

# Basic Attachment Notes

Learn this or fail module 1  
You should also learn APFCC for at least one study in each section

Description AO1	Evidence/Commentary AO1/AO2	Criticism & Evaluation AO2
<b>Development of Attachments</b>		
<b>Definition</b> A close emotional relationship between two persons characterised by mutual affection and a desire to maintain closeness.		
<b>Characteristics</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeking proximity to carer</li> <li>2. Distress on separation</li> <li>3. Pleasure when reunited</li> <li>4. Orientation towards carer</li> </ol>		
<b>Stages of Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0-6 weeks – <i>asocial</i> – crying &amp; smiling, but not directed at anyone</li> <li>• 1-7 months – <i>indiscriminate</i> – attention sought from variety of people</li> <li>• 7-11 months – <i>specific</i> – strong attachment to particular person/people</li> </ul>	<b>Shaffer &amp; Emerson (1964)</b> found that most children form first proper attachment at around 7 months. Fear of strangers appears about a month later. Also found that children tend to attach to people who are emotionally responsive, not necessarily those who feed them etc.	Some data was collected by mothers themselves. Some retrospective data gathering. Potential for bias in results.
<b>Individual Differences in Attachment</b>		
<b>Secure &amp; Insecure Attachment</b> Classification using Strange Situation (SSC). Children assessed on how they respond when left alone and the reunited with carer. 3 types of attachment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secure – distress on separation, joy when reunited</li> <li>2. Resistant – distress on separation, rejects carer when reunited</li> <li>3. Avoidant – little reaction to separation or being reunited.</li> </ol>	<b>Ainsworth &amp; Bell (1970)</b> found 70% secure, 10% resistant, 20% avoidant. Suggested that attachment type was due to parental behaviour, which affects child's view of self: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secure – responsive &amp; sensitive mother – positive view of self</li> <li>2. Resistant – inconsistent mother – negative view of self leads to aggression &amp; exaggerated responses</li> <li>3. Avoidant – unresponsive mother – view of self as worthless</li> </ol>	<b>Main et al (1985)</b> assessed children's attachments at 1 yr and 6 yrs. Most children had same type of attachment second time, so SSC is reliable. <b>Sroufe (1983)</b> compared SSC types with other measures. Secure children more popular, less aggressive, higher self-esteem, so SSC is valid. Ainsworth assumes that attachment type is fixed, but evidence suggest children have different attachment types with different people SSC classification says it's all due to the parent's treatment of the child, but the child's own temperament/personality might contribute.

Description AO1	Evidence/Commentary AO1/AO2	Criticism & Evaluation AO2
<p><b>Cultural Variation in Attachment</b> Attachment is universal. It appears in every culture. Cultures vary in how they rear children, this leads to some variation in attachment styles between cultures.</p> <p><b>Van Ijzendoorn &amp; Kroonenberg (1988)</b> found that in all cultures, secure was the commonest attachment type. However, lots of variation, so in Japan, more resistant, fewer avoidant kids; Germany, more avoidant, few resistant kids.</p>	<p>Unlikely that Israelis/Germans are bad parents. Probably reflects cultural differences in what different cultures expect from children – in Japan, kids rarely separated from mother, so get v. upset in SSC; in Germany, independence is encouraged, so kids not upset when carer leaves.</p>	<p>Problem with the cross-cultural validity of the SSC. In US/UK, not reacting when carer leaves probably indicates a problem but the same behaviour has a different meaning in Germany.</p> <p>Using the SSC in other cultures without understanding that the results may mean different things can result in cultural bias (imposed etc).</p>
<b>Explanations of Attachment</b>		
<p><b>Learning Theory</b> 'Cupboard love' – kids attach to whoever feeds them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conditioned association between mother and food, as mother and food always occur together. After a while, the mother's presence comforts the child because of the association with food.</li> <li>2. Operant conditioning – child learns that some behaviours (e.g. smiling) bring attention/food etc. These behaviours are reinforced &amp; the child does them more.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Harlow (1959)</b> found that infant monkeys showed attachment to a cloth mother even when it was a wire mother than fed them.</p> <p><b>Shaffer &amp; Emerson (1964)</b> found that in many cases a child's first attachment figure was not the person who looked after their physical needs.</p> <p>These findings suggest that physical needs/food/learning are not the basis for the formation of attachments.</p>	<p>Not always safe to generalise from monkeys to humans, but all the research seems to say the same thing.</p> <p>The learning theory of attachment is basically wrong.</p>
<p><b>Bowlby's Attachment Theory</b> Evolutionary approach – kids are biologically programmed to form attachments to people.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kids have a range of attachment behaviours that signal adults to attend to them (e.g. crying, smiling)</li> <li>2. They form emotional relationships with whoever is responsive to these signals.</li> <li>3. Attachment has several functions – safety, emotional development, secure base for exploration.</li> <li>4. Attachment is monotropic i.e. one attachment is more important than all others (prototype)</li> </ol>	<p>The existence of attachment in all human societies suggests it's biological.</p> <p><b>Shaffer &amp; Emerson (1964)</b> found that attachments are formed with responsive adults.</p> <p><b>Hazan &amp; Shaver (1987)</b> found that adult relationships correlate with attachment to parents.</p> <p><b>Fox (1977)</b> found that kibbutz children (Israel) form strongest attachments with parents, even though they see them relatively little.</p> <p>These findings support various aspects of Bowlby's theory.</p>	<p>Correlations between attachment behaviour and other behaviour are often very weak. Suggests that Bowlby may have overstated the influence of attachment.</p> <p>However, well-supported theory overall – the main problems arise with what B said about deprivation (see below).</p>

