Learning theory: Bollard and Miller
Attachment based on Operant & classical Conditioning. First attachment-care giver looks after them, feeds changes, comfort. Powerful source of pleasure for baby and remaining physical & emotional discomfort. Operant: Skinner-rats in cage/(animals), explored their surroundings, animal presses lever gets food; learns to repeat behaviour for pleasure, food-operant-positive reinforcement-learn by reward e.g. food. Negative reinforcement-repeat a behaviour to switch off discomfort, behaviour leads to unpleasant outcome-less likely to be repeated.

Classical conditioning: Learn through association-Pavlov-mils is unconditioned stimulus-provides unconditioned response-baby is given pleasure/relief from hunger. Becomes a reflex/automatic as the baby associates whoever feeds them (neutral stimulus) with the food and soon the person produces a learned/conditioned response of pleasure and relief.

EV: Harlow & Zimmerman-Rhesus monkeys-isolated & deprived from real mothers until 8 months old.2 surrogate mothers one made from wire brush the other from soft fabric. Wire mother-feeding bottle, measured time spent with each mother. Used toy to scare them to see which mother they went to-soft mother for comfort (safe base). Only used wire mother for food. Can’t be generalised, strong EV-suggests there’s more to attachment than feeding and rewards. Shaffer & Emerson: Development of attachments.60 Glaswegian babies-visited monthly up to 18 months, data on: separation anxiety-shows attachment, stranger distress-distress at strangers shows a baby can recognise familiar people, anxious at unfamiliar. Interviews observation, approach baby see if they showed distress. Asked about situations leaving the baby, had to rate 1-3, 39% wasn’t person carrying physical care, that baby was attached to the caregiver who was most sensitive.

Why we develop attachments

Types of attachment: Ainsworth-individual differences, range situation.100 Americans infants used 12-18 months old, laboratory based.
1.) Mother & infant enter the room-child enters to play
2.) Stranger enters sits on second chair, talks with mother.
3.) Stranger approaches infant attempts to interact,
4.) Baby leaves, stranger attempts to comfort and play with the baby.
5.) 3 mins, mother returns, stranger leaves.
6.) 3 mins, mother leaves again
7.) Stranger enters and attempts to play/comfort
8.) mother returns, stranger leaves

Can assess separation anxiety and stranger Anxiety, behaviour to strange environment. B-Secure types-safe base, showed distress, welcomed back on return, wary of stranger and treated them differently.
A-Insecure avoidant-didn’t have same behaviour towards mother. Showed distress didn’t seek comfort, rejected stranger -keeping distance-avoiding closeness.
C-Insecure ambivalent- upset at separation-not easily comforted, angry and rejected attempts to comfort them, relationship difficult, alternated seeking closeness/distance.
Incredibly stressful for the baby more than Shaffer & Emersons.

Cultural variations: Van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg-meta analysis-8 different Countries-32 studies. using strange situation, differences in attachment types. 2000 were studied. Babies classed as type A, B, C. Large differences between cultures-reflect different Approaches to child rearing. Type B-most common-less in china most in England. Type A-Most common in western countries-less in Japan. Type C-most common in Israel, china and Japan, Scandinavian countries the least.2 japs’s studies-no Type A, second 20% similar to Ainsworth. Intra-cultural variation 1 ½ x the cross cultural variation.

Evolutionary theory: Bowlby
Maternal deprivation hypothesis, theory of attachment.
Innate: Tendency to form attachment for survival to mature and reproduce. Babies possess social releasers that unlocks the innate tendency to care for them by there physical and behavioural releasers. If baby or mother don’t possess these releasers then they have been removed from the gene pool.
Monotropy: Form a primary attachment to one caregiver.
Internal working model: First attachment provides a template for future Relationships, including how you and other people are likely to behave. Influences Child’s relationships through to adulthood-continuity hypothesis.
Process of attachment -2 1/2 years critical period borrowed form Lorenz (attachment in animals), if the attachment is broken or disrupted before the critical period cause serious consequences.

EV: Hazan & Shaver-continuity hypothesis. "love directly related to attachment type as a child"-produced love quiz, North American paper, three description, 1-uncomfortable getting close, difficult to trust, difficult to depend on.2 easy to get close, comfortable depending, doesn’t worry about abandonment.3-others reluctant to get close, doubt, wants to get close but afraid. The groups randomly selected by Gender. "secure"-lasting love, "anxious avoidant"-doubtful of love ,ambivalent"-fall in love easily, rarely fond true love. Tested two groups,1-215 men &315 women randomly selected.2-108 Undergraduates strong relationship in childhood attachment type and adulthood attachment type.