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My Research Interests

My main research interest is in understanding the cognitive and emotional processes that facilitate positive (attitude-behaviour) change.

In particular, how people build, restore or deepen close, meaningful, enjoyable and productive interpersonal relationships at home (parents and children; siblings) or at work (professionals and clients; colleagues).
Close relationships, in particular in infancy and early years, are critically important for neurological, emotional and social development of humans.
A Focus on Relationships Pays Off…

- Brain Development (ex. Siegel, 1999)
- Emotional Well-being (ex. Salisbury, et. al. 2004)
- Psychological Resilience (ex. Mathijssen, 1998)
- Self-esteem (ex. Sheeber, et. al. 2000)
- School Achievement (ex. Barbarin, O.A., 1992)
The Transformative Power of VIG in the Restoration of Family Relationships

• Parental attitude-behaviour change and development of the child (ex. Fukkink, 2008; Kennedy, Landor & Todd 2011).

• Increased parental sensitivity with long-lasting impact (ex. Velderman, 2005).

• Effective with vulnerable or high-risk families (ex. Doria, Strathie & Strathie, 2011; Strathie & Kennedy, 2008; Moss et al, 2011).
The Transformative Power of VIG in the Restoration of Family Relationships

• Also Families with children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) increasing parental sensitivity and child's attachment security (Juffer et al. 1997; Forsyth & Sked, 2011).

• VIG is an evidence-based intervention and is now a recommended approach in the NICE Guidance (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 2012) for all those involved in promoting social and emotional wellbeing in young children.
VIG works but how?


**RESEARCH AIM:**

To explore the mechanisms underlying the success of VIG in family psychotherapy from the perspective of its users (client families, guiders and supervisors).
VIG works but how?

METHOD:
Grounded Theory Approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which is an inductive, theory-discovery approach that allows the development of a theoretical account grounded in empirical observations or data.

PARTICIPANTS:
Five parent-child dyads (VIG intervention: 3 cycles of video recordings and shared reviews). Parents were female ($M = 37$ yrs), and children $\leq 5$yrs; high-vulnerability: mental health issues (depression) and problems of substance misuse. Three VIG guiders (2 VIG female and one male ($M = 44$ yrs), and five VIG supervisors (female, $M = 49$ yrs) all with extensive experience with VIG.
VIG Cycle

VIDEO RECORDING
the VIG guider films the family in interaction

PLUS

SHARED REVIEW
The guider edits the video selecting the most successful moments to be watched and reviewed by the client and guider together

An example in video…

Pictures extracted from http://www.kenttrustweb.org.uk/eps/eps_VIG.cfm
Phase 1: Families
content analysis of 3 first feed-back sessions (NVivo)

Phase 2: Families & Guiders
semi-structured interviews with the clients/families and guiders

Phase 3: Supervisors
focus group with the VIG supervisors
Results
Content Analysis of Review Sessions

The analysis of the content produced by parents during the video review sessions generated 62 factors that were organized into nine categories:

