which consists of feelings and memories related to the home (Proschansky et al., 1983, p. 136).

Disruption of the place attachment through frequent moves has been documented by Stokols et al. (1983) to be directly related to higher incidence of illness. More germane to this study is a finding by Giuliani (1991) that people who move frequently, especially those who were forced to move frequently in youth, develop a "nomadic" orientation which stays with them throughout their lives. The "nomadic" orientation, like an avoidant attachment, renders the person reluctant or unable to form place attachments. Most significant in Giuliani's work was the finding that length of residence does not necessarily correlate with strength of attachment. She found "expected duration" of stay in a home had a much greater effect on strength of attachment. For instance, a person who is reluctant to form attachments is more likely to attach to a particular home if s/he plans to stay there for a long period of time. Giuliani also found that the more connections a person develops to a neighborhood and a community, the greater the feeling of place attachment. She sees home as the "custodian of one's own individual history" (Giuliani, 1989). To a great extent personal identification with the home triggers a sense of loss of self upon moving (Giuliani, 1989, 1990; Feldman, 1990; Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton, 1981).
Robert Coles (1989) asked homeless children to draw themselves and the home where they used to live. Some children declined. Some children drew themselves floating in air, no baseline, no sun. Some drew footballs and other unrequested items. One young Black girl said that she was living in

'the hotel... it's not anyone's home, it's where you stay if you don't have a home.' She went on to say, 'Some day we might get a place to live, where we can stay put... You're not wandering anymore. You can unpack, and discover where all you own is--the stuff you've been carrying around. You can be yourself, and not someone waiting for the time to pass until you have your own place.' (Coles, 1989, p. 188)

Coles believes "an important part of what she is, what all of us are, has to do with our living quarters, our apartments or houses. We define ourselves by the country in which we live, by the state, the city or town, the neighborhood, even the street we call our own" (1989, p. 188). Attachment to the home is presented here as a significant factor in the developing child's sense of self and self-in-relation to others and the world. Coles spoke once with Anna Freud, the founder of child psychoanalysis, about some of the children with whom he was working. Freud commented:

Our sense of ourselves has to do with the people, the places, the things in our lives. When children are cut loose from a particular place, when there is no reliable continuity in their lives, because they have no rooms even to regard as regularly theirs, then they are not only literally homeless, they are also psychologically adrift--transients or
wanderers in their minds. (Coles, 1989, p. 189)

Many families in our culture are forced to move often due to financial hardships, high unemployment, substance abuse, etc. Women are highly effected by moves. McCollum's (1990) book entitled The Trauma of Moving documents the moving experiences of forty-two women. McCollum's findings substantiate those of Weissman and Paykel (1972) who find a high correlation between moving and depression in women. In 1983 The New York Times reported that 30% of a two-thousand-person sample made a major move without anguish. The other 70% suffered a sense of grief and loss. This report corroborates McCollum's finding that the anguish of moving is denied its significance. Clearly the effects of moving and expression of these effects is downplayed in this culture in which moving is common across all strata of society. When we consider that The New York Times finding is based on a middle- and upper-class sample, the trauma of moving for the lower class looms large. And when we consider the issue of attachment in light of lower income mothers who move frequently either because of evictions from substandard living conditions, or to follow jobs, men or to keep ahead of creditors, we begin to see the magnitude of the problem. It is extremely difficult to ensure a secure attachment to an infant or child when one is "precariously housed" or homeless, depressed, physically ill, hungry and under financial stress.
TEACHER AS MOTHER

In this section a deliberate blending of the theories of attachment and discourse communities will frame the discussion. As a fundamental component of the child's representation of self and others, attachment status warrants inclusion in the child's "identity kit" (Gee, 1989), his Discourse. As an entrant into a new discourse community, school, the child carries his primary Discourse, his home ways of knowing, valuing, behaving and believing into the new social arena.

The degree to which the child can profit from the school experience is contingent upon the child's sense of security, his ability to explore, interact with, and extract from his social and physical milieus that which will benefit him. As attachment research shows some children are more, and others less, equipped by their early experiences to do so.

Opportunities for human development (and thus risks for not developing, or underdeveloping) often occur with a change of primary, immediate setting. For young learners, this is usually when they go from spending most of the day at home to most of the day in an educational institution. This can be a time of development, the child's 'evolving conception of the ecological environment, and his relation to it, as well as the . . . growing capacity to discover, sustain, or alter its properties' (Brofenbrenner, 1979, cited in Allen, 1989, p. 10).

Brofenbrenner claims that success in such a transition depends on the
match between the child's development in the former setting, home, and the "balance between challenge and support presented both by the new setting and its interconnections with the old (Brofenbrenner, 1979, p. 288). Education is a reacculturation process. Teachers and other children construct the classroom culture, the school Discourse, based on strong traditions of the institution of school and essayist literacy. We have learned from ethnographic studies (Heath, 1983; Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines, 1988; Michaels, 1981; and Gee, 1989) that if a child's family values, beliefs and ways with words match those of the institution, the child succeeds in making a smooth transition. This child finds little novelty in the reacculturation process. However, if because of family values—ways of knowing, believing, and using language, there is no match for the child, the child is likely to be marginalized.

Attachment status bears a recursive relationship to the family’s primary Discourse. Attachment shapes and forms the child's inner representation of self, then reinforces the child's sense of self which he brings into every situation. Attachment status derives from the earliest mother-child interactions which may be insecure for reasons of maternal physical, mental, or spiritual illness or because of the mother's own attachment history which constitutes part of her family's value system. As such, we can conclude that the psychological makeup of the child as determined by the attachment bond stands as another barrier to some children's access to education.

The child likely makes one obvious connection from the first day of school. Here in her classroom an adult female (generally) serves in an authority role just as at home. This one female adult is vested with the power to instruct, guide, nurture, punish and minister to the children in her care, just like the mother at home. The attachment relationship
serves as an organizational construct for approaching the social milieu of school. Internal working models of the self and the mother (as well as other primary attachment figures) developed in the intimate social context of home carry over in the child's experience and expectations of school. Social competence in this setting rests on the foundation set in the first setting, the home.

Several research studies document that children's attachment status determined in the Strange Situation is predictive of their relations with teacher and peers in school (Sroufe, Schork, Motti, Lawroski, & LaFreniere, 1984; LaFreniere & Sroufe, 1985; Sroufe, Fox & Pancake, 1983; George & Main, 1979). Recall that the Ijzendoorn and Bus (1988) study in which mothers and children enacted a familiar instructive relationship which set the tone for the child's competence as a learner. This earliest tutorial established the child's attitudes towards self and mother/teacher, the child's ability to concentrate, the child's focus, the child's ability to ask for and receive help, the child's ability to handle frustration, and to problem-solve. As Harste et al. (1984) claim vulnerability and risk-taking constitute two key requirements for learning. Recall as well the earlier discussion of the implications of exploration to the development of social cognition and mastery of the physical environment. It seems fair to say that the child will respond to the new ecological environment as she learned to respond to the home environment, depending upon the interconnections she perceives. It follows that the shift in ecological environments will stimulate the child's evaluation of her relationship to both.

In their study of preschoolers Sroufe, Fox and Pancake (1983) set out to identify the relationship between attachment quality and later
overdependence in children upon other adults.

The terms dependency and attachment are both used to refer to a class of behaviors... that maintains contact... between a child and one or more individuals and elicits reciprocal attentive and nurturant behavior from these individuals. (Maccoby & Masters, 1970, pp. 74-75)

Sroufe et al. proposed the hypothesis that the establishment of a secure attachment relationship serving the child's emotional needs fosters normal autonomy which they define as "a balance between individual mastery and effective contact with adults" (Sroufe, Fox & Pancake, 1983, p.1617). They assert that "effective dependency" or secure attachment in infancy lays the foundation for self-confidence, autonomy and independent functioning whereas the insecure attachment engenders excessive need for nurturance from adults as well as inhibiting the healthy development of the autonomous self.

In their 1983 study Sroufe et al. looked at forty four and five year old children who had been part of a longitudinal study of Egeland and Sroufe (Vaugh, Egeland, Waters & Sroufe, 1979) and whose attachment status had been classified in a Strange Situation at 12 and 18 months. Classroom observers coded children and teachers contact in three-minute time samples focusing on one of the three teachers at a time. Observations took place during free play and large group routine activities. The child-initiated interactions were coded as: seeking nurturance, seeking attention, seeking physical help, seeking cognitive help and seeking social help. The teacher-initiated contact was coded as: giving support, giving guidance, and discipline. In addition the three teachers were asked at the end of each class to rate the children
as to dependent behaviors such as: "nurturance or attention-seeking, extreme reliance on the teacher for help or guidance, involvement with the teachers at the expense of peers" (Sroufe, Fox & Pancake, 1983, p. 1619).

The researchers' hypothesis was confirmed. Insecurely attached children scored highest on teacher rankings of dependency. Thus researchers conclude insecurity of attachment strongly predicts overdependency on teachers in the four- and five-year old preschoolers. Based on teachers' responses to the Beller Dependency Scale (1955), Sroufe et al. found securely attached children sought attention in positive ways while insecurely attached children tended to seek attention in negative ways, e.g., whining, sulking. In addition they discovered that insecurely attached children sought help in self and social management far more often than their securely attached peers. Interestingly, differences in dependency based on the classroom observations by observers blind to the hypothesis were "revealed primarily through what the children elicited from the teachers rather than consistency in what observers could see in their behavior" (Sroufe et al., 1983, p. 1623).

No differences emerged between secure and insecure groups in cognitive help-seeking. Yet teachers perceived the help-seeking of secure children generally to be "smooth, situationally appropriate, and effective (Sroufe et. al., 1983, p.1625). These children got the nurturance they needed and returned to play. At no time did their requirements for adult nurturance inhibit their peer play or mastery of the environment. The insecurely attached children clearly demonstrated that what they lacked in attachment at home they sought
to compensate for in the school setting with the teachers.

Two years after the previous study in which secure relationships with teachers in effect supported the child's relationships with peers, Sroufe and LaFreniere (1985) conducted another study of four- and five-year-old children's peer competence in a preschool setting. Competence may be defined according to Waters & Sroufe (1983) as "the ability to mobilize and coordinate these resources in such a way that opportunities are created and the potentials or resources in the environment are realized... competence will require... different behaviors at different ages" (Waters & Sroufe, 1983, pp. 83-84). For the preschool child peer relations are a primary developmental goal. Sroufe and LaFreniere drew their sample from working-class and lower-class families. All of the children had participated in a Strange Situation at 12 and 18 months. Observers watched children during free play periods for three thirty-minute sessions each day over the course of nine months. Time sampling of attention, event sampling social exchanges and scan samples of social participation were conducted. The classroom teachers made evaluations of children's social competence. Each child responded to a peer sociometric measure in which children rate their affinity to peers in a class photograph.

Researchers found that teacher evaluations and peer sociometrics differentiated the securely and insecurely attached groups. Researchers' primary hypothesis, that maternal attachment would predict peer competence, was supported for girls but not for boys. There were marked differences in the peer relations of secure versus insecure girls. Secures were "socially outgoing, engaging their peers in predominantly positive interactions and receiving a great deal of
attention" while their insecurely attached counterparts were noted as "passive, withdrawn, submissive and neglected by their peers" (Sroufe & LaFreniere, 1983, p. 67). Boys in this study differed negligibly in peer competence by attachment status though secure boys were rated more "ego-resilient" and less dependent than the insecure boys. Researchers note one important finding relating to classroom ecology. In classes with a preponderance of insecurely attached children observers noted more conflict, noise and unruly activity.

The child carries internal working models of self and others based on early experiences with the mother and other significant attachment figures such as the father, siblings, grandparents, etc. Sroufe and Fleeson (1983) believe that the child internalizes both sides of the attachment relationship. As the child enters school these internalized models significantly effect the way the child relates to teacher, peers and the physical environment of school. Park and Waters' (1989) study of preschoolers' friendships showed that secure-secure friendships were characterized by harmony, responsiveness, negotiated settlement of conflict, and little controlling. The Q-set variables for the secure-insecure friendships portray these pairs as more verbally aggressive, physically aggressive with grabbing toys, and rejecting of partners in conflict.

Women mother and to a great extent women teach, especially at the elementary level. Issues of attachment and autonomy versus closeness, warrant consideration in light of women's primary role in children's lives throughout the early childhood years. Gender differences, pertinent to children's presentation of self, sense of self, and functioning in relation to others, are evident by the time children enter formal schooling. The studies cited in this section serve to
support the hypothesis that children relate to teachers as they have learned to relate to their mothers or primary female caregivers. Children form attachments in school reflective of this primary attachment bond. Consequently, their position in the culture of the classroom, in the discourse community of the classroom, as well as their position towards learning, risk-taking and representation of self in public necessarily depends in great measure upon the child’s attachment history. If mother is secure, teacher will likely be perceived as secure. Once the child bonds with the teacher he feels free to continue his exploration and mastery of environments, physical and social.

THE SCHOOLCHILD AND DEVELOPMENT

Many of the studies cited thus far have considered the implications of the attachment relationship for the child as he faces certain key developmental milestones namely, exploration of the physical environment, development of a sense of an autonomous self, and competence in the peer group. As the child moves into the public school arena at the latency stage of development, he must work towards Erikson’s goal of industry versus inferiority. He enters this school setting facing the challenge of peer relations, another adult attachment relationship, and the continuing evolution of his sense of autonomy. As Brofenbrenner posited the child will necessarily deliberate on his position in relation to the home and the new ecological environment with its new cast of characters. By now it is clear that the quality of the
attachment relationship underscores the child's every engagement with the material and social world. It determines the child's sense of himself in both social contexts—home and school. It effects her perceptions of both sides of any relationship.

Although latency is a period of quiescence in which no new instinctual issues arise, boys and girls settle into living in a sex-role stereotyped world. Gender identity, established by the time a child is three years of age according to research (Stoller, 1964; Kohlberg, 1966 in Chodorow, 1978), plays a significant role in the development of children. According to Chodorow, girls tend to retain a more symbiotic relationship with the mother, closer physically and emotionally. Meanwhile, boys tend to separate earlier, establishing boundaries between themselves and their opposite-sex parent. Chodorow explains:

"Girl's identification processes . . . are more continuously embedded in and mediated by their ongoing relationship with their mother. They develop through and stress particularistic and affective relationships to others. A boy's identification processes are not likely to be so embedded in or mediated by a real affective relation to his father. At the same time, he tends to deny identification with and relationship to his mother and reject what he takes to be the feminine world; masculinity is defined as much negatively as positively. Masculine identification processes stress differentiation from others, the denial of affective relation, and categorical universalistic components of the masculine role. Feminine identification processes are relational, whereas masculine identification processes tend to deny relationship." (Chodorow, 1978, p. 176)
In our culture fathers are either generally absent from children's lives due to their work schedules or actually absent due to the high divorce rates. The indigenous absence of fathers significantly effects the gender identification of boys in particular. Boys are more explicitly taught to be masculine whereas girls learn femininity through close identification. Generally, a boy learns his gender identity through cultural stereotypes, images and myths. In the absence of a same gender role model to engage with in an active process of identification, boys settle for positional identity which means, according to Chodorow (1978), that they identify with the role they perceive the father plays or would play if he remained in contact with the family. For a girl, the learning of gender weaves through an emotional bond she has with her mother. For a boy, on the other hand, gender identification involves no such close, connectedness.

The society has another influence on children at this stage according to Erikson. It is Erikson's belief that in the latency period, the child regardless of gender, no longer seeks to control people's actions as he originally learned to try to control his mother. Rather, the child facing the task of industry versus inferiority learns to win attention by making things, especially products of his emergent literacy. According to Erikson this period in which the child's "ego boundaries include society's tools and skills" (Bemporad, 1984, p. 89) hones the child's ability to use societally-sanctioned tools. The societal institution of school sanctions books, paper, pencils, crayons as tools. The school-aged child will build a sense of industry in the school realm through mastery of these tools.
CHAPTER 2
THE DEVELOPMENT OF WRITTEN SYMBOLIZATION

The Young Symbol User

Symbolization in children develops from the early gesturing and mimicking of the infant seeking to communicate in a social world. "(T)he motivation to engage in symbolic activity emanate(s) from the desire to share experiences with the other social partner"—initially the mother (Werner and Kaplan, 1963). This symbol sharing with the mother, according to Werner and Kaplan, begins as "undifferentiated and global" in the infant and expands to more "differentiation and hierarchic integration" as the child attempts to communicate with others.

Communication between deaf parents and their deaf infants exemplifies the attachment base of the development of symbols. Deaf infants so keenly imitate the gesturing of their parents who use sign language that before they are ten months old their hand gestures are more organized than the random gesturing of hearing babies (Pettitos, 1991). The deaf infants' gestures repeat a base set of about thirteen motions of the hand, component parts of American Sign Language. Together with other gestures yet unmastered the deaf infant will form strings of gestures equal to signs as the hearing baby will string together babbled syllables to form words. Deaf parents reinforce their babies' gesturing as hearing parents reinforce their babies' babbling by extending the infant's telegraphic messages into signed or spoken
"The gesture is the initial visual sign that contains the child's future writing as an acorn contains a future oak." (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 107) In the 1970's researchers in the field of writing analogized writing development with the development of oral language (Goodman & Goodman, 1979; Weeks, 1979). Although this continues to be a tenable position, Vygotsky argues "written language stands in a different relationship to consciousness than oral language" (Vygotsky in Dyson, 1991, p. 102). Oral language is a first order symbol system while written language is a second-order symbol system. Language objectified in written form more closely resembles drawing than "talk written down," to use Savage's terms (as cited in Dyson, 1982, p. 361).

As early as eighteen months the child can pick up a tool and make her first personal marks on paper. Through the mediation of symbols, an ability which develops at age two, the child can identify and differentiate herself from her mother, and think about mother and other things when they are not visibly present. There is a lag time of several years from when a child can understand a symbol to when she can produce it, whether the symbols are graphic, verbal, musical, or alphabetic (Gardner, 1978). The child must spend long periods of time exploring a medium by acting upon it or making attempts at symbolization through it. As the child actively engages in experience she will press at the margins of her symbolizing repertoire. She discovers the communicative powers of symbols. She searches out "equivalents" (Arnheim, 1971; Goodnow, 1977; Dyson, 1991) for experience through gesturing, speaking, drawing and play.

