|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reciprocity** | | **Interactional synchrony** | |
| Define |  | |  | |
| Example |  | |  | |
| How do they overlap? |  | | | |
| Supporting evidence + grounding | Meltzoff and Moore | Belsky | | Isobella |
| Studies are well carried out-valid and reliable |  | | | |
| Not universal |  | | | |
| Practical applications |  | | | |

**Caregiver-infant interactions in humans**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schaffer’s stages of attachment** | | | | | | | |
| Pre-attach | Birth-3 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Evaluation** | | | | | | | |
| P-The stages are based on longitudinal research evidence which strengths support for the stages as not based on subjective opinion BUT | | | | | | | |
| E-Method | | | | Findings | | | |
| **L- BUT the stages are based on evidence of only 60 babies from Glasgow and so questions whether the stages really do generalise to all children around the world.** | | | | | | | |
| **Not universal** | | | | | | | |
| **Pre attachment stage may be wrong** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role of the father** |  |
| **Summary of key research findings** | |
| Are fathers different to mothers- | |
| Can fathers be as sensitive as mothers? | |
| How important are they in secondary caregivers? | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Not enough research to make a firm conclusion | |
| Maybe Dad’s aren’t that important then? | |
| Socially sensitive | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Animal studies** | | | | | |
| **Harlow** | | | **Lorenz** | | |
| **Problems of extrapolation** | | | **Difference in nature and complexity of bond** | | |
| **Imprinting not permanent** | | | | | |
| **Ethics** | | | | | |
| **Explanations of attachment-** | | | |
| **Bowlby’s Monotropic theory** | | **Learning theory** | |
| Evaluation | | | |
| Supported by Harlow | | Contradicted by Harlow | |
| Overemphasises nature and nurture | | | |
| Socially sensitive | | Too simplistic (link to above) can’t explain reciprocity etc so need to look at alternative explanations | |
| **Types of attachment and Ainsworth’s strange situation** | | | | | | | |
| Secure | | | Insecure-avoidant | | Insecure-resistant | | |
|  | | |  | |  | | |
| **Ainsworth’s strange situation** | | | | | | | |
| **Method**(all 8 stages)  **Findings** | | | | | | | |
| **Secure** | | | **Avoidant** | | **Resistant** | | |
| **Evaluation** | | | | | | | |
| Validity | | | | | | | |
| Reliability | | | | | | | |
| Cultural bound | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cultural variations in attachment-Van izendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988)** | |
| Procedures | Findings |
| Conclusion | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| There are more similarities than differences especially in security | |
| **Issues with meta analysis** | |
|  | |
| **Culture bound** | |
|  | |
| **Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Evaluation** | | | |
| Deprivation confused with privation | | | |
| Issues with the 44 thieves study that he based the hypothesis on **that reduce support for the hypothesis** | | | |
| Application to real life. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Romanian orphans: Effects of institutionalisation** | | |  | |
| Rutter –(aims, methods, findings and conclusions)  O’connor (2000)  Summary of the effects of institutionalisation | | | | |
| Kumasta (2010) | Cognitive | Emotional | | Physical |
| **Evaluation** | | | | |
| Reliability, Longitudinal studies, positive | | | | |
| Natural and extraneous variables | | | | |
| Application | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The influence of early attachment on childhood and adult relationships, including internal working | |
| **IWM-** | |
| **Prototype/continuity** | **Revisionist** |
| **Findings of a childhood study** | |
| Findings of one adult study | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Retrospective data | |
| Causation and low correlations | |
| Too simplisitic | |