1. Aims;
2. positive content about oneself, other and the world;
3. negative content about oneself, other and the world;
4. metacognition;
5. self-reflection;
6. parental skills;
7. change with VIG;
8. picturing future;
9. other.
Table 1  
*Factors Extracted from Content Analysis of Shared Review Sessions (Code Book)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Factors</th>
<th>Description of the Category and Included Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1: Aims             | **The client speaks about the aims regarding the VIG process.**  
The client refers the aim to be: seen/respected as a parent figure with Authority (1.1); to improve the parent-child Relationship (1.2); to see the videoed Interaction (1.3); to feel more Self-confidence (1.4); to prove that he/she can be a good parent (Self-efficacy, 1.5); to like herself/himself better (Self-esteem; 1.6). |
| 2. Positive Content| **The client speaks positively about herself/himself, other people and the world.**  
The client speaks positively about: the Future (2.1); the Other-Person/Child (2.2, 2.3*); the Partner’s Parenting (2.4); an aspect of the other, herself or the relationship mentioned by the guider with which she explicitly agrees (Agreement, 2.5); the Change experienced (2.6); the Consequences Of (her/his) Positive Actions (2.7); her/his Feelings (2.8); the Intentions for the future (2.9); the Surprise that is seeing herself/himself doing well (2.10); the Partner as a person (2.11); the Relationship between Parent (herself/himself) and Child (2.12); being Seen By Others positively (2.13); One’s Self (Self-Positive, 2.14, 2.15*); the Support received from others (2.16); One’s Self and the Other-Person/Child as We (2.17). |
| 3. Negative Content | **The client speaks negatively about herself/himself, the other person and the world.**  
The client speaks negatively about: personal ability (Self-Efficacy, 3.1); the Future (3.2); past or present Life Circumstances (3.3.); the “Usual” Undesired Behaviour (3.4); Used Parenting Strategies (3.5); the Other-Person/Child (3.6, 3.7*); the Partner as a person (3.8);); the Relationship between Parent (herself/himself) and Child (3.9); her/his Feelings (3.10); being Seen By Others negatively (3.11); One’s Self (Self-Negative, 3.12, 3.13*); the Support received from others (3.14); Unsuccessful Attempts for change in the past (3.15); One’s Self and the Other-Person/Child as We (3.16). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Factors</th>
<th>Description of the Category and Included Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Metacognition | The client reflects upon how the other person is feeling and/or thinking.  
The client reflects upon: her/his reaction if she/he would be in the Other-Person/Child Position (4.1); how the other person/child is feeling (Emotional Metacognition, 4.2, 4.3*); how the other person/child is thinking (Thoughtful Metacognition 4.4, 4.5*). |
| 5. Self-Reflection | The client reflects upon how she/he is feeling and/or thinking.  
The client reflects upon: her/his usual undesired behaviour in a critical way exploring ways for improvement (Constructive Self-Criticism, 5.1); a new way of seeing things and understanding (Insight, 5.2); how she/he felt/thought in the past recognizing mistakes (Confessional Discourse, 5.3); the Need For Help (5.4); relevant episodes of childhood and past memories (Autobiographical Descriptive Discourse, 5.5). |
| 6. Parental Skills | The client speaks about the importance of specific parental skills.  
The client refers to: doing things for the sake of the children (Parental Sacrifice, 6.1); moments of Parental Self-Efficacy (6.2); important skills for being a good parent (Parental Skills, 6.3); the importance of supporting children (Parenting Support, 6.4). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Factors</th>
<th>Description of the Category and Included Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Change with VIG  | The client speaks about the change achieved with VIG  
The client refers to: how it was before and after VIG underlining the achieved Change (7.1); how motivating is to see improvement (Motivated Improvement, 7.2); the importance of Seeing Change along the VIG sessions (7.3). |
| 8. Picturing Future | The client pictures the desired future and explores realistic means to achieve it.  
Client speaks about: the conditions or means to sustain change in the future (Means for Desired Future, 8.1); the Desired Future for herself/himself and her/his family (8.2). |
| 9. Other            | Infrequent content that did not fit with any of the above main categories.  
Client refers to: what the client and/or the other person/child were doing during the videoed interaction (Descriptive Behavioural Discourse, 9.1); what the client was intending with his actions within the interaction (Personal Intentions, 9.2); that Does Not Know (9.3); the importance of the guider for the positive change achieved with VIG (Guider's Effect, 9.4); the importance of the Partner's Involvement in the VIG process (9.5); and finally a content whose meaning could not be understood by the coder (Unclear/Ambiguous, 9.6). |
Inter-rater reliability analysis of the code book (kappa statistic)

Phase 1: TRAINING of the coder in the code book (rules, codes and definitions) and 5 practice trials.

Phase 2: CODING of 30 randomly selected statements (55 units of meaning, almost 10% of the overall coded text), giving to each statement the code or codes that best describes the meaning of that statement.

Inter-rater agreement measure: Kappa = 0.696 (p < 0.001), considered substantial (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Phase 3: DEBATE of the disagreements to reach consensus, in order to identify and correct problems with the code book.

Final Inter-rater agreement measure: Kappa = 0.941 (p < 0.001), considered outstanding (Landis & Koch, 1977).
Table 2
Frequency (n) and Proportion (%) of Categories of Factors in Shared Review Sessions (SR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Factors</th>
<th>SR 1 n (%)</th>
<th>SR 2 n (%)</th>
<th>SR 3 n (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (all) sessions n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aims</td>
<td>13 (2.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (0.5)</td>
<td>15 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive Content</td>
<td>192 (43.0)</td>
<td>151 (35.6)</td>
<td>149 (38.4)</td>
<td>492 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Content</td>
<td>106 (23.7)</td>
<td>78 (18.4)</td>
<td>47 (12.1)</td>
<td>231 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Metacognition</td>
<td>20 (4.5)</td>
<td>41 (9.7)</td>
<td>31 (8.0)</td>
<td>92 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-Reflection</td>
<td>10 (2.2)</td>
<td>11 (2.6)</td>
<td>10 (2.6)</td>
<td>31 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parental Skills</td>
<td>17 (3.8)</td>
<td>20 (4.7)</td>
<td>32 (8.2)</td>
<td>69 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Change with VIG</td>
<td>47 (10.5)</td>
<td>72 (17.0)</td>
<td>73 (18.8)</td>
<td>192 (15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Picturing Future</td>
<td>5 (1.1)</td>
<td>2 (0.5)</td>
<td>4 (1.0)</td>
<td>11 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>37 (8.3)</td>
<td>49 (11.6)</td>
<td>40 (10.3)</td>
<td>126 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (all categories)</td>
<td>447 (100)</td>
<td>424 (100)</td>
<td>388 (100)</td>
<td>1259 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Most Frequent Category is Positive Talk
- Decrease Positive Talk & Negative Talk
- Increase of Positive Change
Table 3  
*Frequency (n) Evolution of Spontaneous and Reactive Responses in Shared Review Sessions (SR).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>SR 1</th>
<th>SR 2</th>
<th>SR3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other-Person/Child Positive</td>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Person/Child Negative</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Positive</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Negative</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Metacognition</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful Metacognition</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Decrease Pos-Other Talk (reactive)  
- Increase Pos-Other Talk (spontaneous)  
- Polynomial Curve Pos-Self Talk (spontaneous) – same effect in Doria, et.al. (2011).  
- Increase in Metacognitive Emotional Spontaneous Talk
Research Procedure