In play the child uses a plaything as a prop for gesturing. She conveys through gestural language the meaning of her playthings. The
plaything 'stands for' something else in the child's play scheme. Eventually the plaything can also indicate its own identity while serving to stand for something else. "For example, when we put down a book with a dark cover and say that this will be a forest, a child will spontaneously add, 'Yes, it's a forest because it's black and dark'."

(Vygotsky, 1978, p. 109) The child's ability to decouple the identity of the plaything from the symbolic function she wishes it to serve signals the advent of second-order symbolization.

The child artist gestures on paper with scribbles portraying, for example, a car going fast. This is first order symbolization -- the scribble is the car and the motion. Greater coordination and control authorize the child to draft shapes which derive their "thingness" (Gardner, 1980) from the short distance between the symbol and its referent, e.g., circle = ball, line = path. Eventually the child artist moves all the way to intentional depiction of some "thing" with planfulness. She names her creation thereby enacting a second-order symbol system.

Vygotsky regards play and drawing as precedents to written language. The trajectory of each toward second-order symbolization, is similarly portrayed above. Vygotsky bases his claim on his own research and Hetzer's (1926) experimental study of the play of three to six year olds. Looking specifically at the function of symbols in their play, Hetzer found:

Whereas some children depicted everything by using movements and mimicry, not employing speech as a symbolic resource at all, for other children actions were
accompanied by speech: the child both spoke and acted. For a third group, purely verbal expression not supported by any activity began to predominate. Finally, a fourth group of children did not play at all, and speech became the sole mode of representation, with mimcry and gestures receding into the background. (Hetzer, 1926 cited in Vygotsky, 1978, p. 111.)

The amount of gesturing decreased and the use of speech increased with age. This led Vygotsky to conclude that the symbolic representation used in child's play constitutes an early "speech" antecedent to written language.

Drawing and early writing can be considered "presentational" (Langer, 1967) symbols according to King and Rentel (1979). The child ushers forth graphic and drawn symbols with a verbalized story and gestures. It is difficult to understand the graphic products without the accompanying behaviors (Korzenick, 1977). The all-at-once nature of this symbolization renders simultaneous, rather than successive, meaning. To convey the meaning to another person the child thus engages in a performance.

For a long time the child relates to her drawings as the objectified things she has depicted. Her equivalents bear some resemblance to the original object or experience in the child's perception. However, she does not endeavor to represent realistically between the ages of three and five, to designate and name her drawings suffices. "Drawing is graphic speech which arises on the basis of verbal speech" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 112). Drawing does not diverge from writing until the child acknowledges that certain marks she makes on paper denote talk. Dyson (1982) found Kindergarten children used the terms "draw" and
"write" interchangeably to connote three overlapping functions: to represent people and things, to graphically create an object in the form of a letter or present, and to represent a narrative. Learning to write involves learning to symbolize in many different ways and bringing all of these to bear upon the conveyance of a particular message. As Dyson concludes:

The differentiation of writing from drawing and its precise connection with language is not necessarily a step preceding, but a gradual process occurring during and through first attempts to represent experience through letter graphics (Dyson, 1982, p. 379).

SCHOOL ENTRANCE

As the child enters the institution of school she is confronted with the impersonal symbols: No Parking, EXIT, Boys Room, Girls Room, Principal's Office. From the moment she passes through the doors bearing the sign "Visitors Must Check in at Front Office" she will begin to consider herself in relation to the institution. Her ease of access to this place will be determined by her family's impressions of, interactions with, and valuing of the school. The family's regard for school will be based on their perceived position in relation to it.

A growing interest in and attempts at writing language down will coincide with the beginning of formal schooling. In school the child will realize there is a standard symbol system, written language, which is most highly valued in this place. In the primary grades the child will communicate largely through the "presentational" symbolization
explained earlier as drawn symbols and early writing with gestures and verbal story. To a certain degree her learning to write will erase her will to draw. "Writing is 'the name of [the] gesture that effaces the presence of a thing and yet keeps it legible'" (Spivak, 1976, xli, in Dissanayake, 1992). As the child becomes cognitively capable of abstraction she learns that the written meaning is most valued in school.

Writing is a public act. In school the teacher and other students become the other social partners. This role was originally the exclusive territory of the mother. In dealing with these non-intimates, as they are in the early weeks and months of school, the child's written work involves not only the risk of commitment of self to the page but what is more, it requires a presentation of self. When a child relates or is asked to relate the meaning of her written work, she is essentially asked to make a verbal performance.

This verbal performance is a speech event with antecedents in the early training of 'essay-text' literate (Gee, 1990) homes. A child whose parents assume a tutorial role in her early life learns the importance of print through interactions with her parents and books. From the earliest days of the child's life her parents bring her picture books pointing at the pictures cueing her to make the sounds of the pictured animals or to name the objects. Later, when she picks up crayon or marker and scribbles across a sheet of paper, her parents ask, "What's that?" The toddler launches into a verbal performance which evolves from monosyllabic labeling to the spinning of yarns as she grows into this valuing of print literacy. She learns that she can create objectified symbols akin to those she sees in books and in her environment. Her
parents foster her competence in such verbal performances over the course of three or four years prior to school entrance by supplying her with books, time and drawing tools.

Presentation of Self through Drawing

"As (her) explorations extend beyond self, (her) drawings reflect (her) new discoveries and experiences, (her) self-image in action and interaction, and the richness or paucity of (her) imagination." (Barrett and Trevitt, 1991, p. 132) For most children drawing pleases and exhilarates with the power to express all that is felt inside. For others any marks on paper are more of a commitment than they are willing to risk.

For at least 100 years children's drawings have been used as projective measures of their personalities (Buck, 1948; Machover, 1949; DiLeo, 1970, 1973; Hammer, 1960; Koppitz, 1968; Klepsch & Logie, 1982), cognitive abilities and maturity (Cooke, 1885; Goodenough, 1926; Goodenough & Harris, 1963). Generally speaking, the clinical use of drawings is based on the belief that through drawings children reveal feelings independent of their cognitive ability. DiLeo (1970) asserts that well-adjusted children's drawings are markedly similar whereas the drawings of emotionally disturbed children are as different from each other as they are from the drawings of well-adjusted children.

While Machover hypothesized that the figures children draw portray themselves, Koppitz claims the child may, in fact, depict that person with whom she is most concerned at that particular moment in time. Yet Koppitz agrees that children's egocentrism prompts their frequent self portraiture. Clinicians look at the overall impression of a drawing
for a reading of the child's emotional response to her subject. They look for specific features and the lack of other features as emotional indicators. For example, poor integration of parts, slanting figures, omission of mouth, omission of the body, omission of arms, monster or grotesque figure, three or more figures spontaneously drawn are the age-appropriate indicators signaling the potential of emotional distress in primary grade children responding to the Human Figure Drawing task (Koppitz, 1983. The clinician also looks at the child's process, e.g., with what features does the child begin the drawing? A transcript of the child's presentation of the drawing's meaning plays a significant role in the clinician's analysis. In family drawings, as in self portraits, clinicians look at the amount of space surrounding the figures as representative of the child's perception of her relationship to her environment and her feelings of distance or closeness to others. The Kinetic Family Drawings (Burns & Kaufman, 1970, 1972) require the child to portray the members of her family "doing something." It is hypothesized that these drawings elicit a child's perception of interaction patterns as she gives figures movement and purpose.

Finally, Machover considers the self children draw in the Draw-A-Person test as the "self in the environment." This environmental self, Burns (1982) contends, is wearing many masks. The self depicted in a Kinetic Family drawing characterizes the inner or nuclear self. This dichotomy sparked Worden's (1985) case study comparison of the Draw-A-Person test with the Kinetic Family Drawing task. The researcher found the child's drawing of the family elucidated the child's inner state substantiating his testimony in counseling. Whereas the self he presented in the Draw-A-Person task corroborated the
environmental self described in parent and school reports.

**Drawing and the School Age Child**

The child of six or seven in the first grade has entered the latency stage of development according to Freud, during which time the feelings and energies quiet. Gardner (1980) hypothesizes that this quiescence may partially explain why children of three, four and five create extremely expressive drawings which give way to the more literal order and stock schemata of the older schoolchild's works. In the first grade children hover between order and expressiveness. The critical eye which they will cast upon their works a few years hence does not yet inhibit their graphic expression. Now the child is content to draw those things which she thinks about, cares about, and knows about.

Most children enter first grade having mastered the tadpole figure stage of human figure drawing. The child will translate 'prototypes' (Gardner, 1980) - good examples of things in her world into a base set of graphic schemas. Most children develop schemas for a remarkably similar set of prototypes: person, house, tree, sun, cloud, rainbow, star, dog, cat, balloon, flower. They have experience with figures from the media, especially superheroes and cartoon characters, and attempt to depict them. Depending on their exposure and equipment, some children may have added personal symbols to their base set of stock and media symbols. A 'personal symbol' shall be defined as a symbol unique to the artist within the context of her society of writers. Personal symbols burgeon forth out of a need she has to express some thought, idea or feeling.

The child of six or seven is moving beyond representation of
symbols in isolation on the page toward the representation of scenes. This reflects a move towards integration and differentiation of symbols and symbol use. As the gesturing infant develops these abilities, so too does the child artist. She attempts to problem-solve her graphic dilemmas in her attempts to construct meaning, e.g., how to depict the rooms of a house.

First graders often create collage-like configurations of symbols. Many drawing theorists believe the child draws what she knows about a subject (Ricci, 1887; Kerschensteiner, 1905; Piaget, 1951; Moustgard, 1962; Goodnow, 1977 in Mortensen, 1991). Vygotsky's (1986) framework of conceptual development can be applied to these collage configurations to better understand what the child is 'working out' on paper. First, Vygotsky identifies the 'syncretic heap' -- a collection of things assembled according to some subjective bond in the child's mind. These are somewhat random. (See Appendix B, Figure 5 on page 162).

Secondly, he presents thinking in 'complexes.' Thinking in complexes entails putting things together which have some actual similarities though the choice of common feature or connection is somewhat subjective. There are five types of complexes to be considered. The first complex mentioned by Vygotsky is the 'associative complex' whereby the child combines things on the basis of any bond she perceives. Graphically this may look like Figure 6 on page 163.

The second complex, the 'collection complex,' groups objects on the basis of the associative principle used above but with focus on one contrastive feature. For example, tableware—knives, forks, spoons, cups, saucers, plates are grouped by a functional purpose but differ in
the aspect of the eating function which they serve. Figure 7 on page 164 depicts a collections complex.

The third complex Vygotsky called the 'chain complex.' The child forms a chain complex by consecutively linking one thing to another. The link which binds each new thing differs as additions are made to the chain. For example, the child chooses a blue cylindrical block and adds to it a blue square block, based on 'blueness.' Then the child adds a yellow triangular block to the blue square block based on angularity of corners. And so on. (See Figures 8 and 9 on pages 165- ).

The fourth and final complex, the diffuse complex, unites things through fluid, surprising generalizations. Diffuse complexes sanction limitless connection-building and extend beyond concrete thought into the realm of impressions. Vygotsky gives the example of a child's grouping of triangles and trapezoids. The child considers trapezoids to be triangles with their heads cut off. (See Figure 10 on page 167).

The child of six or seven negotiates these graphic abilities and challenges each time she brings pencil to paper. This symbolizing leads to some larger issues of self presentation within the social context of writing sessions in an elementary classroom within the institution of school.

Gender differences do appear in children's drawings in the latency period. Machover (1953, 1960 in Mortensen, 1991) conducted two large sample studies of latency children's human figure drawings. She found boys' drawings to contain more conflict with overemphasized or odd features and extended limbs. In contrast, girls' drawings evidenced more order and social entrapments through detailed depiction of clothing, hair and accentuated heads. Machover summarized that latency is a more consistent time of life for females because passivity
and obedience are valued traits in children and particularly, girls. Girls settle into their identification with female role models, mother and teacher. Whereas boys, according to Machover, struggle with their role as children with the expectation of obedience, and their future role as men, which is characterized by dominance, competition and aggression. A Danish study (Mortensen, 1991) involving 540 drawings by 180 children ages five to thirteen, found sex differences most pronounced between the ages of five and seven and again between ten and twelve. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974 in Mortensen, 1991) find gender differences in amount of physical activity or movement engaged in with boys exercising the greater amount. Mortensen found this trend in her study of drawings as well. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) also cite gender differences in aggression with boys displaying more aggressive tendencies than girls. Mortensen found this gender difference in her study as well. Mortensen's findings corroborate Kerschensteiner's (1905) findings that girls tend to use a lot of decoration while boys emphasize technical details or correctness of details. With regard to content Kerschensteiner (1905) found boys more often drew technical things like cars while girls more frequently drew people, houses and flowers.

Developmentally, Anthony (1970) states six-year-old girls are one developmental year ahead of boys with neuromotor functions being significantly more advanced (Waber, 1979 in Mortensen). Girls show superiority in verbal skills while boys excel in mathematical and spatial abilities (Wittig and Petersen, 1979 in Mortensen). Mortensen concludes that sex differences in drawing may be largely due to developmental factors impacting drawing performance.
Drawing and Early Writing in School as Presentation of Self

The child's presence literally, psychologically and representationally in the society of classroom writers depends in great measure upon the security of the attachment to mother and home. A child's willingness to engage in the society of classroom writers is contingent upon her sense of herself as valuable which derives from the attachment bond. Her feelings of competence as a language user also relies on the attachment bond with the mother, her original conversation partner. As a risk-taker, her exploration of the physical and social environment links back to the earliest days of experience as an infant.

Earle (1987) cites three necessary conditions for creative risk-taking: 1) trust of others, 2) trust of oneself, and 3) a sense of personal competence in social settings. "Behavior occurs in a social setting which implies a compounding of self-esteem and interpersonal trust in order for risks to be taken..." (Rotter, 1980 in Earle, 1987, p. 420).

The classroom, the writing period, the rapport with the teacher and the peers around the symbolizing act comprise the 'framing' environment. This framing environment becomes familiar with time, through experience and mutual agreement. This agreement refers to expectations, rules, boundaries, protocols of the writing period which serve to ensure the comfort and engagement of students. Many aspects of the agreement will be made explicit in the first days of school by the teacher, other aspects may be conveyed nonverbally. The importance of the framing environment can be explained in terms of attachment
theory. Winnicott (1953) spoke of the safe, "holding" environment in which the secure attachment between mother and infant is sustained. Likewise, in the classroom during writing session the children require a "holding" environment believing that they are valued and esteemed by their teacher and peers in order that they might feel safe to put their thoughts and feelings and self images on paper.

Art therapy offers a sequence of stages of beholding the artwork upon completion. The first two stages, identification and familiarization, seem applicable to the child who creates in the classroom context. "Identification" (Schaverien, 1992) is the stage just after the work is finished when the artist feels a strong attachment to the work, identifies strongly with it, feels at one with it. "Familiarization" follows identification with the artist beginning to separate from the picture, acknowledging the picture as an other, outside of herself.

The paradox for the child is to maintain the social self or self-in-environment role while documenting on paper the inner self, the vulnerable self. The proponents of projective drawing tasks contend that the child draws the contents of her thoughts and feelings. Machover argues there is an intimate relationship between a person and her drawing of herself (Machover in Mortensen, 1991, p. 52). In approaching the task of drawing herself, the child must select what she will draw from many possible features. "This process of selection involves identification through projection and introjection" (Mortensen, 1991, p. 52). Goffman (1959) would claim the child in the writing/drawing session faces the dilemma of the 'official self' and the 'performing self'. The 'performing self' (known as the 'self-in-environment' in projective drawing analysis) wears a mask in society to protect the vulnerable 'official' or inner self. The child artist makes
decisions about which self she will depict when asked about her work. The performing self tells about the self she wishes to be in her society. She may leave parts of her inner self undisclosed in the verbal performance she makes. However, as projective drawing analysis has shown there are many messages embedded within the symbols the child chooses to draw.

As stated earlier, many children create drawings of symbols common to all children. These are the stock symbols: house, tree, person, etc. -- things children know about and care about. These symbols or prototypes are successively differentiated, elaborated and eventually integrated into various configurations. In contrast, some children draw characters from the media, especially superheroes. Gardner (1982) claims the impetus for the appropriation of media symbols is to deal with emotions around powerful themes. Smith (1985 in Salome, 1991, p. 1) suggests that copying cartoon characters provides children an easy graphic form through which they can express personal themes and emotions. Still other children draw portraits of their families, their homes, their yards, their pets. Though these themes are common, some children demonstrate something of a preoccupation with drawing the same symbols or scenes exclusively. These drawings act like 'transitional objects' for the child in the school setting while separate from the mother. It would appear that the risk to create novel symbols substantiates a child's personal feelings of efficacy as a symbolizer. With so many stock and media symbols she could potentially rely on, it seems such risk-taking attests to her drive to express and to be understood.

A child's need for expression finds many forms. The functions of
children's language have been classified by M.A.K. Halliday (1973) in descending order from most to least dominant to the child:

- **instrumental** - fulfilling needs
- **regulatory** - controlling
- **interactional** - relating to others
- **personal** - defining self
- **heuristic** - finding out
- **imaginative** - making believe
- **representational** - communicating about content

From a sociolinguistic standpoint, "language is 'defined' for the child by its uses" and "language is required to serve in the establishment and maintenance of all human relationships; it is the means whereby social groups are integrated and the individual is identified and reinforced" (Halliday, 1973, p. 17). The child of six communicates largely through pictures which justifies the assignment of function to her drawn communiques. Britton (1970) claims the personal function is predominant in children's early writing. The child writer in a social context, the writing session, satisfies personal and interactional functions with her written symbolization. Dyson (1982) found that Kindergarten children created many graphic objects for others, an early form of note or letter. The graphic object consisted of the addressee's name, the sender's name and some picture. An 'attachment' function has been added in the present study to describe written symbolization used to reinforce and maintain a child's bond to her family while away from home.