Description AO1	Evidence/Commentary AO1/AO2	Criticism & Evaluation AO2
<p><b>Deprivation &amp; Privation</b></p> <p>Two key terms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Deprivation – attachment is formed then interrupted</li> <li>2. Privation – no attachment is allowed to form</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Short-term Separation</b></p> <p><b>The PDD Model</b></p> <p>Short-term separation (days/weeks) has an emotional impact on the child. 3 stages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protest – child gets very upset</li> <li>2. Despair – apathy, depression</li> <li>3. Detachment – recovery, but attachment may need to be relearned</li> </ol>	<p><b>Robertson &amp; Bowlby (1952)</b> observed kids placed in temporary foster care – found predictable sequence in reactions.</p>	<p>Doesn't take into account individual differences e.g. securely attachment child may cope better with separation than resistant one.</p> <p>Reaction is not inevitable. Can be avoided if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Child prepared for separation</li> <li>2. Normal routines are followed</li> <li>3. Carers talk to child about mother whilst separated.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Maternal Deprivation Hypothesis (MDH)</b></p> <p>Based on Bowlby's theory. If attachment is the prototype for future relationships, then anything that affects attachment can affect future ability to relate to others. In extreme cases, child may be unable to form relationships with others (affectionless psychopathy)</p>	<p><b>Bowlby (1946)</b> compared disturbed children with criminal children. Found that juvenile offenders more likely to show 'affectionless' character and more likely to have been separated from mother during childhood. This supports the MDH.</p> <p><b>Spitz &amp; Wolf (1946)</b> studied hospitalised children – found they became withdrawn &amp; depressed. Recovery was usually complete if separation lasted less than 3 months not harder if longer. Supports view that separation has important consequences.</p> <p><b>Bowlby (1956)</b> found that children hospitalised long-term with TB did not have relationship problems when older. This contradicts the MDD</p>	<p>Study relied on retrospective data – possibly not reliable. Bowlby made the diagnosis of affectionless psychopathy himself – might have been biased. Generally didn't pay enough attention to the causes of the separation e.g. mental illness or imprisonment of the mother.</p> <p>Does not necessarily support the idea that deprived children lose the ability to form relationships.</p> <p>Likely that the circumstances surrounding the separation are more important than the separation itself. E.g. divorce with a high level of parental conflict may well affect a child, but it's the conflict that matters, not just the separation from one of the parents.</p> <p>Although disruption of an attachment can affect the child in the long term this is not inevitable and Bowlby probably</p>

