

Proposition 1: Safe, trusting relationships are fundamental to healthy development

Safe, Trusting Relationships as the Foundation of Healthy Development: A integrated theoretical framework

Drawing on Attachment Theory, Ecological Systems Theory, Resilience Science, and Self-Efficacy Theory

1. Introduction

A substantial body of developmental science converges on a central claim: safe, trusting relationships are not merely beneficial but fundamental to healthy human development across the lifespan. From the earliest moments of life, the quality of an infant's relationships with caregivers shapes the architecture of the developing brain, the capacity for emotional regulation, the formation of a coherent sense of self, and the ability to form and sustain relationships later in life (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2004; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). This document synthesises key theoretical frameworks that illuminate why and how these relationships matter, focusing on John Bowlby's attachment theory, Mary Ainsworth's empirical elaboration of secure attachment, Urie Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, Ann Masten's resilience science, and Albert Bandura's self-efficacy theory, together with complementary contributions from Erik Erikson and contemporary developmental neuroscience.

The argument is not that relationships are the sole determinant of developmental outcomes, nor that biology is irrelevant. Rather, relationships constitute the primary proximal process through which genetic predispositions, environmental opportunities and adversities, and cultural contexts are translated into developmental trajectories. In Bronfenbrenner's terms, relationships are the "engines" of development; in the language of the Center on the Developing Child, they are the "active ingredients" of the environment's influence on the developing child (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2004).

No single theory fully explains the complexity of human development. Rather, each contributes a unique perspective on how safe, trusting relationships influence developmental processes. Together these theories provide a coherent conceptual foundation for the Paws & Connect Theory of Change.

2. John Bowlby and Attachment Theory

John Bowlby's attachment theory provides the foundational account of why human infants are biologically prepared to form enduring emotional bonds with

caregivers. Drawing on ethology, evolutionary biology, and clinical observation, Bowlby (1969/1982, 1973, 1980) argued that the attachment behavioural system evolved because proximity to a protective caregiver increased the survival chances of vulnerable offspring. Attachment is therefore not a secondary drive derived from feeding or secondary reinforcement, but a primary motivational system in its own right.

Central to Bowlby's formulation is the dual function of the attachment figure as a *safe haven* in times of threat or distress and as a *secure base* from which the child can explore the environment (Bowlby, 1988). When caregivers are consistently available, responsive, and sensitive, the child develops confidence that support will be forthcoming when needed. This confidence frees cognitive and emotional resources for exploration, learning, and the progressive development of autonomy. Conversely, when care is unavailable, rejecting, or unpredictable, the child's attachment system remains chronically activated or becomes defensively deactivated, with consequences for emotion regulation, attention, and later relationships.

Bowlby further proposed that early interactions give rise to *internal working models*—cognitive-affective representations of the self, others, and relationships—that guide expectations and behaviour in subsequent relationships (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Bretherton & Munholland, 2008). These models are not fixed, but they tend toward continuity because they shape the interpretation of new social information and the selection of relational partners and strategies. The clinical implication is profound: the quality of early caregiving relationships lays down templates that influence mental health and interpersonal functioning across the life course.

3. Mary Ainsworth and the Secure Attachment Pattern

Mary Ainsworth translated Bowlby's theoretical insights into a rigorous observational science. Through naturalistic studies in Uganda and Baltimore, and the subsequent development of the Strange Situation Procedure, Ainsworth and colleagues identified individual differences in the organisation of infant–caregiver attachment (Ainsworth, 1967; Ainsworth et al., 1978). The majority of infants in low-risk samples organise their attachment behaviour in a *secure* pattern: they use the caregiver as a secure base for exploration, seek contact or proximity when distressed, and are readily comforted by the caregiver's return. Secure attachment is strongly associated with caregiver sensitivity—the ability to notice, accurately interpret, and respond promptly and appropriately to the infant's signals (Ainsworth et al., 1978; De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997).