Genres, like discourses, carry specific meaning in the larger social context. These meanings are socially constructed. "Discourses are
derived from the larger social institutions within a society; genres are derived from the conventionalized social occasions on and through which social life is carried on" (Kress, 1989, p. 20). The institution limits the kinds of occasions which occur within them and consequently the kinds of genres and discourses sanctioned within them. The social occasion addressed in this study is the writing session in first grade classrooms using a writing process approach (Graves, 1983). The teacher signals the beginning of writing time in any of the following ways: by either passing out paper, or asking children to open journals, or directing children to obtain paper, or children simply begin. In the selected classrooms most children write at their desks. Some prefer to sit at a common writing center table with easy access to writing materials. In all classrooms in this study writing can be solitary or collaborative. Each child understands that at the end of the session there will be a product which she can take away, to which she can sign her name. Likewise, all children learn relatively quickly the requirements of the speech event of verbally performing a drawing's story or meaning. As Burke sees it "organization and selection of linguistic resources in verbal performance (action) is underlain by kinds of symbolic competence that transcend linguistic competence" (in Hymes, 1974, p. 139). Referring back to the earlier discussion of children's gesturing and symbolizing through play, Burke's statement seems extremely apropos. Children can accomplish creative performance in spite of limitations in their linguistic competence by virtue of other semiotic abilities such as gesturing, exaggeration, dramatic prosody, sound effects, extending tool use to serve as props to the drawn story, and so forth. Within the microsociety of a classroom there is the potential through verbal performance in bounded speech
events such as the explication of drawings to transform the social structure.

It is part of the essence of performance that it offers to the participants a special enhancement of experience, bringing with it a heightened intensity of communicative interaction which binds the audience to the performer in a way that is specified to performance as a mode of communication. Through (her) performance, the performer elicits the participative attention and energy of (her) audience, and to the extent that they value (her) performance, they will allow themselves to be caught up in it. When this happens the performer gains a measure of prestige and control over (her) audience—prestige because of demonstrated competence (she) has displayed, control because the determination of the flow of the interaction is in (her) hands (Bauman, 1984, p. 43-44).

Thus through creativity any child can adjust her position in the social order of her classroom.

Goffman (1963) explains that in social situations there exist "accessible engagements" for which no physical or situational boundary or closure separates participants and nonparticipants. This aptly describes the classroom setting where some children may be engaged in interaction while others by the fact of their nonparticipation become default 'bystanders.' In a classroom those engaged in interaction have dominance. A demonstrative analogy used by Goffman is that of the elevator. Those engaged in conversation on an elevator subordinate others who maintain 'civil inattention' by not exercising their communication position. Such 'civil inattention' in a classroom while
allowing the child to absorb much from her peers' language actually subordinates her. The risk of nonengagement is impotence and lack of position in the social order of the class.

Genre and mode of discourse are ways of positioning oneself to ones' text and to ones' social group/audience. Though elementary school classroom libraries abound with fictional narratives, eventually the child writer will be nudged to move beyond the production of narrative to the expository form of conveying information. Exposition stands as the cornerstone of 'essay-text literacy' (Scollon & Scollon, 1981) which has predominated in our European-based educational system. Sociolinguistic research documents the inception of 'essay-text literacy' in the lives of mainstream toddlers (Cazden, 1988; Heath, 1983). Through peek-a-boo games and bedtime stories mainstream toddlers learn the performance of point and name pictures in books. They learn the performance of making marks on paper and telling elaborate stories akin to the stories they hear in response to the printed pictures and words in books.

Newkirk (1989) looked at the incipient differentiation of genres and modes of discourse in children up to age seven. Newkirk challenges Moffett's (1968) contention that children can only communicate through story narratives. First, Newkirk introduces the concept of drawing as genre. "Whereas the narrative picture stresses the continuity of action, the expository picture examines the child's world removed from the stream of events" (Newkirk, 1989, p. 54). Newkirk sees narrative drawings depicting what happens or happened and expositional drawings as depicting what is. In the narrative picture the child faces the challenge of determining which part of the action to portray while
in exposition she decides what to include and how specifically.

In the child's performance of presenting her drawing to someone else she elucidates its genre. If she tells a story of what is happening in the picture, clearly it is a narrative. Exposition, according to Newkirk, emerges in several forms in younger children's drawings. First, the child attaches a label either verbal or written. Later, she will add a stem such as "This is ________." She will develop this exposition through the explication of the subject's attributes. The child catalogs her world, according to Newkirk, and in so doing engages in another expository form. In her drawings and early writings she may inventory her family members, or their names, she may draw all the things she associates with Halloween in a collage-like format. Another expository form, note writing, the early letter form, is prevalent in children's work. And as mentioned earlier, Dyson (1982) documents "graphic objects" as pictorial notes.

Moffett (1986) asserts that children learn to manipulate our symbol system through role play of the 1st and 2nd person in every combination of child to subject and child to audience. Distance from speaker and abstraction of the subject matter engender different modes of discourse. "The elaboration and expansion of small language structures into full discourses is itself a major dimension of growth. It depends on increasing abstractive ability" (Moffett, 1986 p. 30). Gee asserts that fictionalization of the author and the audience characterizes the essayist style. The 'reader' of an essayist text is not an ordinary human being, but an idealization, a rational mind formed by the rational body of knowledge of which the essay is a part. By the same token, the author is a fiction, since the process of writing and editing essayist text leads to an effacement of individual and idiosyncratic identity" (Gee,
1991, p. 63). Simmons (1990), in his study of portfolio use among 4th, 8th, and 11th graders, found the breadth of range of modes of discourse was predicted by socioeconomic status. This brings the discussion to Kress's contention:

Children grow up in contexts in which certain texts, discourses, genres, the modes of speech or writing, already have certain configurations. These are the forms which become habitual, and once habitual become 'natural' for a child growing into society and into language. And these initial configurations have a strong determining effect through the range of discourses and genres, which structure texts, in providing subject positions, assigning reading positions, roles of dominance or subordination within specific discourses and genres, facilitating or impeding modes of thinking and modes of acting, giving prominence to modes of the public or of the private domain in the forms of speech and writing (Kress, G., 1989, p. 51).

Essentially the child, based on issues of gender, race and class comes to school already schooled in positioning herself in her discourse and within her primary discourse community. As was discussed in the first chapter, the child's attachment relationship determines a child's working models of herself, of herself in relation to others. Her attachment status bears directly upon her valuation of herself and consequently the position she assumes in relation to herself, her audience and her subject. This is revealed in her choices of mode of discourse, genre, symbols, and official self disclosed in the speech event
of telling about her drawings. "The longer one person monologues
uninterruptedly, the more (her) discourse is likely to subordinate (her)
relation to (her) listener in favor of (her) relation to (her) content; that
is, (s)he is less and less influenced by the presence and responses of
(her) interlocutor and becomes more like someone writing to someone
else at a distance." (Moffett, 1983, p. 41)

Assessment of Written Products

Dyson (1982) investigated how Kindergarten children used drawing
and writing in their written products. She defined writing as consisting
of letters and drawing as consisting of pictures. In looking at the child's
performance and the writing/drawing she determined five
combinations of written production:

A. Drawing and writing were intermingled on
   the page; writing and drawing were not
   related thematically.
B. Drawing and writing contributed (roughly)
   equally to the complete product;
   information supplied by the writing may
   have overlapped but did not simply label
   information supplied by the drawing.
C. Writing served as a label for at least part
   of the drawn graphics.
D. Writing was part of the drawn graphics.
E. Drawing provided the meaningful context
   for the writing; it was not simply an
   illustration of the writing.

A means of sorting children's early drawings and writings derives from
Newkirk and Dyson. Thomas Newkirk (1989) and Anne Haas Dyson (1982) have observed first grade and kindergarten writers respectively in the act of writing in free writing or naturalistic situations in public school settings. From their observations they have generated very similar categories of graphic symbol configurations. A hybrid of their categorization systems follows: drawing only, writing only, decorated letters, drawing and writing on a page with no thematic link, drawing imbalance (more drawing than writing), writing imbalance (more writing than drawing), equal contribution of drawing and writing, general writing and specific drawings.

We can classify the written symbolizations of first graders as explicit concepts, rather than perceptions by the child. Drawings tell us basically what children know. Ricci (1887, in Mortensen, 1991, p. 29) is credited as the first to observe that the child draws what she knows about. This concept was then adopted by Piaget. Piaget and Inhelder (1969) claim drawing "is a form of the semiotic function which should be considered as being halfway between symbolic play and the mental image" (1969, p. 63). Rudolf Arnheim said "The child's statement, then, consists of visual concepts, which are demanded by direct experience but depict the subject abstractly by some relevant features of shape, relation and function" (Arnheim, 1971, p. 256). Vygotsky articulated a scheme for the development of concept formation in children described earlier, which serves to elucidate children's drawn concepts. Finally, we have considered the verbal performance which accompanies the drawing as indicative of the child's position in her primary discourse community as well as her negotiated positioning in her classroom society. Given that the child's presentation of self through the semiotic
function has its antecedents in the attachment relationship, a study of the relationship between attachment status and drawn/written symbolization seems critical to our understanding of the development of writing. At the beginning of a child's formal schooling we would do well to avail ourselves of all potential information about the child's sense of self in order to facilitate her transition to school literacy.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study is based on several major hypotheses. 1) Teacher assessment of children's attachment status through observations of and interactions with students in the first weeks of school will be correlated with a projective measure of children's attachment, i.e., the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test. 2) Insecurity of attachment will be associated with insecurity of place attachment. Insecurely attached children will be more likely to have changed residence several times between kindergarten and first grade. Insecurity of place attachment will be associated with insecurity of family attachment. 3) Security of attachment will predict higher scores on standard measures of language, i.e., the P.P.V.T.-R and the C.E.L.F.-R. Security of attachment will predict higher scores on standard measures of language, i.e., the P.P.V.T.-R and the C.E.L.F.-R. 4) The secure child will likely explore more functions or purposes for writing including: the personal function of defining self and "what I like," the interactional function of relating to others through letters, notes, etc. and the family attachment function of writing. However, the insecurely attached children will rely on the family attachment function predominantly in order to establish and
reinforce their familial ties while away from home. 5) Security of attachment will also be predictive of use of a wider range of modes of discourse. The secure child will likely explore not only personal narrative, the first genre to develop in children (Moffett, 1983), but also fictional narrative --telling a story, and exposition in the form of lists, labels, letter, notes and explanations. Whereas the insecurely attached child is expected to rely on the personal narrative mode of discourse. 6) Security of attachment will predict a broader range of symbol use meaning that a secure child will not only use many stock symbols common to all children, e.g., house, tree, person, rainbow, but will invent pictorial and graphic symbols to express her messages. Thus the greater numbers of personal symbols and larger total number of different symbols used across twelve pieces will be associated with secure attachment. 7) Security of attachment will be associated with greater proportions of graphic symbols per paper. That is to say, the written products of the securely attached child will include more letters and words than evidenced in the written works of insecurely attached children. 8) Symbolic configurations which are integrated, i.e, represent a scene, or evidence greater conceptual exploration (recall Vygotsky's description of the development of conceptualization) will be produced more often by securely attached children. While their insecure counterparts will likely rely more on isolated symbols.

The Children

Thumbnail sketches of some of the children and their symbolization patterns are presented below. Each child was chosen on the basis of his
or her drawings which are representative of the kinds of symbols used by the children in their groups.

Chuck

Chuck is a low language ability, insecurely attached boy from an unstable home. His father beats him and burned his neck in six places with a cigarette last year. Chuck spent last year in Readiness and thus is a little older than his first grade peers. He was 7.7 years at the beginning of first grade. He often dealt with his anger in the classroom by acting out, challenging the teacher's authority, sulking in a corner, or through angry verbal interchanges. Chuck had one best friend in the class—Mick. Mick had been in Chuck's Readiness class the previous year. This exclusive friendship lasted until Chuck unexpectedly moved to Florida one Friday in January.

Chuck's symbolization patterns followed the parallel play format. He and Mack sat together and drew about the same subjects—generally media symbols. Some days they did absolutely identical compositions of Ninja Turtles or guys surfing—"Surfin' Up." Other days they worked collaboratively on mini books. As the year progressed Chuck began a series of Bart Simpson books in which he dealt with his father's aggression. See Figure 100 on pages 268-276. Simultaneously Chuck dealt with his father's abandonment of the family to escape possible imprisonment on drug charges.

Sabina

Sabina is a securely attached, high language ability female. A very gregarious child, Sabina spends a lot of time chatting with teachers and other children. She directly asks for what she wants and needs,
sometimes pouts when she doesn't get her way. She responds well to redirection. Sabina actively listens to stories, flits about the classroom taking surveys, and enjoys being at the center of attention.

Sabina used a fair amount of continuous text in her early days of first grade. She wrote the names of all her family members. She did a written survey of her classmate's phone numbers. She wrote the names of her dolls. She wrote love notes to her Mom. She also made lists of colors, numbers and other classroom symbols. Early on she began creating "books" in which she depicted things she liked—mainly stock symbols such as rainbows, houses and pools, and flowers. Her family book stands in sharp contrast to Chuck's book on the same subject. (See Figure 101 on pages 277-285).

Her literacy is social. She utilizes all human and material resources available. She creates functions and uses for literacy relevant to her life rather than dutifully following established models. Though she does identify with her female role model, the teacher, she has a strong sense of self. She knows she is valued and can articulate this as evidenced in her family book.

**Amy**

Amy is an insecurely attached, low language ability child. She reports that her father is an alcoholic. Amy is gregarious yet she is quick to anger and her feelings are extremely sensitive. Amy cries at the offenses of her peers in class regularly. She holds a grudge for a long time and has been observed pouting for an entire writing session after having her feelings hurt.

When Amy symbolizes she uses many colors and creates patterns.
Some of her patterns are abstract. Some use stock symbols in an organized array, the family offers her a pattern of people which she prefers and draws on a regular basis (See Figure 102, page 286). None of her papers included any text. She created several drawings from stencil templates. She developed a very small number of different symbols.

Amy's symbolizing shows her as insecure, fearful of making any major commitment to paper. She has trouble sitting still and concentrating.

Ury

Ury, a securely attached boy of low language ability is friendly and liked by everyone in his class. Most of his classmates cited him as someone with whom they like to play. He is attentive and engaged during class activities. He does not talk much about his family. In his drawings he writes about his independent experiences. He begins most statements about his drawings with "I" which demonstrates the personal function.

His drawings are varied in subject matter. He draws both fictional and nonfictional subject matter. He draws movie plots, storybook characters, and he creates symbols and stories from his own imagination, one isolated symbol he drew was a potato witch. Ury also creates conceptual configurations based on his own perceptions. (See Figure 6, page 174). The only text which appeared in his early pieces was an alphabet sheet he created.

Ury's repertoire includes a high number of different and personal symbols which he utilizes to exploit the personal function of writing.
Ury seems complacent, though with his symbolizing. He attempts no written text or labelling but does a fair amount of graphic conceptualizing.

Maria

Maria, an insecurely attached girl of high language ability, reports ducking under her apartment windows to avoid the crossfire of guns in her neighborhood. She is shy. Her conversations center on disasters and misfortune of her relatives and things she fears. In the classroom she tries to please the teacher. She is a "good girl."

Her symbolization includes a balance of stock and personal symbols. Yet she attempts some invented spelling. This is such a risk for her that she constantly seeks confirmation of her accuracy in such a way as to convey real pain at the thought of making a mistake. Her favored composition is a scene of a house, a rainbow and flowers (See Figure 103, page 287). It seems a fantasy with respect to her actual domicile.

Jack

Jack is a high language ability, insecurely attached male. He reports his father is an alcoholic. One day when he was given a note to take home to his parents regarding detention for fighting on the playground, Jack dissolved into tears. He despaired that his father would "kill him" and begged his teacher throughout the afternoon not to make him take the note home. He was panic-stricken.

Jack spent the first month of school walking around during writing time. He wrote nothing. In October he began using stencil templates to make patterns. Later he embarked upon written symbolization of his family. Each of a series of tadpole figures was labeled with a name and
an age (See Figure 65, page 233). He repeated this pattern-like configuration each writing session for many weeks. His labeling of family drawings gave way to transcription of environmental signs, e.g., Reading Area.

Jack is obsessed with attachment issues. He draws only family portraits and stencils. He shows little engagement with the classroom environment. He takes little or nothing from the human and material resources of the classroom. He is not really a member of the classroom writing community nor is he an isolater. Jack is a wanderer.

Anastasia

Anastasia follows directions. She is a low language ability, securely attached female. She is a "good girl" like Maria. She does not mention anything of her family but she always draws herself in her compositions with the label "ME." (See Figure 104, page 288). She likes to draw isolated symbols and labels them with words from lists her teacher has hung about the room. Sometimes her collections of symbols make no sense together, but for the fact that they are objects she can draw and label. As the semester progressed she began adding a baseline and a sun, the rudiments of a scene.

Anastasia appears dutiful. She attends keenly to her teacher's verbal and nonverbal messages. She appears complacent and has several friends with whom she consults during writing time for help or attention.

Mitch

Mitch is a high language ability, securely attached male. He is
gregarious and has many friends. He functions independently of the teacher and relies much more on male peers for advice or support when needed. He draws independently, he draws collaboratively. He creates trademark symbols which others copy. His symbolization includes inventively spelled stories and many conceptual configurations, see Figures 8 and 10 on pages 176 and 178.

Mitch's literacy is very social. He takes risks by creating and solving graphic problems. Aware of everything that goes on, he makes use of all potential resources--teacher, peers, books, group discussions, audiotapes, environmental print. He explores. He pushes at the boundaries of his own literacy. It is significant to note that much of his most challenging literate endeavors take the form of drawings rather than text.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

What is the association between attachment status and emergent writing patterns among inner-city first graders in the first months of school?

