

# A modified video-feedback intervention for carers of foster children aged 6 years and under with reactive attachment disorder: a feasibility study and pilot RCT

Paula Oliveira,<sup>1,2\*</sup> Eloise Stevens,<sup>1,2</sup> Lydia Barge,<sup>1,2</sup>  
Julie Comyn,<sup>1</sup> Kirsty Langley,<sup>1</sup> Paul Ramchandani,<sup>3</sup>  
Barry Wright,<sup>4</sup> Matt Woolgar,<sup>5,6</sup> Eilis Kennedy,<sup>7</sup>  
Sarah Byford,<sup>6</sup> James Shearer,<sup>6</sup> Stephen Scott,<sup>6</sup>  
Jane Barlow,<sup>8</sup> Danya Glaser,<sup>1</sup> Rob Senior,<sup>7</sup>  
Peter Fonagy<sup>1,2</sup> and Pasco Fearon<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London, London, UK

<sup>2</sup>Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families, London, UK

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

<sup>4</sup>Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

<sup>5</sup>National Adoption & Fostering Service, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

<sup>7</sup>Research and Development Unit, Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

<sup>8</sup>Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

\*Corresponding author [paula.oliveira@annafreud.org](mailto:paula.oliveira@annafreud.org)

**Declared competing interests of authors:** none

Published August 2022

DOI: 10.3310/SLIZ1119

## Scientific summary

Video-feedback intervention for carers of foster children

Health Technology Assessment 2022; Vol. 26: No. 35

DOI: 10.3310/SLIZ1119

NIHR Journals Library [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)

# Scientific summary

## Background

There were 68,840 looked-after children in the UK as of 31 March 2014, of whom 51,340 were cared for in foster placements. These numbers gradually increased in the preceding few years. Looked-after children are at significantly greater risk of experiencing childhood mental, emotional and behavioural problems, including suboptimal attachment patterns. Despite this, access to children's mental health services and therapeutic interventions is highly variable. Furthermore, many interventions to treat emotional or behavioural difficulties, or to promote positive well-being and attachment have not been tested rigorously among looked-after children. There is thus an urgent need to develop clinically effective and cost-effective interventions, and to make them available for this large group of highly vulnerable children. The Video-feedback Intervention to promote Positive Parenting and Sensitive Discipline is an extensively evaluated and generally effective treatment for promoting sensitive parenting and increasing rates of secure attachment. Therefore, it is a promising approach for addressing the emotional and mental health needs of young children in foster care. The original treatment programme has been tested with many different populations, including children at increased risk of behavioural problems. In addition, the treatment manual has already been adapted for use in foster care in the Netherlands, but has not been adapted to the UK foster care context until now.

## Objectives

The objectives were to:

1. adapt an existing evidence-based intervention, the Video-feedback Intervention to promote Positive Parenting and Sensitive Discipline, to meet the specific needs of children aged  $\leq 6$  years with difficulties in the domain of attachment falling under the rubric of the term 'reactive attachment disorder' in foster care in the UK, using intensive input from a collaborative team of expert clinicians and foster carers
2. conduct and evaluate a feasibility case series to optimise the treatment manual and assess clinician and foster carers' views regarding the acceptability of the intervention
3. conduct a scoping study of the practical and scientific hurdles that would need to be overcome in preparation for a pilot trial
4. conduct a pilot randomised controlled trial of the modified intervention to determine the feasibility of a future full-scale trial of clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, including recruitment rates, the characteristics of treatment as usual for these children, treatment dropout rates, completion rates of study measures, development and testing of a measure of service use, and constrained estimates of measure variances.

## Methods

### Design

The study had several interlinked phases. We adapted the Video-feedback Intervention to promote Positive Parenting and Sensitive Discipline for use in a UK foster care setting with children presenting with symptoms of reactive attachment disorder (phase 1). We trained a range of professionals working with children in foster care (primarily child and adolescent mental health services professionals) to deliver the modified intervention to a small case series of foster parents and children (phase 2a). We also conducted a scoping study involving key stakeholders from local authorities and mental health services

to optimise the study protocol; and interviews focused on strategies for engaging local authorities and social services, recruitment methods, the utility and acceptability of a screening system for attachment problems and the suitability and acceptability of the intervention from the point of view of practitioners and managers in mental health services and social care (phase 2b). Finally, we conducted a pilot randomised controlled trial of the proposed intervention, assessing key feasibility parameters and monitoring usual care (phase 3). As part of phase 3, we also conducted qualitative interviews with the foster carers who received the new intervention to further assess its acceptability.