Phase 1: Families
content analysis of
3 first feed-back
sessions (NVivo)

Phase 2: Families & Guiders
semi-structured interviews with
the clients/families and guiders

Phase 3: Supervisors
focus group with the
VIG supervisors
Results
Interviews to Parents and Guiders

Semi-structured Interview – OPEN QUESTIONS

1. How does the Video Interaction Guidance method works? What are the main factors that made it work?

2. Are you happy or unhappy in generally with the outcomes of the VIG sessions of the cases you had so far? Why?

3. In your opinion, what are the most positive aspects of VIG in comparison with other social or psychological interventions at improving family relationships?

4. What was the impact of VIG for your personal life and the life of your family / professional life?

5. Were there any obstacles that prevented it working better?

6. Was there anything you think should be improved?
Table 4
Proportion (%) of Clients’ and Guiders’ Responses to the Semi-Structured Interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Client Parents’ Responses</th>
<th>Guiders’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1) How does the Video Interaction Guidance method works? What are the main factors that made it work?</td>
<td>Self-reflection (20%) Video (17.5%) Great Impact (17.5%) Meta-cognition (15.0%) Guider (12.5%) Motivator of change (12.5%) Receiving Client (5.0%)</td>
<td>Supported/ Co-Exploration (20.5%) Positive/Success Focus (15.4%) Empowering families (12.8%) Motivator of change (10.3%) Self-reflection (7.7%) Discovery (7.7%) Counter-reality (5.1%) Guider (5.1%) Receiving Client (5.1%) Video (5.1%) Self Modeling (2.6%) Guider Positive Focus (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2) Are you happy or unhappy in general with the outcomes of the VIG sessions?</td>
<td>Happy (57.1%) Very Happy (28.6%) Extremely Happy (14.3%)</td>
<td>Happy (75.0%) Very Happy (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3) In your opinion, what are the most positive aspects of VIG in comparison with other social or psychological interventions?</td>
<td>Positive/Success Focus (50%) Video (37.5%) Micro-analysis (12.5%)</td>
<td>Positive/Success Focus (25.0%) Solution Focus Approach (16.7%) Strength Focus Approach (16.7%) Values Based Approach (16.7%) Combination of Factors (8.3%) Inter-Subjectivity (8.3%) One-to-One Team Work (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Proportion (%) of Clients’ and Guiders’ Responses to the Semi-Structured Interview - Continuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Client Parents’ Responses</th>
<th>Guiders’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Q4</em> ) What was the impact of VIG for your personal life and the life of your family? / What was the impact of VIG to the life of the family?</em>*</td>
<td>Positive interaction (20.0%)</td>
<td>Happiness (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness (16.4%)</td>
<td>Positive interaction (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meta-cognitive/self-reflection (12.7%)</td>
<td>Attitude behavior Change (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude behavior Change (9.1%)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem (9.1%)</td>
<td>Self-esteem (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Closeness (7.3%)</td>
<td>Interpersonal Closeness (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication (7.3%)</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy (5.5%)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-confidence (3.6%)</td>
<td>Self-confidence (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help depression (3.6%)</td>
<td>Help depression (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution (1.8%)</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Respect (1.8%)</td>
<td>Interpersonal Respect (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (1.8%)</td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5) Were there any obstacles that prevented it working better?</strong></td>
<td>No (50.0%)</td>
<td>Lack of Managerial Investment (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Negative Mind Frame (25.0%)</td>
<td>Managerial Resistance (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distractions (ex. children around) (25.0%)</td>
<td>People’s Resistance (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6) Is there anything in the method you think should be improved?</strong></td>
<td>No, Nothing (100%)</td>
<td>No, Nothing (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No but open to change (33.3%)</td>
<td>No but open to change (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In interviews to guiders Q4 was adapted as: What was the impact of VIG on the life of the family?
Phase 1: Families
content analysis of
3 first feed-back
sessions (NVivo)