The First-Grade Children

To investigate the association between attachment status and emergent writing in incoming first graders the present study was conducted in an inner-city public primary school housing grades Kindergarten through three. The population served by the school is predominantly white, working class poor and unemployed. The majority of the families are single parent, female head of households who can be considered "precariously housed" (Bassuk and Rubin, 1987). Seventy students between the ages of 6.1 and 7.11 years of age began the study but over the course of the four months of data collection eleven students moved. Thus fifty-nine students from three first grade classrooms (n = 15, n = 17, n = 16) and a Readiness class (n = 11) completed the study. Of the fifty-nine subjects, thirty-one were male and twenty-eight, female. Forty-four of the students (75%) receive free or reduced lunch. Twenty-one of the students (36%) receive Chapter 1 services and thirteen of the students (22%) participate in a pull-out Special Education program.
Classroom Teachers

The classrooms had three relevant similarities: 1) the classroom teacher was an outwardly warm and caring individual who gave clear, direct guidance to children; 2) the classroom teacher employed a writing process approach to writing in which she allowed children ample time, contact with peers and materials to engage in self-initiated written symbolization; 3) the classroom teacher was willing to transcribe verbatim the children's talk about the written works for twelve works per child in the first two months of school.

Procedures

Written Product Collection. The writing samples were collected in September and October of 1991 for two reasons: 1) to procure the first written works children produced in first grade and 2) to control for teacher difference. Written work was collected before the children had participated in a particular classroom ecology for a significant period of time. Each classroom had a routine daily writing session. All writing samples were collected during the class's daily writing session. Children were interviewed at the time of writing by their classroom teacher acting as a teacher-researcher or the researcher/author of this study about the current piece. The child was requested to 1) "Tell me about this..." and 2) "What is it for?" The researchers then transcribed verbatim the child's verbal response to the questions regarding the
written work. These brief transcripts were later attached to the written pieces. Written products and transcripts were assigned a student code number. Each child contributed a set of twelve pieces to the study. Proportions of symbol use, modes of discourse, function, etcetera were made on the basis of the set of twelve pieces.

Coding of Written Products. A group of five coders blind to the hypothesis used an analysis chart (See Appendix A-1, page 163) to code each of twelve papers per student. Analysis of each piece was based on the graphic and pictorial symbols on the paper and the child's transcript. Coders determined mode of discourse selecting either letter or note, narrative, or exposition: list, label or explanation. The second feature coded was function of the writing. The possible functions (Halliday, 1973) were narrowed to three: Personal - defining self or things I like, and Interactional - written in order to relate to others. The third function, created for the purposes of this study, was family attachment referring to those written products which served to establish or reinforce family ties.

The third coding of symbolization differentiated among the following graphic configurations: I. Drawing Only. Written products coded as drawing only were either A) static, abstract, non-representational; B) approximation of letters and/or numbers; or C) representational drawings. II. Drawing and Text. Pieces combined drawing and text as A) unrelated collage of pictures and letters/words; B) labeled pictures; C) illustrated story. III. Text Only. Text only arrangements consisted of A) random letters or numbers; B) isolated words or lists; C) continuous text. Inter-rater reliability estimated by Cohen's Kappa was .62 for mode of discourse, .72 for function, and .79
for symbolization configuration.

The fourth and final coding was executed by the author according to classifications of symbolization (See Appendix A-2, page 164). Total number of different symbols across a child's twelve papers were calculated first. Symbols were then identified as either personal, stock, media or environmental. Personal symbols are those symbols which were unique to the child's repertoire and did not appear in other children's works. Symbols common to all children's written works, e.g., house, tree, person, sun, rainbow, cat, dog, school, cloud, flower, star and balloon were identified as stock. Media symbols used by children in this sample were: Ninja Turtles, Bart Simpson, Ghostbusters, Damien of Friday the Thirteenth, Nintendo's Mario Brothers, Batman, Garfield, Airwolf and Zorro. Symbols which appeared on the classroom walls or in popular books were classified as environmental symbols. These included letters of the alphabet, number sequences, lists of students' names, book titles, poems or chants copied from charts or pictures copied from charts, book covers or posters in the classroom.

Papers were identified as fiction or nonfiction based largely on the children's transcripts and the inclusion of media symbols, especially. Generally inclusion of Ninja Turtles, etc. signaled a flight of fantasy.

Lastly, the configuration of symbols on the page was evaluated. Each written piece was determined to be either isolated symbols, representation of a scene, or a conceptual exploration. The isolated symbol stands alone on the page. It might be a depiction of one ninja turtle as in Appendix B, Figure 1 on page 169 or multiples of symbols in the same family e.g., my family, a row or Ninja Turtles or a group of dinosaurs which are not grounded by a baseline or other scenery (See
Appendix B, Figures 2, 3 and 4 on pages 170-172). Configurations which represent a scene integrate symbols with some semblance of scenery including a baseline, possibly houses, trees, flowers, and usually sun or clouds and a skyline. Configurations which appeared to be collages were identified as conceptual after Vygotsky's (1986) theory of concept development in children. An analysis of the written symbolization and the child's transcript allowed the researcher to determine the type of conceptualization the child was exploring.

Although in the initial coding drawings were identified as syncretic, or associative, collections, chaining or diffuse complexes, for statistical purposes these categories were collapsed into the overarching category, conceptual. A collage-like mixture of pictures and possible letters or words which were unrelated fell into the syncretic category (See Figure 5, page 173). These were considered rudimentary conceptualizations based on some indicator in the child's transcript as to the thinking being depicted. Associative configurations are collages based on any bond the child perceives between or among various symbols. Figure 6 on page 174 shows a child's associating the multi-color nature of a traffic light and the rainbow, for example.

Collections referred to configurations of symbols demonstrated associations by contrast. That is, symbols collected differed on one key feature as in Figure 7 on page 175 in which the child considers good food and bad food. A configuration was classified as a chain complex if the "type and nature of the bonds vary from link to link" (Vygotsky, 1986). Figures 8 and 9 on pages 176 and 177 exemplify the chain configuration. In Figure 8 the child begins decorating the wings of the butterfly and links the stars on the wings to the stars in the sky then links stars in the sky with flowers on the ground. Figure 9 is a tiny
three-page book which the child read as follows: (p. 1) "This is my Mom and that's me. (p. 2) The two little pigs, the mother and the kid pig. (p. 3) Clouds with Bart Simpson." Clearly the writer makes links from page to page as she sees the similarity between her mother and herself and the mother pig and "kid pig" as similar pairs. The link she makes as she draws page 3 is a bit more implicit but for the fact that she has drawn a pair of Bart Simpson figures. The diffuse configuration is characterized by limitless connections made among the pictorial symbols. Consider Figure 10 on page 178 in which the child makes graphic transitions from the Ninja Turtle figure in the far right bottom corner to the exploration of turtle body parts especially the hands then makes a startling association between the turtle hand floating in space and the butterfly which he then repeats several times.

**Language Measures.** Children were administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (P. P. V. T. - R) (Dunn and Dunn, 1981) to assess their receptive language ability. The expressive language subtest of the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals - Revised (C. E. L. F. - R) (Semel, Wiig & Secord, 1987) was used to assess their language production. The three tasks which comprise the expressive language subtest are word structure, formulated sentences and recalling sentences. The word structure task is an oral fill-in the blank measure of the child's understanding of plurals, possessives, verb tenses and superlatives. The child is shown a picture prompt and asked to formulate a sentence using a key word in the formulating sentences task. Finally, the recalling sentences task requires the child to repeat back sentences graduated in difficulty which are orally presented by
the examiner.

For most data analysis in the study, children were grouped as high or low language ability based on their scaled scores above or below the population mean, 80.2. For the purposes of the ANOVA on addresses the children were grouped into high, middle and low groups on the basis of the C.E.L.F. - R. With high denoting children who scored greater than one standard deviation above the mean (mean, 80.2 and standard deviation, 12.32); middle including children scoring between one standard deviation below the mean and one standard deviation above; and low designating children who scored less than one standard deviation below the mean.

Separation Anxiety Test (SAT). Attachment was measured through child, teacher and observational data. The primary measure of the child's attachment status was the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test (Slough and Greenberg, 1988) which the experimenter administered to children individually. This semi-projective measure was adapted from Hansburg's (1972) measure of separation anxiety for eleven to seventeen year olds. In 1976 Bowlby and Klagsburn created a version of the measure appropriate for children ages four to seven. They did this by decreasing the number of pictures and replacing the illustrations with actual photographs of separation situations. In the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test the same scenes are depicted in photographs however the sets for boys and girls were made absolutely consistently in every detail except for the gender of the depicted child. In addition, children's positioning has been modified to backviews or profiles to maintain emotional ambiguity. Clothing and
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hairstyles have been updated and in all but two photographs both parents are pictured.

Recent investigation into attachment capitalizes on children's verbal abilities beyond infancy where attachment is generally measured via the Strange Situation. Main, Kaplan and Cassidy, 1985 and Bretherton, Ridgeway and Cassidy, 1990 have conducted studies which tap three- to six-year-old children's working models of attachment relationships by administering the Bowlby-Klagsburn Separation Anxiety Test and correlating these scores with the child's separation and reunion behaviors in a modified Strange Situation with their mothers. Main et al. found children's attachment security assessed at twelve months and six years through the Strange Situation was highly predictive of their verbalized working models of attachment in the Separation Anxiety Test (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). The present study includes the new Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test and observations of children in a metaphorical Strange Situation, their first weeks of first grade separated from their mothers with an adult stranger and unfamiliar children. It is believed that the child's entry into the institutional setting can be considered an authentic Strange Situation.

Slough and Greenberg issue a caution about the use of children's responses to questions about their primary relationships. Keeping in mind Bowlby's (1973) concept of "defensive exclusion" whereby the child excludes from conscious awareness those components of her working models or representations which are too upsetting. For example in the case of an abusive parent, the child may defensively exclude information about the parent, hence her responses may not be exact representations of truth. However, Ainsworth (1969) believes how the child manifests defensive exclusion is important attachment
information and does constitute that child’s perceptions of her real-life attachment relationships. Cassidy and Kobak (1988) claim that a child exercising defensive exclusion who avoids her mother upon reunion in the Strange Situation will also exhibit avoidant behaviors when questioned about her attachment relationships as in a Separation Anxiety Test.

To administer the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test the test administrator shows a series of six photographs to the child. The photographs depict three mild separation situations: parents go out for the evening, parents take child to the park asking the child to go play so they can talk, and the mother puts the child to bed; and three severe separation situations: the parents go away for the weekend, the mother takes the child to school on the first day and the parents go away for two weeks but give the child a present. Upon introducing the task to the child the experimenter says:

Sometimes parents have to go away for a little while and leave their little girl/boy. We would like to know how children feel when their parents have to leave. Some children feel happy, some feel angry, some feel scared, and some feel OK. I would like you to help us know how little girls/boys feel. I will show you some pictures and ask some questions (Slough and Greenberg, 1988).

The experimenter presents each photograph to the child, explains the scene and asks: 1) How does the little girl/boy feel? 2) Why does she/he feel that way? 3) What's the little girl/boy going to do? Having completed these questions regarding the child in the picture the examinee is asked: 4) How would you feel if you were the little
girl/boy? 5) Why? 6) What would you do? The child examinee is encouraged to respond to all questions but if the child shows extreme anxiety or refuses after gentle coaxing, the experimenter moves on to the next mild separation photograph.

The premise behind the scoring of the SAT is that if children have a strong working model of an accessible mother, they should respond to depictions of mild separation situations with confidence and severe separation situations with direct expression of feelings of sadness, anger or anxiety. An insecurely attached child may be unable to respond or to respond logically, or may respond with self-reliance to severe separation situations, or may express extreme hostility. The ratings, holistic assessment of the child's total response for each photograph, reflect three dimensions of the responses through expression of: vulnerability or attachment, self-reliance, and avoidance. Initially the response for each photograph is classified into one of five major categories: attachment, self-reliant, attachment/self-reliant, avoidant or additional. An attachment response designates expressions of sadness or anger about the separation. A self-reliant response is one in which the child verbalizes happiness at the parents' departure. An attachment/self-reliant response partially satisfies conditions for both response categories. Avoidant responses were the non-responses or reluctant responses. Responses were categorized as additional if they focused on fear of the dark or of being kidnapped. Also classified as additional were responses exhibiting extreme hostility or hatred towards parents or extreme happiness due to the parents departure.

A second rating, a subcategorization for each response, denoted the coping strategies articulated by the child. These ratings referred to the
appropriateness of the coping. A third and summary score ascribed to responses for each of the severe separation situations an attachment rating of 1 (low) to 4 (high); a similar 4-point rating of self-reliance was given to each of the mild separation responses; an avoidance rating of 1 (low) to 3 (high) was assigned to all six responses.

Self and other scores were calculated for each question. Slough and Greenberg hypothesized that in light of defensively excluded material a child might be better able to talk about separation situations in terms of the child in the picture with less anxiety than she could talk about her own attachment relationships. Their findings confirmed their hypothesis with regard to insecurely attached children. In addition, they found that the calculated difference scores (response score for self minus response score for other) of avoidance (which is derived from all six pictures) was most significantly correlated with children's attachment classification based on separation and reunion behaviors in the modified Strange Situation. In the present study the difference scores in the avoidance category were used to designate groups of securely attached children (zero difference between self and other scores) and insecurely attached children (difference between self and other score was either a positive or a negative number).

**Sociogram.** Each child was asked to name the child or children she or he would most like to 1) sit next to and 2) play with. Scores were given each child for the number of times his or her name was mentioned by peers in response to the two sociogram questions.

**Attachment to Place.** A tally was taken of the total number of addresses on each child's registration card which covers the time
period from school entrance to the beginning of first grade.

Teacher Assessment of Child Attachment Behaviors. Each classroom teacher filled out a questionnaire which asked her to rate each child in her class on various attachment behaviors exhibited in the classroom (Appendix A-3, pages 165-167). First she was asked to rate on a scale of 1 (very close) to 6 (very distant) her feelings of closeness to each child. Secondly, she rated on a 4-point scale her feelings of effectiveness in her teaching rapport with each child and her perceptions of amount of time spent with each child. Questions 3 - 5 ask her to reflect on her observations of her class and identify which children have formed enduring friend pairs, which children spend the most time isolating and which children are consistently left out of collaborative or group activities. Questions 6 and 7 request identification of children whose parents have had positive and negative interactions with the teacher.

Teachers were given a modification of the Hazan and Shaver Adult Attachment Style measure to fill out for each child in her class (See Appendix A-4 on page 168). Three descriptive paragraphs denote secure, ambivalent and avoidant attachment. Without the attachment labels, teachers, blind to the hypothesis chose the one paragraph which best described the child.

Classroom Observations. Prior to the administration of the SAT and subsequent attachment coding of the children, the author made weekly observations of writing session in all four classrooms and kept limited
fieldnotes of these observations.

Additionally the researcher selected one classroom to observe closely for the duration of the study. Through participant observation information regarding all students in the one classroom was collected throughout the class routine two days per week from September through December. Attachment behaviors, socialization patterns and emergent writing served as the focus of these observations.
Chapter 4

Attachment and Position in the Classroom

Emergent Selves

Each child comes to school unaware that this schooling will change her irrevocably. How much will she allow herself to be changed? Isn't that the essential question? How prepared is she to accept the authority of the school? the primacy of school literacy? the risk of literacy? Where will she position herself in the social order of her classroom? Where will she position herself on paper? How much of herself does she know? How much of herself will she risk sharing? Will she form attachments to teachers and peers which will foster the emergence of not only her literacy, but herself?

Secure children let go of mother's hand, figuratively speaking, and come to school. From that jumping off point they reach for the challenges, they welcome the risks of literacy and socialization. The observational and teacher questionnaire data show that only the insecurely attached children isolate or get left out of children's activities in the classroom. Since much of the learning that occurs in classrooms happens among peers, the insecurely attached begin school less able to profit from classroom interactions.

Teacher Distance

Hypothesis 1 stated that teacher assessment of children's attachment security will be associated with children's attachment...
security as measured by the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test (Slough & Greenberg, 1988). The premise that teachers keenly observe children's socialization in their classrooms underlies this hypothesis. Additionally, children's behaviors in a new school environment, a Strange Situation of sorts, contribute to the teacher's understanding of the child's attachment patterns. These patterns will be played out in the child's interactions with her (Barrett & Trevitt, 1991) as well as with peers.

The Children

Seventeen children (29%) gave responses to the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test which placed them in the securely attached category, while forty-two (71%) children were considered insecurely attached. Thirty-two children had scaled scores in the high language ability range, above the sample mean (X = 80.2) and twenty-seven children scored below the mean placing them in the low language ability category.

Teacher Perceptions of Children's Attachment Status

In order to test the first hypothesis, a Chi Square test showed significant association between teacher assessment of her students' attachment security via the modified Hazan and Shaver measure and children's attachment security determined by their responses to the
Seattle version of the SAT ($X^2 = 6.566, V = .339, p < .0375$). The modified Hazan and Shaver measure (See Appendix A-4, page 168) allowed teachers to select descriptors for children which identified some of their observable attachment behaviors in the classroom. These categorizations were significantly associated with children's attachment codings based on their responses in the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test ($p < .0375$).

This indicates that teacher observations of children in the classroom match children's self reports of attachment status via a projective measure such as the S. A. T.

**Teacher Distance**

A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed on teacher rating of distance (1 - very close to 6 - very distant) from student. The mean score on the teacher distance scale was $X = 2.672$ (1-very close, 6-very distant) with a standard deviation of 1.22. There was one main effect for gender ($F(1, 50) = 5.864, p < .019$), males being more distant from the teacher. No main effects for attachment or language ability emerged.

A significant effect was found for the interaction of attachment and gender ($F(1,50) = 6.921, p < .01$). Secure males (4.1) were cited as the most distant by their teachers. See Table 4 on page 131. Insecure males (2.5), and females both secure (2.1) and insecure (2.5) received essentially similar ratings near the mean (2.672, standard deviation = 1.22). A Dunnett's t-test found male secure to be significantly more
distant than male insecure (t = 3.72, p < .01), or female insecure (t = 3.37, p < .01), or female secure (t = 3.81, p < .01).