### Health technology

The health technology was the Video-feedback Intervention to promote Positive Parenting and Sensitive Discipline modified for children with reactive attachment disorder symptoms in foster care in the UK. The original intervention is an extensively evaluated and effective treatment approach recommended by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence for treating attachment problems among looked-after children. It has been shown to reliably enhance the sensitive responsiveness of parenting and reduce attachment difficulties among children in care or on the edge of care. The programme was previously adapted for use with children in the Dutch foster care system. Based on both the original and the Dutch foster care manuals, we adapted this well-established attachment-focused intervention to suit the needs of young children placed in foster care in the UK who were presenting with reactive attachment disorder symptoms. The programme aims to (1) improve the sensitive responding of foster carers, (2) improve the consistent responding of foster carers to challenging child behaviour, (3) improve foster carer–child relationships and (4) improve reactive attachment symptoms, and the child’s emotional and behavioural outcomes. The intervention was compared with usual care. The modified intervention was delivered in-home by trained mental health practitioners in the NHS and other appropriately qualified professionals. The practitioner allocated to each family films the child and carer interacting at home and provides feedback in the following session. The six sessions are delivered over a period of 4–6 months.

### Setting

This study was set in outpatient NHS mental health services across eight trusts and nine partner social services departments. Sites included urban (Greater London, Peterborough) and rural/semirural (Yorkshire/Hertfordshire) areas.

### Target population

The target population was foster carers with fostered children aged  $\leq 6$  years with difficulties in the area captured by the diagnostic term ‘reactive attachment disorder’.

### Inclusion criteria

#### Parental figure

- Foster carer(s).
- Aged  $\geq 18$  years.
- Proficient in English.
- Capacity to consent.

#### Child

- Living with foster carer(s) in a placement planned to last at least 4 months.
- Aged between 11 months and 6 years.
- Presence of symptoms or difficulties in the area of reactive attachment disorder [as defined by the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, Fifth Edition (American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th edn. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association; 2013)] as assessed using the Disturbances of Attachment Interview, a validated research diagnostic interview. Note that, owing to recruitment difficulties, this diagnostic criterion was removed during the last period of the pilot trial to increase throughput of cases.

### **Exclusion criteria**

The exclusion criteria were as follows:

- parental figure – (1) insufficient language or cognitive abilities to participate fully in trial procedures or (2) already engaged in a similar parenting intervention
- child – severe developmental disability.

### **Measurement of costs**

The Child and Adolescent Service Use Schedule was used to measure the use of all health, social care and education-based services and to support the description of usual care.

### **Measurement of outcomes**

#### **Screening**

Screening used reactive attachment disorder symptom scores from two questionnaires: the Attachment Screening Assessment and the Development and Well-Being Assessment.

#### **Primary outcome**

The primary outcome was reactive attachment disorder symptom scores in the Disturbances of Attachment Interview.

#### **Secondary outcomes**

Secondary outcomes were the quality of the child's attachment pattern to caregiver, the child's general psychopathology, and emotional/behavioural problems; parental sensitivity, self-efficacy and stress; and goal-based outcomes.

#### **Analysis**

Feasibility parameters (means, proportions and variance estimates) were assessed using 95% confidence intervals. Qualitative methods and process records were used to address questions regarding stakeholder and foster carer perceptions of treatment acceptability and delivery.

#### **Service user involvement**

Input to the study design, treatment development and evaluation protocol from foster carers was substantial throughout the project. Specifically, foster carers were engaged in reviewing and shaping the modified clinical intervention, providing feedback on study measures, and in planning recruitment, participant engagement and study dissemination.

#### **Ethics review**

This study was reviewed by the London-Harrow Research Ethics Committee (reference number 17/LO/0987) and given a favourable opinion.

#### **Governance**

A Trial Steering Committee and a Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee were established, which included senior researchers and practitioners with experience in treatment development studies and trials, patient and public involvement representatives and a statistician. Each committee met approximately every 6 months during the project.

## **Results**

### **Timetable**

The project ran for 32 months. In phase 1 (4 months), we adapted and produced intervention manuals prepared study materials and set up sites. In phase 2 (6 months), we trained therapists, undertook

initial feasibility testing and further examined key implementation parameters. In phase 3 (22 months), we completed a pilot randomised controlled trial and qualitative interviews with the recipients of the intervention.

