|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 |