Phase 2: Families & Guiders
semi-structured interviews with
the clients/families and guiders

Phase 3: Supervisors
focus group with the
VIG supervisors
Results
Focus Group With Supervisors

One Open Question and One Group Task:

1. How does the Video Interaction Guidance method works? What are the main factors that make it work?

2. From the factors that emerged from content analysis of the interviews with families and guiders, please integrate them in a model (i.e. which variables influence which) that best describes how and why the VIG process works. Please do it first individually and then in group.
# RESULTS OPEN QUESTION

**How does the Video Interaction Guidance method work? What are the main factors that make it work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supervisors’ Responses</th>
<th>Freq (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How does the Video Interaction Guidance method work? What are the main factors that made it work?</td>
<td>Follows the Client</td>
<td>9 (15.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive focus</td>
<td>6 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Construction New Reality</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Micro-analysis</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Seeing for Themselves</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guider's Reception</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client-Guider Relationship</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination of factors</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact principles as guides</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain of new perspective</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transversal</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not cognitively demanding</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-empowering</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-modelling</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Exploration of Video</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-subjectivity</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Objectivity</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUCCESS - Focused Approach & Desired Aims & Videoed Interaction & Guider's Support

Edited Video as Proof of Success

Positive Feelings

Co-construction new reality

Attitude & Behaviour Change

Motivator of Further Change

Video Recording

Shared Review

Outcomes

Guider Receives & Follows Client’s Initiatives

Success-Focused Approach & Edited Video as Proof of Success

Self-Reflection & Metacognition

RESULTS GROUP TASK – First Proposed Model

VIG Cycle Timeline
OVERALL INTEGRATION OF FINDINGS

Analyses of the video review sessions, interviews and focus group were integrated in a model to explain the mechanisms underlying the success of VIG in the context of family psychotherapy.
Explanatory Model of VIG Success from the Perspective of Users.

Methodological Components

(C1) Guider Receives & Follows Clients’ Initiatives * and Desired Aims

(C2) Videoed Interaction With Guider’s Presence and Support

(C3) Success-Focused Approach

(C4) Edited Video as Proof of Success and Change *

Underlying Mechanisms

(M1) Metacognitive Processes **

(M2) Shared Construction Of New Reality *

Outcomes

(O1) Happiness

(O2) Self-Esteem

(O3) Self-Efficacy

(O4) Attitude-Behaviour Change

Note: Model developed by authors based on supervisors first explanatory model.

* Factors added by supervisors during the focus group. **Self-Reflection and Metacognition
Explanatory Model of VIG Success from the Perspective of Users.

Key Methodological Components of VIG

C1. The Guider’s Reception & Support to Clients’ Initiatives and Aims. The reception and guidance of the professional throughout the entire intervention is a main success factor of VIG from the user’s perspective.

C2. The Videoed Interaction. The first videoed interaction in the presence of the guider is therapeutic in itself as it becomes an exceptional positive moment for the family.

C3. The Success Focused Approach. VIG focuses on the successes that client families achieve during the recorded sessions rather than on the problems that made them seek help. This is crucial for the success of the intervention.

C4. The Edited Video as Proof of Success and Change. The edited video offers a “seeing is believing” proof of success and change for the families, being a major contributor to VIG success from the user’s perspective.
Explanatory Model of VIG Success from the Perspective of Users.

Key Underlying Mechanisms of VIG

**M1. The Metacognitive Processes.** In VIG, families are confronted with video evidence that challenges their preconceived negative self-evaluation. The viewing of positive exceptions of family interaction leads parents to question themselves. The need for further understanding activates metacognitive processes through which the client starts reflecting on her/his own and the other person’s/the child’s thoughts and feelings, taking into account the overall systemic implications of one's actions and emotions.

**M2. The Shared Construction of a New Reality.** The construction of a new reality for the family with the support and collaboration of the guider is the other important mechanism of VIG success from the perspective of users. VIG users acknowledge the importance of constructing a new reality and identity for the family as a collaborative act in dialogue with the guider.
VIG offers families the unique experience of *insight* in their own family dynamics. Parents seeing and feeling themselves communicating with their children in a different better way (with eye contact, touch, posture, movements, pace and timing, intensity, and tone of voice) makes them believe that they are able to change and pursue this ‘new way of being’ everyday in their lives.
VIG is a powerful tool to be used in early intervention and prevention services to guide parents in the care of their children, and also in therapeutic contexts to help families reconnect and recover from past difficult attachment bonds and relations.
Towards The Nurturing City....

...only with Nurturing Families!

THANK YOU.
For any questions or references you can contact me:
mdoria@ymail.com / m.v.doria@uea.ac.uk
+33 (0)7.70.16.70.40