**Attachment (Paper 1)** 

**Caregiver- Infant Interactions:**

**The non-verbal communication between and infant and their caregiver (e.g. mother or father)**

There are two types of interactions:

* Reciprocity - caregivers and infants’ responses to signals (e.g.mother smiles which triggers a smile from infant) - taking turns - baby takes an active role- “like a dance” {Brazelton}
* Interactional Synchrony- infant and caregiver reflect each others actions and emotions in a coordinated fashion (e.g. both laughing )

N.B > Babies have an alert phases = keep them ready for interactions

The four characteristics of attachment (proposed by Mcooby):

* Proximity seeking- trying to stay physically close
* Separation distress- when attachment figure leaves, person is distressed and anxious
* Secure base- make regular contact with attachment figure ( e.g. returning to mother whilst playing)
* Pleasure at reunion- the happiness felt when they are back together with attachment figure

N.B> Brazelton says that the better the attachment, the better the interactions.

**Studies: ( It is up to you how to use these studies, if you were given an essay question [AO1 or AO3])**

Meltzoff et al :

* Observed babies (young as 12 weeks)
* Adult displayed either a facial expression or gesture
* Child response filmed
* Association found between the actions and baby

Isabelle et al:

* Observed 30 infant-mother units (one mother+one infant= one unit)
* Looked at level of synchrony and quality of attachment
* Better synchrony shown with better better quality of attachment

**Some general evaluation points: You must develop these more indepth**

* Internal validity is low - all conclusions made on assumptions that the hand gestures or facial expressions were interactions - cannot know for certain it is exactly that.
* Generalisation problems: most ,nearly all, research done with mother- what about the fathers? Field’s study - found primary caregiver fathers interacted the same as primary care giver mothers- do more studies on mothers and fathers - to make generalising universal statements
* Piaget’s critique: imitations are just reflexes-real imitations do not develop until after the age of 1- most studies on children younger than this - does not add support to theory- pointless- question validity

**Role of Father:**

Traditional role: father= breadwinner mother=housewife and childcarer

Scahffer and Emerson: found majority of babies attach to mother first and then father

Crossman: Longitudinal study on both parents and their child (all the way until their teenage years) - Fathers were able to take role of primary caregiver when required- more important role for father is in play and stimulation.

Field et al : Mentioned above - Do you remember it ?

**General Evaluation:**

* Inconsistency in research- everyone looks at fathers’ role differently - lack reliability
* Fathers are not biologically determined to nurture as much - women have high levels of oestrogen and oxytocin = love and care hormones
* Paternally deprived children do not develop differently - McCallum et al- single sex or same sex families developed same as “traditional” nuclear families- question validity - contradicts theory
* Culture bias: These studies were carried out in Western Cultures and operationalised accordingly - imposed etic to apply to everyone - Eastern cultures may have a paternal role that is more nurturing (possibly)

**Stages of Attachment {Schaffer and Emerson}**

* 60 babies
* All working class
* All from Glasgow
* Visited home every month for the first year and then at 18 months
* Asked mother questions on the babies behaviour according to the characteristics of attachment (Remember them?)

**Found 4 Stages:**

* Asocial : 0-6 weeks- behaviour to objects and people is the same
* Indiscriminate: 6 weeks- 7 months- more social behaviour- prefer humans
* Discriminate : 7-9 months- display stranger anxiety and separation distress
* Multiple: 10 months onwards - extend attachment to others- multiple attachments- secondary attachments- e.g.father

**General Evaluation:**

* Longitudinal study - a lot of detail collated- better understanding- stronger conclusions - high internal validity - possible individual differences (e.g gender) will not be confounding- also high external validity (ecological ) - natural setting of the child’s home - they will not feel anxiety due to environment
* Not reliable- it is not controlled- cannot be replicated to find consistent findings- question credibility
* Culture bias: sample all from Glasgow - attachments different as well as the stages of forming the attachment- the meta- analysis of Strange Situation shows this - Korea has the most insecure resistant attachment type whilst Germany has the most insecure avoidant- diff culture raise babies differently - also all working class- class differences in child rearing styles. - generalisation problems

**Learning Theory of Attachment (Cupboard Love Theory)**

* Behaviourist approach
* Learn attachments through the environment

**Classical conditioning-**

* Learn attachment through association

At first:

* Food=Unconditioned Stimulus
* Pleasure = Unconditioned Response
* Caregiver= Neutral Stimulus

Overtime:

With multiple pairings of the food and caregiver = caregiver associated with food thus pleasure = when no food needed for caregiver to produce pleasure for infant.