Teacher ratings of her feelings of distance from individual students identify children who fail to form attachments with the mother-surrogate, the teacher. That boys were perceived as more distant from the teacher if they were securely attached to mother substantiates Chodorow's (1978) theories of male development as one of separation from the mother and, as these data show, from female surrogates. Insecurely attached boys and all the girls were rated about the same, with average ratings of closeness, approximately 2.5. Females in the latency stage would be expected to maintain close proximity to the mother and here it shows they continue this gender identification with the female teacher. Teachers in this study admitted to feeling closer to their female students and the questionnaire data corroborates this. The exception to this rule is the case of the insecurely attached boys who act out attachment behaviors similar to girls. Insecurity of attachment to the mother engenders an anxious need for closeness and possible overdependence on the female teacher. This attachment behavior inhibits the insecurely attached boys from their gender identification task of separating from the female caregiver.

Teacher Rapport

To assess teacher ratings of their rapport (1 - very effective, spend a lot of time to 4 - ineffective, never spend enough time) with students, a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed. The mean score for the teacher rapport scale
was 1.966 with a standard deviation of .837. One main effect for
gender ($F(1, 50) = 5.469, p < .0234$) found females holding the closest
rapport with teachers. There were no main effects found for
attachment or language ability.

The interaction of attachment and gender reached significance ($F(1,
50) = 4.917, p < .0312$). Table 4 on page 138 shows that teachers felt
the strongest sense of rapport with securely attached female students
(1.7). Both insecure girls (1.8) and insecure boys (1.8) received similar
ratings from teachers with regard to rapport. The pattern of teacher
ratings cluster the insecure males and all females in closer attachments
to the teacher. Only securely attached males (2.9) were rated as
significantly different in their teacher's perceptions with regard to her
effectiveness and time spent with them.

A Dunnett's t-test found male secures to have significantly less
rapport with the teacher than male insecures ($t = 3.183, p < .01$), female
secures ($t = 3.231, p < .01$), and female insecures ($t = 3.184, p < .01$).

The teacher-as-mother concept serves to explain the gender effect
and the gender/attachment effect on teacher perceptions of children's
attachment status in the current study. In this study teachers felt most
distant from boys, especially securely attached boys. Clearly six-year-
old boys who are securely attached to their mothers carry out their
gender identification needs of the latency period in school. They begin
to separate from the mother and mother surrogate to define themselves
as independent, competitive, possibly aggressive. The teachers reported
feeling least effective and having spent the least time with securely
attached boys. That would indicate that boys in this study are
functioning fairly independently of the teacher. Observations reveal
boys banding together in same-sex pairs or small groups.

Insecurely attached boys cannot keep pace with their instinctual drive to separate from the mother due to the unfinished developmental task of forming the original attachment with her. Thus these boys come to school seeking the mothering they need and consequently develop close or dependent relationships with their teacher-mothers. The distance and rapport data testify to this supposition. Girls of latency age have identified with mother whether they are securely attached or not. All girls in this study were found to be significantly closer in teacher perceptions than the secure boys. Yet security of attachment forced insecure boys to behave like the girls, that is, they kept close to the teacher which, in terms of boys' gender identification may be considered problematic.

Attachment, Place Attachment and Language Ability

The second hypothesis posited that insecurity of attachment, as measured by the Seattle version of the Separation Anxiety Test, would be associated with insecurity of place attachment as indicated by the number of addresses on children's registration cards from kindergarten to entrance of first grade.

A 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was conducted on the number of addresses which appeared on children's registration cards from kindergarten to the beginning of first grade. The test for association of attachment did not reach significance.

However, an association was found between number of addresses and score on the expressive language subtest of the C.E.L.F.-R ($F_{(2, 51)} = 4.029, p < .05$). An ANOVA of the difference in number of addresses
between high, middle and low score groups on the C.E.L.F. - R subtest found significant differences among groups ($F(2, 58) = 7.128, p < .0017$). The mean number of addresses was 1.562 with a standard deviation of .796. Language ability groups were created based on a mean of 80.27 and standard deviation of 12.32. The high group scored at or above 1 standard deviation above the mean ($M > 92.59$). The middle group scores fell between one standard deviation above the mean and one standard deviation below the mean ($92 > M > 67.95$). The low group yielded scores less than one standard deviation below the mean ($M < 67.95$). Table 5 on page 139 shows the low scoring C.E.L.F. - R group ($\bar{X} = 2.4$ addresses) had a higher number of addresses than the middle score ($\bar{X} = 1.5$ addresses) and high score groups ($\bar{X} = 1$ address). Dunnett's t-tests showed significant differences between the low score C.E.L.F.-R and both the middle score group ($t(3, 56) = 2.998, p < .01$) and the high score group ($t(3, 56) = 3.745, p < .01$), whereas the difference between the middle and high score groups was not significant.

Though the findings did not show a significant association between attachment status of children and place attachment indicated by the number of addresses on the registration card between kindergarten and first grade, the association between such precarious housing and language development warrants serious deliberation. Children in the lowest language ability group with an average raw score of 68/174 ($x = 80.27$) had moved two to three times between Kindergarten and first grade. (See Table 5, page 139). We have no record of the total number of moves they have made in the span of their short lives. However, research on homelessness shows that before a person or family becomes literally homeless they experience at least one year of precarious
housing, moving four or more times (Bassuk and Rubin, 1987). During this time they either double up with relatives who do not have enough space for them or they live for brief periods in motels, condemned buildings and the like. In the current study moves were often precipitated by the lack of money to pay rents. According to school officials, children are swept up at night and moved in an effort to evade the landlord's call.

No research exists to support the language deficit of homeless and precariously housed children. Yet such a lack of stability and consistency can only have an adverse effect on the developing child. Young children thrive on routine. The ability of the mother to scaffold (Cazden, 1988) or vertically construct (Scollon and Scollon, 1981) children's language relies on familiarity between mother and child and between the child and her circumstances. The novelty brought on by changing homes and schools would be overstimulation for most children whose developmental attachment needs render them at-one with people and surroundings. We have yet to determine the ramifications of such disruption to these fundamental attachments.

With regard to the language measures used in the current study, security of attachment was presumed to predict higher scores on standard measures of language ability, i.e., the P. P.V. T. - R and the expressive language subtest of the C. E. L. F. - R. To investigate this third hypothesis, the difference between language scores of secure and insecure groups two t-tests were run. The first t-test measured the differences in P.P.V.T. - R scores for secure and insecure children. The mean score on the P.P.V.T. - R was X = 93.339 with a standard deviation of 14.766. There were no significant effects found. The second test of the differences in C. E. L. F. - R scores for secure and insecure children.
The mean scaled score on the C. E. L. F. - R was $X = 80.271$ with a standard deviation of 12.323. Again no significant effects were found.

The hypothesis that security of attachment would be associated with higher language ability was not confirmed due to the low variability in children's performance on both language measures - the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the expressive language subtest of the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals. Both tests have been normed on urban populations, yet in this sample children's scaled scores ranged from 58 to 122/175 on the P.P.V.T. and from 50 to 108/174 on the C.E.L.F. Given the preponderance of insecure attachments in this sample, the poor showing on these language measures may be a default confirmation of the association between language and attachment. Further research in this area is warranted.

**Positioning Self to the Text**

Halliday's position substantiates the findings of this study which show sixty-six percent of children's papers were characterized as serving a personal function. Personal definition clearly underscores all children's marks on paper. Halliday states:

Language is required to serve in the establishment and maintenance of all human relationships; it is the means whereby social groups are integrated and the individual is identified and reinforced. It is I think significant for certain forms of literature that, since personality is dependent on interaction which is in turn mediated through language,
the 'interpersonal' function in language is both interactional and personal: there is, in other words, a component in language which serves at one and the same time to express both the inner and the outer surfaces of the individual, as a single undifferentiated area of meaning potential that is personal in the broadest sense (Halliday, 1977, p. 99).

This study examined children's positioning of themselves in relation to their texts by looking at function and mode of discourse. Hypothesis 4 stated that the secure child will explore more functions or purposes for writing including PERSONAL, FAMILY ATTACHMENT, AND INTERACTIONAL.

A series of 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs (attachment x language ability x gender) were performed on the proportion of children's papers coded as FUNCTION - PERSONAL, that is, defining self, and those coded as FUNCTION - FAMILY AND FRIEND ATTACHMENT. The INTERACTIONAL category was collapsed into the ATTACHMENT category due to the limited number of papers of this type.

In the first test, a significant three-way interaction of attachment, language ability and gender was found ($F(1, 51) = 5.562, p < .0222$) for writing which serves a PERSONAL function. The mean proportion of personal function writing used was $X = .656$ with a standard deviation of .262. All groups except high language ability females showed an inverse relationship between proportions of papers serving a personal function and attachment security. Looking at graph 9 on page 150 we see security of attachment associated with a decline in the proportion of papers with a personal function.
Low language ability male insecurities (72.5) generated more than average proportions of personal function papers and low language ability, secures (68%) also generated slightly more than average. The high language, securely attached male category was too small to report. Overall, males used the personal function of writing more often than females.

Low language ability females with insecure attachments (56%) created average proportions of pieces satisfying a personal function and their securely attached counterparts (53%), slightly less than average. In contrast, security of attachment is associated with an increase in the personal function of writing to define self in high language ability girls. The high language ability females with insecure attachment status (56%) produced slightly less PERSONAL function papers than average while the high language ability, securely attached females (65%) produced a greater than average proportion.

A significant effect for the interaction of attachment and gender was also found ($F(1, 51) = 6.121, p < .0167$). Refer to graph 10 on page 151. Here we see insecurely attached males (77.8%) produced significantly more writing with a PERSONAL function than either securely attached males (60.4%), securely attached females (58.4%), or insecurely attached females (56.5%). In fact, the trend was a significant decline in personal function papers with security of attachment for boys. Girls showed a slight increase in proportion of personal function symbolization with security of attachment.

Children socially construct their identities. In first grade this development of the identity occurs in relation to other children. Children bear witness to one another's identity formation. They watch each other create new symbols, they borrow, they appropriate, they
transcribe one another’s "trademarks" (Matthews, 1991). This study shows insecurely attached boys as producing the highest proportion of personal function pieces which indicates they may have the most difficulty defining themselves. Findings later in this paper will demonstrate this group's chameleon-like tendency to appropriate girls' symbol patterns and themes. A review of the papers shows an abundance of personal pieces fixated on one subject or issue of personal definition. "For a minority of children, fixed themes do appear to signal a less adaptive, more regressive function... an obstacle to experimentation and growth" (Gardner, 1982, p. 119). Figures 11-19, pages 179-187 exhibit one insecurely attached boy's fixation with home which was coded as connoting a personal function. These drawings exemplify the persistence of the home theme for this child, his writing folder shows he was still drawing home two months later.

The attachment, language ability and gender interaction shows that males use the personal function more often than females regardless of language ability. Females generally define themselves in relation to family and friends and pets (See Figures 20 and 21, pages 188 and 189), rather than independently as many of the boys do (See Figures 22 and 23, pages 190-191). Males also tended to define themselves through drawing fictional scenes of their favorite media characters or things they like, e.g., cars (See Figure 24, page 192).

There were no significant effects found in the second test, a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on the use of the ATTACHMENT function in children's writing. The mean proportion was $X = .264$ with a standard deviation of .228. The thirty-four percent of the papers serving the attachment function did not vary enough to
register significance in the analysis. Differences in teaching styles showed up most strongly with regard to collection of papers categorized as serving an attachment function. Several teachers encouraged authentic forms of writing, e.g., note-writing, polling and census-taking, etc. In the other classrooms the format of writing session did not allow for this type of writing. Additionally, children who write for authentic purposes of forming attachments generally give their "graphic objects" away. It becomes very much like detective work to track such pieces down. We can assume that far more of the attachment function was employed than is represented in these data.

Mode of Discourse

In terms of the modes of discourse children chose, hypothesis 5 states that security of attachment will be predictive of the types of modes of discourse used. Seeking an association between attachment status and proportions of modes of discourse across children's sets of twelve papers, two 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs (attachment x language ability x gender) were performed. The first test assessed the proportion of papers rated as NARRATIVE produced by the first-grade children. There were no main effects for attachment, language ability or gender.

The second test assessed the proportion of papers rated as EXPOSITION in the children's twelve-paper sets. Again, no main effects were found for attachment, language ability or gender.

A2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) produced a main effect for gender on the selection of fiction versus nonfiction among groups ($F(1, 51) = 9.087, p < .004$). The mean
proportion of fiction used was $X = .321$ with a standard deviation of $.273$. The mean proportion of nonfiction was $X = .667$ with a standard deviation of $.276$. Boys (46%) created fiction nearly three times more often than girls (16%). Forty-six percent of boys' papers versus sixteen percent of girls' papers were fictional. Nonfiction represented fifty-three percent of the boys' papers and eighty-two percent of the girls' papers.

This trend has a straightforward explanation. Girls tend to write about their families, friends and home life—nonfiction. Meanwhile, boys write mainly fictional narratives about themselves and superhero media figures. The intercorrelations table (Table 7, page 141) substantiates this claim, showing fiction inversely correlated with stock symbols and directly correlated with media symbols. In contrast, nonfiction is directly correlated with stock symbols and inversely correlated with media symbols.
Chapter 5

Drawn Symbols: Types and Uses

Symbol Use

Types of symbols children use tell much about how they position themselves with regard to literacy--what Discourse they attempt to demonstrate on paper. To a great degree children in first grade demonstrate their appropriation of the Discourse of gender. As the data will show boys and girls have certain repertoires of symbols which identify them with their same gender peers and either connect them with others or define their individuality.

Number of Symbols

Hypothesis 6 conjectured that security of attachment would predict a larger total number of different symbols used across a child's twelve papers. It was predicted that security of attachment would be associated with use of a greater number of written symbols and a larger number of uniquely personal symbols. This hypothesis rests on two assumptions: 1) the child who is engaged in defining self will necessarily create trademarks unique to his or her own emergent literacy and 2) the urge for personal expression will compel children to risk expressing their messages through any and all written and pictorial symbols they know.

To appraise the first graders' range of symbols a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed on the
number of unique symbols represented across the children's twelve-paper sets. Though there were no main effects for attachment, language ability or gender, results show a significant effect for the three-way interaction of attachment, gender and language ability ($F_{(1, 51)} = 4.353, p < .042$).

With a mean number of symbols of $X = 12.559$ and a standard deviation of 4.538, high language ability, securely attached males used the greatest number of unique symbols ($X = 17$). As shown in Graph 1 on page 135 high ability males demonstrated an increase in number of unique symbols used with security of attachment. Low language ability, insecure females ($X = 9$) generated less than the average number of unique symbols. However, with security of attachment low language ability females ($X = 14$) produced greater than average numbers of unique symbols. (See Graph 1 on page 142).

For low language ability males, security of attachment predicted an inverse trend. Low language ability, insecurely attached males ($X = 14$) produced more unique symbols than average while low language ability, securely attached males produced less ($X = 10$). Attachment status had no effect on the number of unique symbols created by high language ability females; both secure (13.5) and insecure females (13.3) produced an average of thirteen.

For high language ability males and low language ability females security of attachment was associated with an increase in number of different symbols used. The high language ability males drew detailed collages and scenes (See Figures 25 and 26, pages 193 and 194) of military artillery such as tanks, helicopters, planes and submarines, Ninja Turtles (or other media characters) each
appropriately outfitted with weapons and engaged in conflict (See Figures 27 and 28, pages 195 and 196), dinosaurs of distinctly different sizes and shape (See Figure 4, page 172), and Halloween characters e.g., skeletons, vampires and ghosts. Only the one high male secure engaged in patterning similar to the females (see Figure 8, page 176).

There do appear to be gender imperatives at work in the symbolization patterns described here. Girls' choice of symbols tends to limit their range and number, as will be explained further in the following section. Also their patterning behaviors and efforts at correctness of form cause them to rely on symbols they can draw well. In contrast, boys' concern for depicting action necessarily precipitates a more expressive artistic style and consequently usage of symbols to express anything they urgently need in the invention of an action story. Additionally, the depiction of equipage expands upon their numbers of symbols.

Types of Symbols

The sixth hypothesis also posited that security of attachment would predict a wider range of symbol use and the creation of more personal symbols versus reliance upon stock symbols common to all children. Thus a series of 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs (attachment x language ability x gender) were conducted on the proportion of papers rated as using PERSONAL SYMBOLS, STOCK SYMBOLS, MEDIA SYMBOLS and ENVIRONMENTAL SYMBOLS.

Tables 6 and 7 on pages 140-41 show intercorrelations matrices for
all dependent variables. Excluding dichotomous and polytomous variables (Function-Personal/Attachment, Mode-Exposition/Narrative, Drawing Only-Nonrepresentational/Approximates words/Representational, Drawing and Text-Unrelated/Labelled drawings/Picture and Story, Personal Symbols/ Stock/Media /Environmental, Fiction/Nonfiction, Isolated Symbols/Represents a Scene/Conceptual/Inventory) only seven variables correlated with one another at .5 or above. As shown in Table 7, fiction was negatively correlated with stock symbols ($r = -.587, p < .21$) in column 3 and positively correlated with media symbols ($r = .644, p < .63$) in column 4. Meanwhile, nonfiction was positively correlated with stock symbols ($r = .588, p < .77$) in column 3 and negatively correlated with media symbols ($r = -.645, p < .57$) in column 4. Isolated symbols were negatively correlated with number of symbols in column 1 ($r = -.565, p < .68$). Represents a scene was positively correlated with number of symbols in column 1 ($r = .509, p < .20$). Finally, inventory was positively correlated with environmental symbols in column 5 ($r = .482, p < .64$). None of the correlations of the dependent variables was significant but all followed predictable trends.

PERSONAL

The first test, a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on PERSONAL SYMBOLS produced a main effect for gender only ($F(1, 51) = 5.599, p < .0218$), with no main effects for attachment or language ability. Males produced (43%) more uniquely PERSONAL
symbols than average (37%), while females (30%) generated less than average. The mean proportion of personal symbols used was $X = .366$ with a standard deviation of .206.