	Evidence/Commentary AO1/AO2	overestimated effects of deprivation.
<p><b>Description AO1</b></p> <p><b>Privation</b></p> <p>Bowlby believed there was a critical period for attachments to form (not before 6 months, not after 2 years). Believed that if an attachment didn't form within the critical period, then the child would be unable to form attachments at all. Suggested a severe impact on emotional and cognitive (thinking) development.</p>	<p><b>Curtiss (1989)</b> found that Genie was severely retarded as a result of chronic deprivation. With intensive training she developed the ability to attach to people and some language, but never achieved normality for her age. Suggests that effects of chronic deprivation are permanent.</p> <p><b>Freud &amp; Dann (1951)</b> found that a group of holocaust orphans were underdeveloped and had poor speech and aggression problems. Recovery was fairly rapid once they were placed in foster homes. Suggests that privation effects are reversible.</p> <p><b>Hodges &amp; Tizard (1989)</b> studied children in care with no attachments. Cognitive development was normal. After adoption recovery was good. Children generally developed normally but tended to have difficulty at school. Suggests that privation is reversible.</p>	<p><b>Criticism &amp; Evaluation AO2</b></p> <p>Unwise to generalise from a single case study. Not known if Genie had congenital problems that would have affected her development anyway. Fact that she formed attachments at all suggests that Bowlby was not completely correct.</p> <p>Case study again – very small sample. Children were able to form attachments to each other during time in camp. Therefore they were not under total privation. This may have helped their development.</p> <p>Children adopted did better than children who went back to their birth parents. Suggests that a special effort/very supportive environment is needed to help children get over privation.</p>
		<p>Generally, deprivation and privation are less damaging and more recoverable than Bowlby suggested but that doesn't mean it's easy to get over. Privation/deprivation is best seen as a risk factor for later maladjustment, rather than a direct cause.</p>

<b>The Effects of Day Care</b>		
<b>Description AO1</b>	<b>Evidence/Commentary AO1/AO2</b>	<b>Criticism &amp; Evaluation AO2</b>
<p>Day care raises concerns because it involves the regular separation of child from attachment figure. According to Bowlby and others, this could affect the child's development in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cognitive development – the child's intellect</li> <li>2. Social development – the child's ability to relate to others.</li> </ol> <p>Others have argued that daycare is beneficial because it exposes a child to a stimulating environment (cognitive) and lots of other children and adults (social).</p> <p><b>Cognitive Development</b>  <b>Burchinal et al (1989)</b> day care children have higher IQs than home children on entering school.  <b>Broberg et al (1997)</b> at age 8, nursery children score higher than home and childminder children of tests of maths and verbal ability.</p> <p><b>Social Development</b>  <b>Kagan et al (1980)</b> compared kids at home with kids in daycare. Found no differences in social behaviour.  <b>Vandell &amp; Corasaniti (1990)</b> found that daycare children score lower on measures of sociability &amp; emotional health than home children.  <b>Clarke-Stewart et al (1994)</b> found that day care kids were more socially advanced than home kids.</p>	<p>These findings suggest that daycare is often beneficial, probably because of the additional structure &amp; stimulation it gives young kids.</p> <p>Suggests that daycare can have both positive &amp; negative effects. Probably depends on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality of care – poor quality care leads to poor outcomes</li> <li>2. Child's personality – outgoing kids are more likely to benefit from daycare than shy ones.</li> </ol>	<p>Day care can mean several different things e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staying with a relative</li> <li>• Going to a childminder</li> <li>• Going to a nursery school</li> </ul> <p>Different types of care are little to have different effects.</p> <p>Also that not all care is the same. E.g. childminder usually has a negative effect, possibly because the children are not stimulated and are rewarded for keeping quiet.</p> <p>Quality of care likely to be important here as well.</p> <p>Other factors likely to affect daycare outcomes include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Age at which child started care</li> <li>2. Frequency and duration of care</li> </ol> <p>Should also consider <b>why</b> child is in daycare/at home and how carer responds to this. E.g. a parent who wants to spend time with child but is forced to work to get money may transmit anxiety to kid, or simply be too tired to relate well when at home.  Conversely, a parent who feels forced to stay home but resents giving up work may become resentful of the child.</p>