Insecure patterns (avoidant and resistant/ambivalent) and, later, the disorganised pattern identified by Main and Solomon (1990), reflect adaptations to less optimal caregiving. Avoidant infants minimise the display of attachment behaviour in the face of rejection; resistant infants maximise it in the face of inconsistency;

disorganised infants show contradictory or fearful behaviour, often in the context of frightened or frightening caregiving. Longitudinal research has demonstrated that secure attachment in infancy predicts more favourable outcomes in socioemotional competence, emotion regulation, peer relationships, and reduced risk for psychopathology, although these associations are probabilistic and moderated by subsequent experience (Sroufe et al., 2005; Thompson, 2016).

Ainsworth's contribution underscores a critical point: it is not the mere presence of a caregiver but the *quality* of the relationship—characterised by sensitivity, consistency, and emotional availability—that fosters the sense of safety and trust necessary for healthy development. Secure attachment is, in essence, the behavioural and representational expression of a trusting relationship.

4. Urie Bronfenbrenner and Ecological Systems Theory

While attachment theory focuses on the dyadic relationship, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory situates that relationship within a nested set of environmental systems that jointly shape development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). The *microsystem* comprises the immediate settings in which the child participates—home, childcare, school—and the face-to-face interactions that occur within them. The *mesosystem* refers to the interconnections among microsystems (e.g., parent–teacher communication). The *exosystem* includes settings that affect the child indirectly (e.g., parental workplace), and the *macrosystem* encompasses cultural values, laws, and social policies. The *chronosystem* adds the dimension of time—both individual developmental time and historical time.

Bronfenbrenner's later bioecological model emphasises *proximal processes*—progressively more complex reciprocal interactions between the developing person and the persons, objects, and symbols in the immediate environment—as the primary engines of development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Stable, responsive relationships are paradigmatic proximal processes. A caregiver who engages in contingent “serve-and-return” interactions, scaffolds the child's exploration, and provides emotional co-regulation is enacting precisely the kind of process that builds brain architecture and developmental competence (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2004). Critically, the effectiveness of proximal processes depends on the broader ecological context: economic stress, social isolation, or community violence can undermine a caregiver's capacity to sustain sensitive interactions, while supportive policies, extended family networks, and high-quality early childhood programmes can strengthen it.

Bronfenbrenner's framework therefore expands the lens beyond the caregiver–child dyad without diminishing its importance. Safe, trusting relationships remain fundamental, but they are themselves nested within and contingent upon larger

systems of support and constraint. Interventions that aim only at the individual or dyadic level while ignoring the ecological surround are likely to have limited and transient effects.

5. Ann Masten and Resilience Science

Resilience science, to which Ann Masten has been a central contributor, addresses the question of how some individuals achieve positive adaptation despite significant adversity (Masten, 2001, 2014; Masten et al., 1990). Resilience is defined as the capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten its function, viability, or development (Masten, 2011). One of the most robust and replicated findings in this literature is that the single most common protective factor for children who thrive in the face of hardship is the presence of at least one stable, committed, and supportive relationship with a caring adult (Masten, 2001; National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2015).

Masten has characterised resilience as “ordinary magic”—not the product of rare and extraordinary qualities, but the operation of basic human adaptive systems when they are given a chance to work (Masten, 2001). Secure attachment relationships, responsive caregiving, and the sense of belonging and safety they provide are among the most powerful of these adaptive systems. They buffer the child from the physiological and psychological effects of toxic stress, support the development of self-regulation and problem-solving skills, and provide models of effective coping. In the absence of such relationships, even children with considerable individual strengths are at elevated risk; with them, many children exposed to serious adversity demonstrate remarkable recovery and competence.

Resilience research thus reinforces and extends the attachment and ecological perspectives. Relationships are not only formative in typical development; they are the primary mechanism through which protective processes operate under conditions of risk. Building and sustaining safe, trusting relationships is therefore a core strategy for promoting resilience at individual, family, and community levels (Masten, 2018).