* Pleasure (love) = Conditioned Response
* Caregiver= Conditioned Stimulus

**Operant Conditioning:**

* Learn attachment via consequences
* Positive reinforcement: reward= baby getting fed- strengthens behaviour
* Negative reinforcement: baby crying to get food to avoid hunger- strengthens behaviour
* Punishment: Hunger- weakens behaviour

So the baby builds an attachment [secondary drive] to get food to avoid hunger [primary drive]

**Study:**

**Hay and Vespo:** Attachment is learnt through observing parents and other family members as they model behaviour - view rewards and punishments (e.g. hugging them)- based on social learning theory- **( This can be used to support operant conditioning or you can use this as a resolution to the problems of the early explanations [Classical and Operant])**

**Animal Studies:** Lorenz and his geese or Harlow and his monkeys- food is not important - contact comfort or imprinting (opposing the whole theory)

**General Evaluation:**

* Opposing theory- caregiver-infant interactions- not based on food
* Critique of animal studies: They are less developed (smaller prefrontal cortex) and they are driven by different things - cannot generalise to humans- maybe it is still food for us
* Culture bias: operationalised variables on western ideal - cannot generalise to all cultures- Kibbutz- a very collectivist culture where most children has nannies- still formed high quality attachment with their mothers.

**Animals Studies (Are our attachments innate or taught?)**

**Harlow’s Monkey**

* 16 baby monkeys
* Two wire monkey mothers- one had food whilst one had a cloth
* Monkeys went to clothed soft wired mother even though there is no food
* Monkeys followed to see if their maternal deprivation had an affect on them- found none of them developed “normally”- they were aggressive and less sociable
* Critical periods: 90 days to form attachment- if not deprivation becomes irreversible

L**orenz’s Geese**

* Clutch of goose eggs
* Half left with mother - natural habitat to hatch
* Other half in a lab- in an incubator to hatch (experimental group)
* Experimental group followed Lorenz everywhere even when mixed with control they stayed with their imprinted figure
* Critical period for imprinting: 12-17 hours- if imprinting does not happen in that time, it will never happen.

**General Evaluation:**

* Guiton et al : chicken imprinted on a glove and tried to mate with it - but later on realised this is not beneficial to itself and developed a normal attachment -with a chicken= not irreversible - question validity of Lorenz’s study
* Generalisation problem: especially for Lorenz as geese are not mammals - humans have more emotional involvement for an attachment which cannot be explored with geese- cannot say this applies to humans
* Monkeys suffered a lot of psychological harm- really harsh procedure- they are primates so we can assume the suffering was similar to us - animal activists would find this unethical
* Cost benefit analysis of Harlow’s study : the harm is justified as it did show an innate element to our attachments - also led to Bowlby’s theory which was a ground breaking theory for attachment in humans.

**Bowlby’s Theory of Attachment**

* Attachment = innate
* Rejects learning theory
* Critical period- 3-6 months to 2 ½ years
* Social Releasers: babies born with cute features encourage attention from adults e.g. big eyes
* Monotropic bond: the primary attachment that is stronger and unique compared to other attachments the child will form
* Internal working model: monotropic bond forms the mental representation to the relationship which is a framework for any future relationships

**Studies:**

Brazelton et al: asked carers to ignore all social releasers - babies became distressed and later curled up and laid motionless- validates theory that social releasers are there to elicit caregiving

Bailey et al : studied 99 mothers - mothers with poor attachments in their childhood had poor attachments with their children- validates idea of internal working model

Schaffer et al / Suess et al: both concluded that not everyone only forms a single primary monotropic attachment = collectivist cultures that have an extended family unit - monotropy is not produced here - what happens? Limited?