"Personal" refers to those symbols which did not appear in the symbolization of other students within a class and which were not stock, copied from the media, or copied from the environment. It was hypothesized that the securely attached children would be more likely to invent such symbols, as this constitutes risk-taking and exploration and consequently would likely be related to a child's security and sense of self.

The differences in numbers of personal symbols is predicated on the types of symbols predominantly used by each gender. They tended to be created for the purpose of telling an action story most often, a favored topic of boys in first grade. These symbols were not necessarily carefully or accurately drawn, as stock and media symbols tended to be. Girls' use of stock symbols, and their maturational imperative for accuracy may by default limit the range of options for symbolization. If girls create compositions only with those symbols they can draw precisely, they eschew the serendipity of expressive drawing. Expressiveness engenders creative solutions to graphic storytelling.

In contrast, boys strive to depict action, an effort which leads naturally to more expressive drawing (See Figure 29, page 197). Boys portrayed a wide variety of media characters and used more expressive drawing techniques to depict them. In addition, the boys' emphasis on the details of technological, mechanical and artillery themes caused a differentiation of the subject matter in drawing (See Figure 25, page 193). More varied subject matter lead them to greater
numbers of unique or personal symbols.

The possible verbal advantage of females, attributable to their maturation, may contribute to the discrepancy between numbers of personal symbols produced by boys and girls. High language ability, securely attached girls best demonstrated this effect with a paucity of graphic symbols accompanied by lengthy oral narratives. Boys tended to seek graphic translations of their thoughts and feelings.

**STOCK SYMBOLS**

The 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on the proportion of STOCK SYMBOLS in children's papers produced a main effect for attachment (\(F(1, 51) = 4.106, p < .05\)). Securely attached children drew stock symbols in 31 percent of their papers, insecurely attached children used them in 40 percent of their papers.

A main effect for gender (\(F(1, 51) = 12.8, p < .0008\)) on proportions of STOCK SYMBOLS was also found with girls (49%) producing significantly more stock symbols than boys (27%). The mean proportion of STOCK SYMBOLS used was \(X = .376\) with a standard deviation of .244.

These findings support the gender differences discovered in studies by Kerschensteiner (1905 in Mortensen, 1991) and Mortensen (1991). Both found patterning, more exploration of color and decoration in females' drawings as compared with males' detail-oriented renderings of technology. Anthony (1970) found developmental differences in physiological maturation between boys and girls putting six-year-old
girls one year ahead of boys. This maturational advantage affords girls a superior ability to sustain sequential motor activity such as that required for the drawing of repetitive patterns (Waber, 1979 in Mortensen, 1991). By contrast, Wittig and Petersen (1979) cite spatial ability as a male superiority in cognitive functioning and several studies confirm this theory (Roberts, 1972; Strauch, 1976; Vanderberg and Kuse, 1979; Waber, 1979 in Mortensen, 1991). Mortensen concludes that gender differences in drawing are likely due to physiological maturation rates. However, the attachment perspective adds texture to the gender differences.

The high language ability females, regardless of attachment status, produced a similar average number of different symbols ($X = 13.25$, secures and $X = 13.5$, insecures). Their works and transcripts of their verbal narration show that the verbal performance subordinates the drawing. The talk of the high language ability females generally gave more information than the written symbolization (See Figures 30-32, pages 198-200). These verbally facile girls, on the verge of making the transition to school literacy, demonstrate that their drawings merely placeholder meaning now and do not embody the meaning as they had earlier in development.

Securely attached, low language ability girls had a more expansive repertoire of symbols ($X = 13.8$) than the insecurely attached, low language ability girls (9.2). This confirms the hypothesis that security of attachment would be associated with a larger range of symbols. The low language ability girls may rely more on drawn or written symbols for communication given the limitations of their verbal abilities. Consequently, attachment status plays a stronger role in determining their ability to express themselves through other semiotic
modes. The low language ability females created decorated pages or decorative scenes comprised mainly of stock symbols--house, rainbow, flowers, people and hearts. The insecurely attached females' pictures took the form of patterns (Figure 33, page 201), pattern-like configurations (Figures 34-37 pages 202-205) or ensemble groupings (See Figures 38-40, pages 206 to 208).

Security of attachment has the opposite effect on low language ability males. The securely attached males with low language ability (X = 10) created fewer different symbols than insecurely attached males with low language ability (X = 14). Looking at the symbols drafted by each group helps to elucidate this finding. Insecurely attached males with low language ability created more stock symbols, while their secure male counterparts employed more varied subject matter. Security of attachment with these boys may indicate a level of satisfaction with their current symbolizing capabilities. While the insecures appear to be engaging in some imitative behaviors possibly to form attachments or to fit in with peers. This finding will be explored further in the next section.

Girls (49%) create nearly twice the proportion of stock symbols as boys (27%). Gardner's (1980) study of children's drawings leads him to believe that as children mature they rely more upon stock symbols in an effort to achieve realism in their works. The pursuit of accuracy appears in older elementary age children in all aspects of functioning e.g., accuracy in spelling and mechanics in writing. "As this interest in accuracy overwhelms the child's behavior, she pays homage to those symbols systems and those sets of ideas that lend themselves to precise rendering" (Gardner, 1980, p. 149). If we accept that six-
year-old girls are a year ahead of boys maturationally, then it follows that girls will seek the greater precision offered them by stock symbols, which they have been depicting for as long as they could draw.

It appears that in addition to a maturation issue, the content of the symbols has a great deal to do with these gendered choices. Girls predominantly create symbols which signify female identification (rainbows, see Dyson, 1991) and attachment (hearts, home and family). A review of the drawings showed insecurity of attachment in boys was associated with symbol repertoires similar to those used by the girls. They relied on stock symbols such as rainbows, houses, and people. These choices can be interpreted as attachment behavior. For boys who are insecurely attached, appropriation of female symbols may be an attempt to form attachments with others as do the girls. (See Figure 41, page 209).

Goffman (1971) uses the term "tie-sign" to refer to ways in which two individuals demonstrate the nature of their relationship to others in social gatherings. A couple may indicate their "with," in Goffman's terms, by a squeeze of the hands or a kiss as they separate to mingle at a party. Children in the first grade also use tie-signs in several ways. Through bestowing "graphic objects" (Dyson, 1982)--notes, cards or drawn gifts upon others, children indicate their feelings of affection and friendship. Figure 42 on page 210, drawn by an insecurely attached male, openly seeks to express affection to the recipient, his teacher. Though secure males also give graphic objects as gifts, in this study they generally depicted Ninja Turtles, their favorite symbol.
Another tie-sign is imitative drawing. This behavior was only observed in insecurely attached children in the current study, though both boys and girls engaged in it. A child who wishes to be friends with another child may attempt to imitate a symbol or an entire composition to demonstrate affiliation and affinity for the other child (See Figures 43 - 48, pages 211-216). In Figure 43 Terry has drawn a self-portrait. Figure 44 shows Terry's desk cluster male friend imitating her somewhat androgynous portrait declaring it to be a self-portrait of himself. Figure 45 was a gift Mary gave to Paul. Figure 46 shows how Paul reciprocated with a graphic object in Dyson's terms. Sarah gave Tony Figure 47, but Karen who was seated nearby wanted to join the friendship so she imitatively drew the scene (Figure 48) and characterized it her own way, "my Mom bowling." These figures indicate that the imitating artists wish to affiliate with the original artist through the reproduction. These two children may then engage in more mutual collaborative drawing after acknowledging the tie-sign. Figure 49, page 217 is a two-page spread of a collaborative book initiated after some imitative drawing, tie-signing. Jack drew the page on the left and Mike drew the page on the left.

Imitating female symbol patterns may serve to bring the insecurely attached boys nurturing from the teacher, a female who responds to these symbols. One female teacher in the study admitted that she feels compelled to discourage boys' violent and aggressive drawing. Naturally female teachers respond from a gender position to children's symbolizing. Female leadership characteristics include esteeming and nurturing others, creating harmony and getting people to work together (Rosener, 1991). Rewarding boys' symbolization of hearts and rainbows and family portraits over the more common male
symbols of media characters and others in combat is a gender response.

MEDIA SYMBOLS

A 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on proportion of MEDIA SYMBOLS used across each child's twelve papers was performed. The mean proportion of media symbols used was $X = .115$ with a standard deviation of $.182$. A main effect for gender was found ($F(1, 51) = 8.848, p < .0045$). Boys (19%) used a higher proportion of media symbols than girls (3%). No main effect for attachment or language ability emerged, however.

Boys predominantly drew Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, the current cartoon heroes (See Figure 50, page 218). Only two girls in the entire sample drew Ninja turtles, possibly because the protagonists are male or because they are violent. However, one girl in the sample invented a "lady Ninja turtle" (Figure 51, page 219). Girls chose Bart Simpson and Garfield, the cartoon cat as their media symbol preferences. Though both are male, Bart Simpson stars in a cartoon about family life and Garfield is an animal. These qualities render them more consistent with girls' themes.

Gardner claims children of the latency period have begun to be aware of powerful themes such as aggression, competition, and good versus evil. Boys, especially, find these themes important to work through in their drawings. "The child does not know for sure which aspects of [Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle episodes] are likely to occur in the real world and which are purely fantastic." (Gardner, 1982, p.
134). He draws them to gain mastery over them.

Viewed strictly from a psychoanalytic point of view, a boy of this age has already come to terms with his primary competitor, the father, in resolution of his Oedipal complex. He has relinquished his mother as a primary love object, realizing he cannot defeat his more powerful father. He must turn to the outside world for replacement love objects and finds the world to be filled with aggressive opponents. He has mythologized his father due to his father's actual or virtual absence. "Boys fantasize about and idealize the masculine role and their fathers, and society defines it as desirable" (Chodorow, 1978). If his father is a fantastical creature, and all his heroes in cartoons are as well, it seems completely fitting that boys of the latency period would be compelled to symbolize larger-than-life male characters. In so doing they depict their idealized views of who they will become. Just as Franz and White (1985) describe the play of three to six-year old children, in their art, a parallel semiotic function, boys role play who they wish to become. If their primary role model must be fantasized, then who is to say that boys do not see magnified as well all of the world's conflicts? Having a nascent purview of what society's expectations are for him—to go into the world and face these conflicts, he shows us in his drawings his realization that he had better get to it.

ENVIRONMENTAL SYMBOLS

Finally, use of ENVIRONMENTAL SYMBOLS by first grade children was assessed via a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) and no main effects for attachment, language ability or gender
were found. This is probably due to the infrequency with which children used these symbols. The mean proportion of environmental symbols used was $X = .135$ or 13.5\% with a standard deviation of .15.
Chapter 6
Symbolic Configurations

Proportion of Drawing To Text

Data will be presented in this section regarding the proportion of text and drawing children used to convey their messages. The seventh hypothesis predicted that security of attachment would be associated with greater proportions of graphic symbols per paper. The written products of the securely attached children were predicted to include more letters and words than those of the insecurely attached children.

To test the association between attachment status and the proportion of text in the children's twelve papers a series of 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed. The first test looked at the proportion of papers in the twelve paper set coded as DRAWING ONLY. This test yielded no main effect for attachment, language ability or gender. The mean was $X = .702$ or 70% of the twelve papers, with a standard deviation of .241.

The second test, a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) of the proportion of papers rated as DRAWING AND TEXT produced a significant attachment - language ability interaction ($F (1, 51) = 4.669, p < .035$). No main effect for attachment, language ability or gender was found. The mean proportion of drawing and text pieces was $X = .236$ with a standard deviation of .215. Looking at Graph 2 on page 143 we see the low language ability, securely attached children (31%) and the high language ability, insecurely
attached children (28%) created larger proportions of papers with drawing and text than the low language ability, insecurely attached children (16%) and the high language ability, securely attached children (18%).

The combination of drawing and text emerged as the preferred symbolization of low language ability, securely attached children and high language ability, insecurely attached children. The predominant pattern was to draw a picture and label it (See Figures 52 - 56, pages 220 to 224). In both groups a few children attempted some inventively spelled labels, but most relied on words visible in the environment. In most cases children drew a picture and attempted to find a word symbol to assign it. In some cases with the low secures, pictures were drawn and words were copied but there was no relationship between them (See Figure 57, page 225). Some low secures began with drawing then labelled the drawing which led to subsequent drawing of objects which they could label (See Figure 58, page 226). A very few low secures were moved to try to invent a label for a pictorial symbol they had drawn and subsequently decided to label (See Figures 59 and 60, pages 227-228).

The high insecurities showed a few interesting trends which differentiated them from the low secures. High language ability males with insecure attachments used sound effects or conversation bubbles as their preferred text to accompany drawings (See Figures 61-64, pages 229-232). Several high insecurities also drew the pictorial list of family members which they then labeled with names, and sometimes ages (See Figure 65, page 233). Lower language ability or insecurity of attachment appear to effect children similarly in their choice of
drawing and text and patterns of combining them.

The third 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on the proportion of papers coded as TEXT ONLY produced a significant effect for the interaction of attachment and gender ($F(1, 51) = 4.918, p < .03$). No main effect for attachment, language ability or gender was found. The mean proportion of TEXT ONLY papers was $X = .058$ with a standard deviation of .098. Refer to Graph 3 on page 144. Ten percent of pieces created by insecurely attached females were coded as 'text only,' securely attached females created 4%. Meanwhile, of papers created by insecurely attached males 3% were coded text only, and securely attached males produced 6%. A Dunnett's $t$-test found the insecure female group proportion (10%) to be significantly higher than the insecure males' 3% proportions ($t = 2.47, p < .05$).

Further analysis of this hypothesis warranted investigation of one more finely differentiated categories from the initial coding: TEXT ONLY - CONTINUOUS TEXT. A 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was completed on the proportion of papers coded as TEXT ONLY - CONTINUOUS TEXT. A significant main effect was found for language ability, as measured by the expressive language subtest of the C.E.L.F. - R ($F(1, 51) = 5.075, p < .0286$). The C.E.L.F. - R high score group used continuous text in an average of 4.3 percent of their papers while the low score group's papers consisted of 1.8 percent continuous text. No main effects for attachment or gender were found.

The interaction of attachment and gender furnished a significant effect ($F(1, 51) = 6.028, p < .0175$) as shown in Graph 4 on page 145. Secure males (6%) produced more continuous text than the other
groups. Insecure females used continuous text (3%) slightly less often while insecure males (2%) and secure females (2%) used equal proportions.

Children varied by the amount of text used in their written symbolization. It was predicted that children with secure attachments would more likely risk an attempt at writing words in the early days of first grade. The pattern that emerged was somewhat different. In fact those children who created the highest proportion of text-only papers were the insecurely attached females. These continuous texts mainly consisted of transcriptions of environmental print, e.g., the alphabet and numbers (including phone numbers solicited from peers, see Figure 66, page 234), names of colors, calendar information (see Figure 67, page 235), whole language chants (from charts) and book titles (See Figure 68, page 236). In a few cases children copied their names and their friends' names from the name tags taped to their desks (See Figure 69, page 237). Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984) saw behavior relative to the use of environmental print in their study:

Being 5 and 6 [children] know that in this context—a school setting, working with individuals who look distinctively teacherlike and who were or seemed interested in distinctively teacherlike things, i.e., reading and writing—they were not to experiment, but rather to demonstrate what they had learned. The only thing they were sure they knew was what their teachers had taught them (p. 139).

Though Harste et al. find this behavior generalizable to all kindergarten and first grade children, this study ferrets out the way that attachment
status affects the use of text. Girls, who could be considered the most unsure of themselves, appropriated the print of the classroom in an effort to please the teacher or at least to avoid incorrectness or impropriety. They read the "signs" which indicate that words are the valued commodity. The other children, secure girls and boys, both secure and insecure, engaged in far less copying of environmental print. This nonconformity to environmental semiotics might be construed as risk-taking behavior.

Language ability affected the use of continuous text as opposed to letters and number, or isolated words which characterizes the text-only productions of the insecurely attached females described above. The high language ability children used more continuous text as was predicted in the original hypotheses. Further analysis shows that the interaction of attachment and gender affects the production of continuous text. Secure males used invented spelling to compose one- and two-sentence narratives (See Figure 70, page 238) about twice as often as secure females. To invent spelling in the early days of first grade is indeed risking literacy. Harste et al. write: "The perception that when one writes one must spell correctly appears to be the single biggest constraint which 5- and 6-year-old children see as the reason why they can't engage in the process" (1984, p. 131) Nowhere on the walls of their classrooms in those first days of school do children see invented spelling. The invention of spelling bursts forth from a desire to communicate in the language spoken in school, print. When a child elects not to subordinate the message to technical features of print, he or she truly risks exposure, not only of self but of ability.
Symbolic Configurations

This section will examine the configuration of the drawings which predominated in this sample. Symbolic configuration deals more directly with the cognitive processes at work during drawing and writing.

The eighth hypothesis predicted that symbolic configurations which are integrated and REPRESENT A SCENE or evidence greater CONCEPTUAL exploration will be more often produced by securely attached children. Meanwhile, insecurely attached children will likely rely more on ISOLATED SYMBOLS.

To investigate the association between attachment status and symbolic configuration a series of tests was performed. First, to examine the proportions of papers coded as ISOLATED SYMBOLS among first graders, a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed. The mean proportion of papers using isolated symbols was \( X = 0.624 \) with a standard deviation of 0.246. This test showed a significant effect for the interaction of attachment, language ability and gender \( F (1, 51) = 9.653, p < .003 \) as shown in Graph 5 on page 146. However, no main effects for attachment, language ability or gender were found.

High language ability females and low language ability males showed parallel trends. The high language ability, female insecures (52%) drew isolated symbols less than average \( (X = 59) \) but the high language ability, female secures (71%) generated more than average. The low
language ability, male inseces (57%) produced slightly fewer isolated symbols than the mean while low language ability, male secures (59.6%) were near the mean. Low language ability females showed a slight inverse relationship between attachment status and the production of isolated symbols. Low language ability, female inseces (80%) generated well above average proportions of isolated symbols, more than any other single group. Meanwhile low language ability, female secures (52%) produced less than average proportions of isolated symbol configurations. High language ability, insecurely attached males (68%) produced well above average proportions of isolated symbols whereas their securely attached counterparts (17%) used this configuration relatively infrequently.