### Research findings

The Manual Development Working Group implemented a series of minor changes to the intervention protocol that focused on improving the suitability of the video-feedback intervention for the UK foster care context, and endorsed the content and approach of the intervention (phase 1). Challenges to recruitment affected both the case series and the final pilot trial in significant ways despite numerous modifications to the protocol and the inclusion of additional sites. In the case series trial (phase 2a), six cases were planned, but only three cases were recruited. The learning from this phase was complemented by detailed interviews with stakeholders ( $n = 10$ ; phase 2b).

In the pilot randomised controlled trial (phase 3), there were challenges to recruitment, most significantly in the initial stages of contact with foster carers. The overall number of mailed-out questionnaires ( $n = 336$ ) was smaller than the original target of 500, largely because significant numbers of children registered with the local authorities were considered inappropriate or ineligible for the study. The overall response rate to the screening questionnaires was low at 29%, but varied substantially by site. The screening tools performed well in identifying potentially eligible participants, demonstrating good convergence and sensitivity against the research diagnostic interview. The results of the research diagnostic interview indicated that approximately 33% of the sample had significant reactive attachment disorder symptoms (22/67 children assessed, 95% confidence interval 22% to 44%). Of the 67 participants who completed the research diagnostic interview, 30 went on to take part in the randomised controlled trial. Thus, we were able to recruit three-quarters of the target sample size of 40 participants. Of the randomised families, 15 were allocated to the new treatment and 15 continued to receive usual care. At the end of the pilot trial, 11 foster carers took part in qualitative interviews to explore their experiences of the intervention.

Although recruitment and efficient working with local authorities and foster carers remained a significant concern in relation to feasibility, most other study parameters were deemed feasible and acceptable. Most notably, we achieved good levels of completeness of outcome data and all of the participants who received the treatment completed all sessions. Both foster carers and practitioners found the intervention programme acceptable and helpful. We concluded that a larger-scale trial may be feasible, but only if three critical conditions are in place: (1) the adequate resourcing of dedicated trial staff in each local authority; (2) the widest inclusion criteria possible, including children in foster care, under special guardianship orders, and possibly extended to include children who have been recently adopted; and (3) central resourcing of intervention capacity to supplement NHS staff, as the rate of staff turnover was generally high and the capacity in sites was low.

### Conclusions

The Video-feedback Intervention to promote Positive Parenting and Sensitive Discipline, adapted for UK foster care, appears highly acceptable to foster carers and other stakeholders, and meets a clear need in addressing both the emotional needs of children and the training and support needs of foster carers. The strain and scarce resources within local authorities, and, to a lesser extent, NHS mental health services, posed significant difficulties to recruitment and to optimal intervention delivery. We were able to develop solutions to many, but not all, of these barriers and conclude that a clinical trial in this context may be possible if adequate resourcing for recruitment is provided within local authorities and the target group of children is widened as far as possible.

## **Trial registration**

This trial is registered as ISRCTN18374094.

## **Funding**

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment programme and will be published in full in *Health Technology Assessment*; Vol. 26, No. 35. See the NIHR Journals Library website for further project information.

# Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.014

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 4.014 and is ranked 27th (out of 108 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2021 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), Embase (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) ([www.publicationethics.org/](http://www.publicationethics.org/)).

Editorial contact: [journals.library@nihr.ac.uk](mailto:journals.library@nihr.ac.uk)

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta).

## Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

## HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

## This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 15/118/01. The contractual start date was in March 2017. The draft report began editorial review in March 2020 and was accepted for publication in December 2020. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Copyright © 2022 Oliveira *et al.* This work was produced by Oliveira *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library ([www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland ([www.prepress-projects.co.uk](http://www.prepress-projects.co.uk)).

## NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

---

**Professor Ken Stein** Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

## NIHR Journals Library Editors

---

**Professor John Powell** Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

**Professor Andrée Le May** Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals

**Professor Matthias Beck** Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

**Dr Tessa Crilly** Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

**Dr Eugenia Cronin** Consultant in Public Health, Delta Public Health Consulting Ltd, UK

**Dr Peter Davidson** Interim Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board. Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

**Ms Tara Lamont** Senior Adviser, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

**Dr Catriona McDaid** Reader in Trials, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

**Professor William McGuire** Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

**Professor Geoffrey Meads** Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

**Dr Rob Riemsma** Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

**Professor Helen Roberts** Professor of Child Health Research, Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Palliative Care and Paediatrics Unit, Population Policy and Practice Programme, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

**Professor Jonathan Ross** Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

**Professor Ken Stein** Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors)

**Editorial contact:** [journals.library@nihr.ac.uk](mailto:journals.library@nihr.ac.uk)