6. Albert Bandura and Self-Efficacy

Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory and the construct of self-efficacy provide a complementary account of how relationships contribute to agency and competence (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1997). Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s beliefs about their capacity to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. These beliefs influence the goals people set, the effort they expend, their persistence in the face of obstacles, and their emotional reactions to challenge.

Bandura identified four principal sources of self-efficacy information: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences (observing similar others succeed), verbal

persuasion, and physiological and affective states. Safe, trusting relationships are implicated in all four. Responsive caregivers structure opportunities for age-appropriate mastery, provide models of competent behaviour, offer encouragement and realistic feedback, and help regulate the child's arousal so that challenges are experienced as manageable rather than overwhelming. In attachment terms, the secure base enables the exploration and problem-solving that generate mastery experiences; the safe haven helps the child recover from setbacks without catastrophic loss of confidence.

Over time, the internal working models formed in early relationships interact with self-efficacy beliefs. A child who has experienced consistent support is more likely to approach novel situations with the expectation of eventual success and of help if needed. Conversely, chronic relational insecurity can undermine self-efficacy, contributing to avoidance, helplessness, or defensive grandiosity. Bandura's framework thus links the relational foundations of development to the agentic processes that sustain learning, achievement, and mental health throughout life.

7. Complementary Perspectives

7.1 Erikson's Basic Trust

Erik Erikson's psychosocial stage theory places the crisis of *basic trust versus basic mistrust* at the centre of infancy (Erikson, 1950/1963). The infant who experiences consistent, responsive care develops a fundamental sense that the world is reliable and that the self is worthy of care. This "basic trust" is the developmental precursor of hope and the foundation upon which subsequent psychosocial tasks—autonomy, initiative, industry, identity—are built. Erikson's formulation is closely aligned with attachment theory; indeed, Bowlby and Ainsworth can be read as providing the ethological and empirical grounding for the relational processes Erikson described.

7.2 Contemporary Developmental Neuroscience and Relational Health

Modern developmental science has illuminated the biological mechanisms through which relationships shape development. Contingent, reciprocal interactions ("serve and return") between caregiver and child stimulate neural circuit formation, support the development of executive function and stress-regulation systems, and protect against the disruptive effects of toxic stress (Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, 2016; National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2004, 2015; Shonkoff, 2016). The concept of *early relational health*—the capacity to form and maintain safe, stable, and nurturing relationships—has emerged as a unifying framework that integrates attachment, resilience, and neuroscience perspectives (Garner & Yogman, 2021). Safe, stable, and nurturing relationships (SSNRs) are now recognised in public health frameworks (e.g., CDC's Essentials for Childhood) as a primary prevention target for child maltreatment and a foundation for lifelong health.

8. Synthesis: Why Safe, Trusting Relationships Are Fundamental

Across these theoretical traditions, a coherent picture emerges. Human infants are biologically prepared to seek and maintain proximity to protective caregivers (Bowlby). The quality of those early relationships—particularly caregiver sensitivity—organises individual differences in attachment security that shape internal working models and developmental trajectories (Ainsworth). These relationships operate as the core proximal processes within nested ecological systems that either support or constrain their effectiveness (Bronfenbrenner). Under conditions of adversity, the presence of at least one stable, supportive relationship is the most consistent predictor of resilience (Masten). Through the provision of mastery opportunities, modelling, encouragement, and co-regulation, such relationships build the self-efficacy beliefs that sustain agency and competence (Bandura). And at the biological level, they literally shape the developing brain and stress-response systems that underwrite lifelong health and learning.

The practical implication is clear. Efforts to promote healthy development—whether in families, early childhood programmes, schools, or community systems—must prioritise the creation and protection of safe, trusting relationships. This requires attention not only to the skills of individual caregivers but to the ecological conditions that enable or impede sensitive, consistent care. Policies that reduce family stress, expand access to high-quality early care and education, support parental mental health, and strengthen community networks are, on this view, developmental interventions of the first order.