The high language ability, insecurely attached males (69%) used isolated symbols frequently to placeholder meaning, as do the high ability female secures (See Figures 71 - 75, pages 239-43). High language ability girls' relatively lengthy oral narratives subordinate their drawings. They produce some incomplete scenes comprised of isolated symbols, also accompanied by longer oral narratives (See Figure 76 and 77, pages 244-45). The high ability males appear less competent in either graphically or verbally conveying their messages. Though they seem to prefer the immediacy of verbalization over the labor of drawing.

With security of attachment the high language ability males moved to conceptual configurations and used very few isolated symbols (17%) (See Figures 8 and 10, pages 176 and 178).

The low language ability, insecurely attached females (81%) drew many scribbles and isolated human figures (See Figures 78-82, pages
With security of attachment the low language ability females (53%) move to rudimentary scenes which are incomplete yet bear labels from environmental print sources (See Figures 83 - 85, pages 251-253). High language ability, insecurely attached females (52%) also created rudimentary scenes which were incomplete but some included invented spellings (See Figures 86 to 90, pages 254-258). The security of attachment allowed high language ability, females (71%) to produce the second highest proportion of isolated symbols. This can be explained by their subordination of drawings to their oral narratives. The isolated symbol placeholders meaning but the high language ability, securely attached girls forego investing in graphic completion of an integrated scene for the sake of orally sharing the story with someone else (See for example, Figures 30 and 31, pages 198-99). Thus they demonstrate their awareness that school values words over pictures. In addition, they act upon their maturational advantage with language.

Low language ability, insecurely attached males (57%) created slightly lower than average proportion of isolated symbols, these were figures (See Figure 91, page 259) and media symbols floating in space with no labels (See Figures 92 - 96, pages 260-64). With security of attachment the low language ability males are able to construct rudimentary, incomplete scenes as did the high language ability females (See Figures 97 and 98, pages 265-6). But for two exceptions the boys in this category generally did not use any labels (See Figure 99 for example, on page 267).

The 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) on the proportion of papers coded as REPRESENT A SCENE was performed. This ANOVA yielded no main effects. The mean proportion of papers which represented a scene was X = .258 with a standard deviation of
The term 'conceptual' applies to those collage-like configurations composed of isolated symbols combined to explore a concept. Vygotskian levels of concept development formed the basis for discrimination of graphic concepts in this study. In order to look at the proportion of papers rated as CONCEPTUAL among groups an $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA (attachment x language ability x gender) was performed. The mean proportion of papers with a conceptual configuration was $X = 0.07$, with a standard deviation of 0.116. Several significant main effects were found: attachment ($F(1, 51) = 6.069, p < .0172$), and gender ($F(1, 51) = 19.827, p < .0029$). The test yielded a significant effect for the interaction of attachment and gender ($F(1, 51) = 7.149, p < .01$). Security of attachment had virtually no effect on females but had a significant impact on boys' use of the conceptual configuration.

A significant effect for the three-way interaction of attachment, language ability and gender was found ($F(1, 51) = 7.951, p < .0068$) as shown in Graph 6 on page 147. High language ability, male insecures (1%) created markedly few conceptual drawings. (High male secures were too few to report). The proportion of conceptual drawings of both high language ability, female insecures (5%) and high language ability, female secures (4%) was slightly less than average ($X = 7\%$). Both low language ability male groups generated similar proportions regardless of attachment status. The low language ability male secures (15%) and low language ability male insecures (14%) produced twice the average proportions of conceptual configurations. Low language ability females produced negligible amounts of this symbolic configuration, secures (5%) and insecures (6%).
The effect of the attachment-language ability-gender interaction shows high language ability, securely attached males (41%) do the greatest proportion of graphic conceptualization while high language ability, insecurely attached males (1%) do the least. As we saw earlier, high, insecure males predominantly create isolated symbols accompanied by oral narration. Girls, regardless of attachment status or language ability produced equally low proportions of this configuration. Girls tended to create more rudimentary scenes and text. Security of attachment effects the demonstration of cognitive abilities in boys. This finding refutes Mortensen's (1991) conclusion. She writes, "No sex differences have been demonstrated in level of conceptual development" (Mortensen, 1991, p. 228). She based her conceptual levels on Werner's (1964) framework the standard of which is the abstract quality of objects tapping only purely cognitive features of concept formation. As Mortensen herself allows, this neglects the emotional, motivational and subjective levels of experience. Vygotsky's scheme values the subjective formulation of concepts which creates a fairer and more comprehensive picture of the process.

A significant effect for the three-way interaction of attachment, language ability and gender was found ($F(1, 51) = 7.951, p < .0068$) as shown in Graph 6 on page 147. High language ability, male insecures (1%) created markedly few conceptual drawings. (High male secures were too few to report). The proportion of conceptual drawings of both high language ability, female insecures (5%) and high language ability, female secures (4%) was slightly less than average ($X = 7\%$). Both low language ability male groups generated similar proportions regardless of attachment status. The low language ability male secures (15%) and low language ability male insecures (14%) produced twice the average
proportions of conceptual configurations. Low language ability females produced negligible amounts of this symbolic configuration, secures (5%) and insecures (6%).

An effect for the interaction of attachment and language ($F (1, 51) = 7.616, \ p < .008$) was found. Looking at Graph 7 on page 149 we see security of attachment did significantly effect the graphic conceptualizing of low language ability children (9%). This can clearly be considered risk-taking behavior by the low language ability children. As shown earlier, the children of high language ability have begun to move beyond drawn symbols towards oral narration and written text.

An effect for the interaction of gender and attachment was found to be significant ($F (1, 51) = 7.149, \ p < .01$) as shown in Graph 8 on page 149. With security of attachment males created significantly more conceptual configurations. There was a slight decline in this symbolization pattern in girls.
Chapter 7

How Attachment Plays into Literacy, Drawing and Thought

Drawing Is Literacy

Literacy promotes detachment and separation in part because writing makes it possible to see a word as a thing, separate from its referent (Dissanayake, 1992, p. 206).

Babies first gesture and babble, then speak, play and draw. When they enter school at five or six years of age children are asked to forego all other semiotic functions but the ordered, detached print literacy so highly valued by our culture. As they begin formal schooling children realize two things: that print literacy involves risk and there are standards of correctness held by teachers and other authorities of the language, books. Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984) contend that the challenge of literacy is hypothesis-testing. According to Vygotsky, mistakes are the hallmark of growth. He believes that through mistakes the language user, or the symbol user, must develop new rules, new signs, new schema which allow her to move beyond what she knows, what is safe.

The school setting promotes the Discourse of duty--children dutifully take print cues from that which the teacher has read, written, or pasted up on the walls of the room. Although this constitutes part of literacy, it is not enough. Literacy is more than reading and writing. Literacy
must be thinking, challenging oneself, problem-finding (Getzels & Csiksentmihalyi, 1976) as well as problem-solving.

Children attempt to create and appropriate pictures, signs and symbols on paper in the first grade. Signs such as letters and words stand at a higher level of abstraction than a picture in that they do not visually share characteristics with their referents. However, as Rudolf Arnheim points out, "a picture can dwell at the most varied levels of abstractness . . . and abstractness is a means by which the picture interprets what it portrays" (1969, p. 137). In this study children demonstrated that the use of letter and word signs can reflect a lower level of cognitive functioning, in spite of the inherent level of abstractness of the signs used, when they simply copied from books, walls, posters, etc. The children also clearly demonstrated the range of abstraction possible with pictorial images. In some cases the less abstract symbolization mode -- drawing a picture, yielded more cognitively complex conceptual configurations. These findings challenge a traditionally held belief that thinking requires detachment from experience. That is to say, the drawing is the thinking. Drawing is print literacy. Thus literacy need not be detached from experience, as has traditionally been the case, if we acknowledge the complexity of the cognitive functioning of children on paper. Arnheim writes:

Unless a person has received specific instruction in mechanically correct copying he tends to look for the overall structure of the model rather than imitating it painstakingly, piece by piece. . . An artist will work in the same way unless he aims for a faithful copy in a naturalistic manner. To look for the overall structure of a given situation rather
than examine or reproduce it mechanically piece by piece is most desirable and indeed indispensible for the intelligent solution of many tasks... A grasp of overall structure is equally essential for the intelligent assessment of social situations (Arnheim, 1969, p. 198).

In the current study those children who experimented, explored, and took risks on paper were generally the children with secure attachments. While the children who relied on static or nonrepresentational configurations and who used a limited range of stock or environmental symbols were more often the children who had been coded as insecurely attached. Just as Gersten et al. (1986) discovered in their study of the symbolic development and attachment of maltreated toddlers, securely attached toddlers had more elaborate vocabularies characterized by a greater proportion of "nominals," e.g., truck, ball, "descriptors" (big truck) and descriptions of the actions or feelings of others, e.g., "you sad mommy?" Their language contained more content. Insecurely attached toddlers, on the other hand, used a greater proportion of what Cicchetti and Beeghly called "exchanges and filler... these types of utterances are relatively content free and serve primarily to mark turns during conversation without supplying novel information" (1987, p. 57).

The parallels between Gersten's findings on the content of toddlers' language and the graphic symbolization of the first graders in the current study are quite remarkable. Insecurity of attachment which predicts filler language in two year olds translates to copying, using plastic templates for stencil drawings, scribbling or nonrepresentational drawing, and reliance upon a set of mastered stock
or media symbols in first grade. Meanwhile, security of attachment which allows toddlers to talk about themselves, objects, other people, feelings and actions makes way for self expression through personal symbols, invented spelling and conceptual configurations—thinking on paper.

Literacy and Attachment

Denny Taylor urges that literacy should: "enable children to explore their own identities and the personal circumstances of their everyday lives" as well as to "build and maintain relationships" (Taylor, 1989, p. 266). With insecurity of attachment comes some level of unpredictability in the family. Perhaps nothing ever stays the same. It might be mother's presence or her mood that changes. It might be father's absence or erratic presence which causes life to be unpredictable. There might be physical or sexual abuse and neglect which causes life to feel painful and confusing. It might even be the address that frequently changes. What a dreadful proposition for a child—to be asked to leave all that she clings to so tightly to come to school.

If nothing at home feels secure, chances are slim that a child will engage in school. Chances are good that child will spend the day worrying about what is, was or will happen at home such that she can barely concentrate on school tasks or play. Data collected through participant observation in this study attest to this. One child drew pictures of her pregnant mother stating, "I'm worried about her
because she's real sick." This child attempted to get sent to the nurse's office in order to get home to her mother on a regular basis.

Csikzentmihalyi explains in his book, *Flow*, that attention is essentially psychic energy directed towards something. Anxiety, anger, fear, pain divert one's attention, thus inhibiting use of psychic energy for those things to which one might like to direct it. The flow of psychic energy allows the merging of action and awareness resulting in the paradoxical disappearance of "concern for self" and appearance of a "sense of self." It may be that insecurely attached children have difficulty experiencing flow given their problematic primary attachment relationship. Their symbolization bears witness to the inhibition of the sense of self.

If we would like children in our schools to experience "flow" we will have to facilitate connected communities of attachments for them. Writing time can be at the center of such community building. Nowhere does a child make herself more public than in the act of sharing herself on paper. And as the drawing research shows a child cannot help but put an authentic portrait of self on paper either with what she draws or with what she leaves out. A community of child writers grows familiar with each other through the semiotic functions of drawing, writing, gesturing and talk. As they share themselves through verbal performances of their written and drawn products, they begin to know and become known by one another. In this way children can potentially form new attachments.
Gender, Attachment and Literacy

Piaget did not look at the influence of social, emotional or environmental factors on symbol formation. Yet in our schools we cannot ignore them. The motivation to symbolize is to share (Werner & Kaplan, 1963). The goal of essay text literacy is "autonomization" using Werner and Kaplan's term, of symbol system. That is, development of a symbol system which is "more communal, and less egocentric, idiosyncratic and contextualized" (Werner & Kaplan, 1964).

For girls in this sample, use of stock symbols may be an early stage in the "autonomization" of written symbols. Stock symbols are, in a sense, universal. Family, hearts, flowers, rainbow, home -- others readily recognize these symbols. Boys in this sample, however, demonstrated a greater production of personal symbols, unique, idiosyncratic, context-bound. Earlier in this dissertation boys' expressiveness of symbolization was applauded. Here, it seems appropriate to explore the efficacy of a personalized symbol system in terms of communication with, and attachment to others.

In latency, boys begin to pull away from the female caregiver(s) for the purpose of gender identity. In so doing, perhaps they forego the need to communicate with others and strike out on a path of self-expression. Whereas girls achieve gender identification through close affinity with the female caregiver(s).

Girls clearly seek a communicative symbol system fashioned out of universally recognizable symbols which results in what Werner and Kaplan have termed "autonomization" of symbols. Boys have an advantage by the fact of their gender imperative to express themselves,
dynamically, and autonomously. Here autonomy has a different meaning. Boys in this sample predominantly used writing for personal functions or self-definition more than girls. This they accomplished through creation of personal and distinctly unique symbols often invented for the sake of conveying action in a story or the detailed equipage of their preferred arm of the service.

Yet in terms of communication with near and distant audiences, girls can be considered at an advantage, predisposed by their gender identification to essay-text literacy via their choice of universal, stock symbols. The drive to communicate and maintain her attachment to her female caregiver especially, propels the female child of latency age to an "autonomization of symbols" (Werner & Kaplan, 1964). Girls sought to interact with others or to maintain attachments through their written symbolization. Not only were the very symbolic vehicles girls put on paper crafted of a more autonomous, communicative nature, but when asked about the purpose or function of the writing girls expressed an intentions of interaction and attachment. It appears that gender and attachment issues inhere in literacy development.

Self and Other

Adequate symbolization depends upon "interpersonal distance" according to Werner and Kaplan. How one represents to oneself is necessarily different from how one represents to communicate with others.

First grade children make a transition from subjective, idiosyncratic
symbolization to the "collective usage" (Werner & Kaplan, 1964) of more universal symbols. They must move from writing to the self to writing for the other. In order to achieve this they necessarily distance themselves from: 1) their subject through abstraction of symbols -- moving from pictures to letters and words, and 2) the self through universalizing their symbols.

Some children make the transition by copying the graphic symbols of the classroom and relinquishing their own expressive symbolization. In this study insecurely attached girls tended to copy most. Low language ability and insecure attachment were associated with labelled pictures using stock symbols. The labels came from the classroom walls, the pictures from a set of mastered symbols common to children of this age. As discussed earlier, in some cases the pictures were drawn to suit a transcribed word, in other cases the stock symbols was drawn and a label sought. These patterns of symbolization appeared to be teacher-directed. Teacher became the other to whom some children direct their symbolization child-mother-object gives way to child-teacher-object. There appears to be a strong gender link to this form of symbolizing whereby girls directed their communiques to the teacher more often than boys. The exception was insecurely attached boys who mimicked the female symbolization behaviors.

Other children, primarily low language ability securely attached children and high language ability insecurely attached children, find they can balance a mix of their own expressive symbols, stock or media symbols with the grapho-phonemic code through labeled drawings. The child creators of balanced compositions fall into several categories depending upon the other for whom they write. The low secures primarily utilized environmental print transcription for labelling while
the high insecurities inventively spelled messages of their own creation. Low language ability renders the child dependent upon the teacher’s symbols, those symbols which she has either created or displayed in the classroom. These children jump from the earlier subjective, idiosyncratic symbolization to mimicry of symbols. Their addressee, the other to whom they write is unclear. We might assume the child addresses the teacher by using symbols pleasing to her.

It may be that high language ability, compensates for insecurity of attachment in children if we consider the invention of spelling a departure from the known, a risk toward further abstraction of the subject and a more potent vehicle of self expression. Spelling invention is a transitional stage for the symbol user who seeks to communicate with the other through a more abstract and universal symbol system. Yet with this transition many personal and idiosyncratic symbols emerge. This causes dissonance between the child’s intent to communicate with the other and the child’s actual communication only with the self.

Boys tended to write either to the self as indicated by the predominance of personal symbols and the personal function of the compositions or, in a fashion analogous to the parallel play of toddlers, indirectly to same sex peers. Parallel composing among boys is where two or more boys draw Ninja Turtles, for example. Both boys draw the same media characters but the compositions develop as distinctly different stories.
Conceptualization

"A concept, statically defined, represents what a number of separate entities have in common" (Arnheim, 1969). In this study children explored abstraction in several ways. Children either used increasingly conventional versions of graphic symbols, words, or in the case of conceptual configurations, they concretely depict an abstraction. High male secure engaged in the most conceptual drawing. However, with security of attachment, low language ability children attempted more of this type of symbolization. For example, in Figure 6 on page 174 Ury has abstracted the multi-color concept of rainbow and traffic light. Through perceptual analogy he formulates a generalization. He depicts this as an associative configuration—he has made a perceptual association between two different entities. Arnheim (1969) believes we gradually shape an abstraction—modifying and perfecting the character of our concepts through perception and experience, until we arrive at generalization. Consider another example, Figure 7 on page 175, in which Paulo abstracts the pallatability of food by symbolizing an array of food and then circling those which positively fulfill his specification and crossing out those which do not. He generalizes good and bad food. First though, he had to abstract the quality of pallatability from the array. Thus he draws a collections configuration. In another example demonstrated in Figures 8 and 10 (pages 176 and 178) Mitch perceives "design analogues" (Roukes, 1988) . He finds images or symbols which refer to the design or shape of other symbols. In Figure 8 he begins decorating the butterfly’s wings and abstracts the star shape common to the wings and the sky. He continues to make further abstraction when he connects the decorative nature of stars in
the sky to flowers on the ground. This drawing exemplifies a chain complex in which the type and nature of the bonds changed from link to link. In Figure 10, Mitch begins a design sequence in which he draws a Ninja Turtle, then explores its component parts graphically. In so doing he abstracts the design and finds a design analogue for the Ninja's hand in the shape of butterfly wings. On paper we see a diffuse complex. That is, he can make limitless connections in this manner of dynamic conceptualization.