**General Evaluation:**

* Socially sensitive: negative implications- blames mother that if they are not present for the critical period the child will have negative future relationships or consequences - later explained in his maternal deprivation theory= coerce them to stay home instead of returning to work
* Too reductionist: Kagan explains how temperment of a child and how it is shaped has a stronger influence over future relationships not just an internal working model

**Ainsworth’s Strange situation**

* Assessed quality of attachment
* Testing: Secure base, Proximity seeking, Stranger anxiety , Separation anxiety and Reunion
* The episodes: [image below] <https://www.slideshare.net/sssfcpsychology/individual-differences-in-attachment-29958539>



Found three attachment types:

1. Type A: Insecure avoidant- careless- very little separation and stranger anxiety
2. Type B: Secure- moderate levels of everything
3. Type C: Insecure Resistant- high anxiety and hard to comfort

**General Evaluation:**

* Inter-rater reliability- not subjective or biased on what was seen - can be replicated to have consistent results
* Too simplistic- Solomon explains how some can have an attachment that is a mixture all three- disinhibited attachment- which is not considered
* Question internal validity = No control for temperament and Kagan explained how temperment of a child is more influential - can be a confounding variable
* Culturally bounded: only can be generalised to the western ethnocentric countries- German mothers seen as cold only because variables operationalised on her US lens of attachment- Germans just value independence.

**Cultural Variations of Attachments**

* van Ijzendoorn et al
* Meta- analysis of 32 studies using the strange situation paradigm

Findings:

* Secure attachment was the most popular in all countries
* Germany had the highest percentage of insecure avoidant [40%]
* Israel had the highest percentage of insecure resistant [30%]
* Jin et al
* In Korea
* Used strange situation paradigm to assess 88 children
* Most of them classified as insecure resistant
* Simonelli et al
* In Italy
* Assessed 76 children using the strange situation paradigm
* 50% were secure
* 36% were insecure avoidant ( Maybe due to mothers’ working hours)

**General Evaluation:**

* Large samples: so many babies- nearly 2000 babies in van ijzendoorn study - increases internal validity as it avoids individual differences (gender, temperament) being a confounding variable and any anomalous data produced from bad methodology
* Comparison of countries not culture: e.g. in the urban areas of Tokyo- attachment was similar to the UK whilst th same cannot be said for rural areas
* Similar attachments due to mass media: advocating similar to same child rearing styles via books or TV (e.g Supernanny)
* Strange situation is culturally biased- the operationalised variables done according to a western ideal and concept of attachment.

**Bowlby’s Theory of Maternal deprivation**

* Deprivation= when the monotropic bond is broken (prolonged separation)
* Separation= when the monotropic bond is broken for a short time period
* Privation= when a monotropic bond is never formed
* Long term consequences of deprivation : > affectionless psychopathy > Low levels of intellectual development >Dependency >Dwarfism
* Bowlby and his 44 thieves: > 14/44 had affectionless psychopathy > of the 14, 12 had maternal deprivation > whilst in the control group : 2 were maternally deprived but none had affectionless psychopathy

**General Evaluation:**

* Evidence for low IQ: Goldfarb et al- found lower IQ in children who remained in care beyond the critical period
* Counter for Goldfarb: When the children were re-tested at the age of 12, not all had the low IQ they did to begin with- IQ not dependant on a monotropic bond but something else- experience?
* Rutter’s critique: Bowlby has mixed up deprivation with privation and Bowlby presented his findings for all (privation,separation, deprivation) - question internal validity
* Research bias- Bowlby conducted interviews, selected participants , analysed date - everything done to fit his hypothesis
* Real life application: social care - children given a primary social worker to develop and build a primary caregiver figure

**Institutionnalisation**

* The effects of living in an orphanage for a very long period of time
* Consequences: low IQ, disinhibited attachment

Rutter’s ERA (English Romanian Adoptee) study

* Assessed orphans in care from 2 or 3 weeks and throughout their life
* 3 conditions: >adopted before 6 months >adopted between 6 months and 24 months > adopted between 2-4 years
* Conclusion: those adopted before 6 months formed “normal” secure attachments- those after that developed disinhibited attachments

The Bucharest Early Intervention Project

* Zeanah et al
* Assessed attachments of 95 children
* Between the ages of 12-31 months
* Control group- children who have never lived in a orphanage
* 74% of control= secure attachments
* 19% of experimental group= secure attachments

**General Evaluation**

* ERA = Quasi experiment - internal validity high= the children were abandoned when born- trauma is not a confounding variable on their attachment type
* ERA= real life application-caregiver in institutes are permanent to child - form primary attachment - the theory has predictive value - so can then avoid the negative effects through this
* Rutter also found evidence for low IQ- adopted before 6 months = 102 >adopted between 6 months- 24 months =86 >adopted between 2 years - 4 years= 77 - shows IQ decreases the longer you remain in institute
* Critique of Rutter’s sample: they are very unusual- severely neglected- poor standard of care- the situational variables mean the applications to real life are limited