9. Conclusion

The theory that safe, trusting relationships are fundamental to healthy development rests on a broad and deep empirical and theoretical foundation. From Bowlby's evolutionary account of the attachment system, through Ainsworth's demonstration of the power of sensitive care, Bronfenbrenner's ecological embedding of proximal processes, Masten's identification of relationships as the cornerstone of resilience, and Bandura's linkage of relational support to self-efficacy, the evidence converges. Relationships are the medium through which human development unfolds. Ensuring that every child has access to at least one—and preferably many—safe, stable, and nurturing relationships is among the most important investments a society can make in its future.

These theoretical foundations provide the conceptual basis upon which the Paws & Connect Theory of Change is built. The following propositions translate these broad developmental principles into the specific mechanisms through which meaningful relationships—including relationships with companion animals—may contribute to positive developmental outcomes.

Theoretical Summaries

Theory	Principal theorist(s)	Contribution
Attachment Theory	John Bowlby & Mary Ainsworth	Secure relationships provide a foundation for healthy development.
Ecological Systems Theory	Urie Bronfenbrenner	Development occurs within interconnected family, school and community systems.
Resilience Science	Ann Masten	Protective relationships foster resilience following adversity.
Self-Efficacy Theory	Albert Bandura	Supportive relationships build confidence and belief in one's capabilities.
Psychosocial Development	Erik Erikson	Trust is the foundation of healthy psychosocial development.
Developmental Neuroscience	(Multiple researchers)	Safe relationships shape brain development and stress regulation.
Need to Belong Theory	Roy Baumeister & Mark Leary	Belonging is a fundamental human motivation.
Self-Determination Theory	Richard Ryan & Edward Deci	Relatedness is one of three basic psychological needs.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love*. Johns Hopkins Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger*. Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Loss: Sadness and depression*. Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.

- Bretherton, I., & Munholland, K. A. (2008). Internal working models in attachment relationships: Elaborating a central construct in attachment theory. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed., pp. 102–127). Guilford Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793–828). John Wiley & Sons.
- Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. (2016). *From best practices to breakthrough impacts: A science-based approach to building a more promising future for young children and families*. <https://developingchild.harvard.edu/>
- De Wolff, M. S., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child Development*, 68(4), 571–591. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1132107>
- Erikson, E. H. (1950/1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). W. W. Norton.
- Garner, A., & Yogman, M. (2021). Preventing childhood toxic stress: Partnering with families and communities to promote relational health. *Pediatrics*, 148(2), e2021052582. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-052582>
- Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. In M. T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & E. M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research, and intervention* (pp. 121–160). University of Chicago Press.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>
- Masten, A. S. (2011). Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity: Frameworks for research, practice, and translational synergy. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23(2), 493–506. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579411000198>
- Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
- Masten, A. S. (2018). Resilience theory and research on children and families: Past, present, and promise. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 12–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12255>
- Masten, A. S., Best, K. M., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development*

and Psychopathology, 2(4), 425–444.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400005812>

National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2004). *Young children develop in an environment of relationships* (Working Paper No. 1). Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. <https://developingchild.harvard.edu/>

National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2015). *Supportive relationships and active skill-building strengthen the foundations of resilience* (Working Paper No. 13). Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University.
<https://developingchild.harvard.edu/>

Shonkoff, J. P. (2016). Capitalizing on advances in science to reduce the health consequences of early childhood adversity. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 170(10), 1003–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2016.1559>

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development*. National Academy Press.

Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., Carlson, E. A., & Collins, W. A. (2005). *The development of the person: The Minnesota study of risk and adaptation from birth to adulthood*. Guilford Press.

Thompson, R. A. (2016). Early attachment and later development: Reframing the questions. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (3rd ed., pp. 330–348). Guilford Press.