Implications for Instruction

This study makes clear the need for a redefinition of gender identification within the elementary school context. In this sample of urban poor, for whom males are absent as role models and as attachment figures, there is an immediate need to recruit sensitive, caring, consistent, healthy males into the schools and into the lives of children. Males who work in the schools in any capacity should be encouraged to form attachments with children, especially boys lacking healthy role models.

The boys in this sample are testing the edges with their symbolizing and their behavior. Caring teachers, of both genders need to follow them out to the edges, validating their journey. The developing male child should not be asked to refrain from drawing violent media figures when, in fact, this has become an integral part of the literate and gender development of males in this culture.

For girls, we need to challenge the dutifulness and passivity which
we as a culture have fostered. It appears as early as first grade in children's early writings and drawings—their willingness to risk, to challenge themselves, to think independently and creatively or not. These qualities must find a home in the classroom if our children will move beyond the barriers of their lives to realize their potential.

Insecurity of attachment and language deficits need not be barriers to literacy if educators acknowledge multiple pathways to literacy. As this study shows, urban poor children demonstrate symbolization patterns, habits and written products which reflect their attachment security, language ability and gender identification. With an understanding of how some of these patterns and habits work, and what factors enhance or inhibit them, educators can make decisions about what methods will be most effective with a particular child. For example, an insecurely attached child whose early writing includes stencilling, nonrepresentational drawing and a lot of nonengagement during writing time may benefit from collaborative projects initiated by another child or by the teacher initially. As the child begins to form attachments with others around literate activities, he or she can be encouraged to gradually take on more independent literate endeavors.

The crisis of absent male role models might be met with mixed-age pairing of same-gender pairs for literacy activities. Pairing first-grade boys and girls with seventh-grade boys and girls, for example, on a regular basis could engender attachment bonds for younger children with same sex role models.

Essentially, schools cannot look outside to meet the primary needs of their students before getting down to the business of educating them. Schools need to become an attachment—a circle of attachments for children. If teachers, staff members, older children, foster
grandparents, volunteer parents began to make themselves available to our urban poor children whose very literacy depends on close bonding with intimates and books and pens and pads, the face of their literacy will appear very different.

In classrooms where children are encouraged to 1) use literacy for authentic purposes, and 2) to bring their whole selves to the task of school literacy, children invariably collaborate, investigate, use one another as resources and find attachments which propel them faster and farther along their own unique literate paths.

Though in Ricardo's short life someone has already "shot the rainbow," hope is poised in the fists of children holding crayons. Each morning they come together in a brick red, monolithic building called 'school' preparing to change the course of their futures. It all begins with marks on paper.
Table 1  Means and standard deviations of symbolization variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents a Scene</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Symbols</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2  Means and standard deviations of mode, function and text variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function-Personal</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function-Attachment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Only (TO)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Text (DT)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing Only (DO)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-Letters</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-Words</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-Continuous Text</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-Labeled Drawings</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-Unrelated</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-Picture and Story</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-Non-representational</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-Approximates Letters</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-Representational</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  Means and standard deviations of subject variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPVT-r</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>14.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF-r</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Distance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Rapport</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4  Means and standard deviations of Teacher Distance and Teacher Rapport ratings for gender and attachment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Distance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Insecure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Secure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Insecure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Secure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Rapport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Insecure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Secure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Insecure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Secure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5  Means and standard deviations of number of Addresses on first graders' registration cards for Low, Middle, and High Language Ability groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6:
Correlation Matrix for Mode, Function and Text Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MDNAR</th>
<th>F-PERS</th>
<th>DO-NON</th>
<th>DO-APP</th>
<th>DO-REP</th>
<th>DT-UN</th>
<th>DT-LAB</th>
<th>DT-P&amp;S</th>
<th>TO-LET</th>
<th>TO-WDS</th>
<th>TO-CON</th>
<th>F-ATT</th>
<th>MDEXPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDNAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-PERS</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-NON</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-APP</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO-REP</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.453</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-UN</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-LAB</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.482</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-P&amp;S</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-LET</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-WDS</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO-CON</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-ATT</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEXPO</td>
<td>-.898</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- **MDNAR** = Mode - Narrative
- **F-PERS** = Function - Personal
- **DO-NON** = Draw Only - Nonrepresentational
- **DO-APP** = Draw Only - Approximates
- **DO-REP** = Draw Only - Representational
- **DT-UN** = Draw & Text - Unrelated
- **DT-LAB** = Draw & Text - Labelled
- **DT-P&S** = Draw & Text - Picture & Story
- **TO-LET** = Text Only - Letters
- **TO-WDS** = Text Only - Words
- **TO-CON** = Text Only - Continuous
- **F-ATT** = F - Attachment
- **MDEXPO** = Mode - Exposition
## TABLE 7: Correlation Matrix for Symbolization Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symbolization Variables</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Nonfiction</th>
<th>Isolated Symbols</th>
<th>Represent Scene</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Symbols</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Symbols</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Symbols</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Symbols</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>-0.587</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>-0.645</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>-0.997</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Symbols</td>
<td>-0.565</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent Scene</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 1 Number of unique symbols used in 12-paper sets by insecurely versus securely attached, high language ability males (HM), high language ability females (HF), low language ability males (LM), and low language ability females (LF).
Graph 2 Proportion of Drawing and Text used in the 12-paper sets of insecurely versus securely attached high and low language ability first graders.
Graph 3  Percentage of Text Only used in the 12-paper sets by insecurely versus securely attached males and females.
**Graph 4** Percentage of Continuous Texts used in the 12-paper sets by insecurely versus securely attached males and females.

![Graph showing the percentage of continuous texts for insecurely and securely attached males and females. The graph indicates a higher percentage for insecure males and a lower percentage for insecure females compared to their secure counterparts.](image-url)
Graph 5  Proportion of Isolated Symbols used in the 12-paper sets by insecurely versus securely attached high language ability males (HM), high language ability females (HF), low language ability males (LM), and low language ability females (LF).
Graph 6 Proportion of Conceptual Configurations in the 12-paper sets by insecurely versus securely attached high language ability males (HM), high language ability females (HF), low language ability males (LM), and low language ability females (LF).
Graph 7 Proportion of Conceptual Configurations in the 12-paper sets of insecurely versus securely attached high language and low language ability first graders.
Graph 8 Proportion of Conceptual Configurations in the 12-paper sets of insecurely versus securely attached males and females.
Graph 9 Proportion of papers with a Personal Function in the 12-paper sets of insecurely attached versus securely attached high language ability males (HM), high language ability females (HF), low language ability males (LM), and low language ability females (LF).
Graph 10  Proportion of papers with a Personal Function in the 12-paper sets of insecurely versus securely attached males and females
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE OF DISCOURSE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>SYMBOLIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter or note</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Drawings only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Drawings &amp; text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Different Symbols</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Non-fiction</th>
<th>Symbolic Configurations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter/Number</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER - CHILD ATTACHMENT SURVEY (Matthews, 1991)

1. The following is a list of the students in your class. Please rate your feeling of closeness to each child on a scale of 1-very close to 6-very distant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very close</th>
<th>somewhat close</th>
<th>somewhat distant</th>
<th>very distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. With the following scale, please rate your teaching rapport with each of the children in your class. Your ratings will range from 1 - very effective, spend enough time to 4 - very ineffective, never seem to spend enough time. (This is not an evaluation of your teaching--this is a rating of your perception of your effectiveness with each individual.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. In your observations of your class this year which friend pairs have been the most enduring?

4. In your observations of your class this year which children spend the most time isolating?

5. In your observations of your class this year, which children consistently get left out of child initiated activities—collaborative writing projects, indoor or outdoor recess games?

6. List below the names of children with whose parents you have had positive and meaningful contact. (after school meeting, phone call, etc.)

7. List below names of children with whose parents you have had negative contact—contact that was awkward, uncomfortable, or somehow left you with a bad feeling.
Teacher Assessment of Child Attachment Measure
(adapted from the Adult Attachment Style Measure, Hazan and Shaver, 1987)

Child's code number ______

Which of the following best describes your perceptions of this child in your class? (Write the child's code number in the one, most appropriate space.)

1. ___________ finds it relatively easy to get close to others and is comfortable depending on them and having them depend on him. S/He doesn't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to her/him. [secure]

2. ___________ is somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; s/he finds it difficult to trust them, difficult to allow her/himself to depend on them. S/he is nervous when anyone gets too close. [avoidant]

3. ___________ finds that others are reluctant to get as close as s/he would like. S/he often worries that her/his friends don't really care about her/him or will not stay with her/him. S/he seems to want to merge with her/his friend. [anxious/ambivalent]
APPENDIX B
Figure 1. This is for you. It's a Ninja.
Figure 2. It's a picture of me, Mrs. W (teacher) and Jessica and Dimitra.
Figure 3. That's Leonardo and that's Donatello. They're going to fight the bad guys. That's Rock Steady and he's shielding him with the bow. The bow stopped the bullets. And Leo caught him.
Figure 4. Dinosaurs. Tyranosaurus Rex, triceratops... has a long neck... he's a lizard.
Figure 5. It's just a cute picture. It has two cats.
Figure 6. It's a traffic light and a rainbow.
Figure 7. This is good food. Some is bad food -- fish, tomatoes, orange juice, ice cream, eggs.
Figure 8. This is my butterfly and these I made the stars and a flower and some grass and I made the things [circles] around. And I made that door to my house but I didn't make the house coz it was too colorful around.
Figure 9. p. 1 This is my mom and that's me. p. 2 Two little pigs—mother and kid pig. p. 3 Clouds with Bart Simpson.
Figure 10. You know that butterfly? I had three of 'em. 'Coz I like my butterflies. I used to have a rabbit, too. My best one is my parakeet—it flew away. My next-door neighbor has a parakeet that talks.
Figure 11. My old house.
Figure 12. I think this is gonna be my new house with nice red flowers and a beautiful sun.
Figure 13. My house, me and a ghost.
Figure 14. It's a rainbow over my house.
Figure 15. My house, clouds and some trees.
Figure 20. On top of the house—I am. I came up the chimney, the ladder. My kitty's coming up, too.
Figure 21. Me and my Mom.
Figure 22. I went outside and it was sunny and I picked a flower for my lunch.
Figure 23. That's me.
Figure 24. That's a antique car.
Figure 25. Army. That's the army plane and missiles on it. That's a gun and a army tank. That's the helicopter and machine gun. That's a guy shooting a machine gun. These are little tiny bombs. Since the helicopter is there the grass is going this way. I watch army shows.
Figure 26. One helicopter shot one way. Two airforces. One's a strong machine, one's not. One has everything. This one has everything and shoots everything.
Figure 27. It's Bebop. It's the Ninja Turtle game. I played the Ninja game at Chucky Cheese at my friend's birthday.
Figure 28. It's about my Ninja Turtle. It was a big one who was getting into trouble.
Figure 29. Me and Bart. Bart hit me with his rock. I'm so mad at him. These are my muscles. This is Bart's muscles. They're monsters and Bart shot all rocks at them. And they turned into black slime so we went home.
Figure 30. This is a tree and this is a sun. This is the sky. This is sand and grass. This is me. I had curly hair then because my meme curled 'em up once. I'm out in the schoolyard with my ring from my Dad. My Dad was nice to me once. I can still see him, only on Saturdays.
Figure 31. They are TVs because it was a shop. We bought a new TV (the yellow one). This is the one we decided to take. Then it got broken. Then we took Uncle Norman’s. This one we found in a box.
Figure 32. I am sleeping with my cat. There are two trees outside my front door. The apples were falling down. There were two pumpkins.
Figure 33. All different color slides. A rainbow slide.
Figure 34. Just made a rainbow.
Figure 35. A house, mine. The people live in there: a baby and a mother, a father, a sister and a brother.
Figure 36. Me in the flowers.
Once upon a time there was a doctor and the doctor went out every day and watered the garden and the flowers would grow. It was night time when she did it. There was stars outside. The next morning the sun was out and there was rainbows. Balloons were up in the air.
Figure 38. My Dad, my Mom, me, my brother and my dog.
Figure 39. This is my whole family. This is Jason and you are one of the big ones.
Figure 40. I drew my family and two friends.
Figure 41. I noticed the fishes—the rainbows came out and the sky is kinda black. This is my cousin. He has to save them. He has to put them in the water and then he had to do something with the fish, feed them and stuff and the rainbows came out of their hearts.
Figure 42. This is for you.
Figure 43. It was a sunny day and I was learning karate. I didn't know how.
Figure 44. Me at my uncle's house drinking Hawaiian punch.
Figure 45. I made a clown picture for Paul.
Figure 46. I made this for Mary.
Figure 47. This is me bowling. Sarah made this for me.
Figure 48. My Mom bowling, a decoration, an S and little lines and some curls.
Figure 49. Jack drew a house and I made me and a ghost.
Figure 50. Donatello trying to kill the Shredder.
Figure 51. A lady Ninja Turtle.
Figure 52. It's me.
Figure 53. It's my cat.
Figure 54. Four balloons and a dog and four people, one's me.
Figure 55. This is a flower and this is a house.
Figure 56. The sun, the house, me, the end. I was thinking my cousin was at my house.
Figure 57. I'm makin' a rainbow. It's my friend. "I love you."
Where we go.
Figure 58. I love you. The sun, the rainbow, the swingset, me.
Figure 59. I wrote 'turtles' and I wrote 'Dan.'
Figure 60. This spells 'werewolf.' I know how to spell the words already.
Figure 61. It's a skeleton.
Figure 62. It's about a Ninja Turtle. His name is Michelangelo. He just chopped some wood.
Figure 63. Then a dinosaur reappeared. It popped up the basketball. He was trying to throw it. Then it got foggy. Then the person said, "Mom, Mom."
Figure 64. That's my father calling for Adam and Ross. That's my house with shape windows.
Figure 65. I like to write about my family. That's me and I'm six. That's my Dad and he's thirty. My Mom is twenty-six. And that's Lynn. Lynn is five.
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Figure 66
October
Happy Birthday
0 x 0 0 0 x 0

Figure 67
Amanda
Matthew
Laura
Paul
Toni
Charlies
Kimberly H
Jeff
Karl
Myron

Ricky
Katherine
Mark
Kimberlys
Mike P
Sonya
Chad
10 - 15 dp
Alpaca
Rob
Rachel

Figure 69
Figure 70. It's me and my Mom and my sister playing monkey in the middle. I'm in the middle but I can never get the ball.
Figure 71. It is raining and there is a turtle outside. My daddy came to pick me up and I brought the turtle home. My daddy gave the turtle a home. And then he laid eggs.
Figure 72. Bear. I wrote bear. My hands are in there too. There is a cave. The bear is in trouble because the rock fell in his cave. He has to find another home. How do bears make caves anyway?
Figure 73. The three bears' house. The papa bear, the baby bear and the mama bear are inside. They are eating porridge.
Figure 74. I'm making my fish tank. I have a goldfish. And me and my brother are playing with Ninja Turtles. And my friend is Donatello and my brother is Raphael and I'm a foot soldier. This is Michael's [brother] fish.
Figure 75. The shark ate the little boy and the mom when she was swimming in the deep water. Lucky the father was there. He had a gun and a knife. He stabbed and shot the shark. The shark was nice but the lady was mean. He ate the lady. The shark was still alive. He said sorry to the dad. It has to be in water.
Figure 76. I'm drawing about me and my friend Damien. We're playing at my house last night after school. This is the house. This is the school and this is me. I'm drawing me and Damien in the school. This is me, Damien and Nicky all playing. Damien is bigger than Nicky.
Figure 77. That's me. When I went to the farm. My father went to go get cows. He killed them. There's a fire behind me. This is my cousin throwing wood in to make the fire more. And we throw the cans in.
Figure 78. My cousin went to Florida. They have big cookies.
Figure 79. Those are fireworks.
Figure 80. That's me.
Figure 81. Me.
Figure 82. A school. Upstairs are classrooms.
Figure 83. This is a rainbow and this is me and my rainbow.
Figure 84. This is me playing outside. This is my house.
Figure 85. This is me and this is my brother and my Mom at the beach.
Figure 86. That's balloons. That's me holding those balloons. Those are ants and those are ant holes they go in. And that's my mom holding balloons.
Figure 87. This is Jessica's mom and dad, my mom and dad and me and Jessica going apple picking.
Figure 88. Me, playing in flowers.
Figure 89. Sky. These are those green things where cowboys live.

Cactus. Sand.

Ski
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Figure 90. I'm making a beach. That's me, a clam, a shark.
Figure 91. That's my mom. I like her.
Figure 92. Friday the Thirteenth Hour. He's going after a guy.
Figure 93. This is a Ninja Turtle. I drew it over my uncle's house.
Figure 94. It's my Mom's jet. She is landing in New York.
Figure 95. D— is drawing a picture. [refers to self in 3rd person]
Figure 96. Donatello—he's gonna be fighting Bebop and Rock Steady.
Figure 97. This is my whole family. I'm playing with a ball. There was a rainbow and then the moon came! It started to rain.
Figure 98. I'm flying a kite at the beach and my sister is in the tree house.
Figure 99. Charlie and I were making a book.
Figure 100. My Bart Book — Bart Simpson's Halloween.
The Simpsons is walking.
Bart Simpson said, 'trick or treat.'
Bart Simpson is walking down the alley.
Bart Simpson has a lot of candy.
Bart Simpson gets in a fight with Homer [the father].
Bart Simpson is walking up the street.
Bart Simpson is tired.
Bart Simpson is done.
MY FAMALE
BY S---

Figure 101. My Family by Sabina.
My Mom colors with me.

CALM SWAT

MY MOM

ME
My Dad plays with me.
My brother colors with me.
My Nana takes me shopping.
My Pop-pop gives me candy.
My cat loves me.
My dog loves me.
My cat and puppy. My pets love me.
Figure 102. Mom, me and my cousins.
Figure 103. A house with flowers 'coz we got a porch with flowers- my Mom planted it.
Figure 104. The rainbow, the end, the house, me.