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**Knowledge Rich Curriculum Plan**

A Level Psychology – Unit 9 Relationships



| **Topic 1 – Factors Affecting Attraction**  |
| --- |
|  | **Intended Knowledge:***Students will know that…* | **Tiered Vocabulary**  | **Prior Knowledge:***To know this, students, need to already know that…* | **Assessment**  |
| **LO1: Self escribe and evaluate how/why Self Disclosure leads to attraction.**  | * Self-disclosure is the revealing of personal information about one self to another person.
* We reveal more to those we like – and vice versa.
* Self-disclosure is rewarding to the other person, signals that we are trustworthy and is complimentary.
* We are more attracted to those we find rewarding (positive reinforcement).

**Social Penetration Theory Altman and Taylor (1973):**Self-disclosure has two dimensions: breadth and depth. Onion metaphor’ to describe these dimensions: at first, people often share a lot of information about certain aspects of themselves (depth), but consider some topics to be ‘off-limit’ (breadth). As they build trust in their partner’s understanding, breadth increases and then depth also increases. revealing more intimate details. **Disclosure will not always lead to attraction:** * Appropriateness of the disclosure
* Motivations for the disclosure
* Gender Differences
* Content of the disclosure

***There are the following evaluation points:**** If people can be encouraged to be open, honest and share intimate information with their partner, this may increase the likelihood of a relationship being successful – there are practical applications.
* Atman & Taylor (1973) disclosing personal information in the early stages of a relationship (1st date) did not enhance attraction suggesting that timing of disclosure if critical.
* Delega & Grzelak (1979) found that those who violated social norms by revealing over personal information were not viewed favourably suggesting that appropriateness of disclosure is key.
* Brewer & Mittleman (1980) found that the positive impact of disclosure breaks down at extreme levels of intimacy – especially so if in early stages of a relationship.
* Derlega and Chaikin (1976) found that men who disclosed personal information were disliked suggesting that there are gender Differences in the affect of disclosure on attraction.
* Tang et al. (2013) n the USA tended to disclose more than romantic partners in Japan; however, the level of relationship satisfaction was high in both cultures
 | **Penetration**Entering or making your way through something**Self-Disclosure** The revealing of personal information about oneself to another. | Operant Conditioning is a form of learning in which behaviour is shaped and maintained by the consequences of that behaviour. **Positive Reinforcement** Occurs when a behaviour produces a consequence that is satisfying or pleasant so the behaviour Is repeated/strengthened.*A dog will sit to receive a treat or reward.***Key AO3:*** Practical Applications.
* Cultural Differences
* Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence.
 |  |
| **LO2: Describe and evaluate how physical attractiveness leads to attraction (including the matching hypothesis).**  | Physical Attractiveness - the degree to which a person's physical features are considered aesthetically pleasing.**1. The Matching Hypothesis:**We are attracted to people we perceive as a similar level of attractiveness to ourselves. We do not desire somebody more attractive (fear of rejection and abandonment)We do not desire somebody less attractive (want the best)**2. The Halo Effect:**Physical attractiveness is an immediate and accessible way for potential partners to rate each other. Those seen as physically attractive give an impression of being trustworthy, optimistic and sociable. Known as ‘The Halo Effect’ general impression of someone is incorrectly formed based on one characteristic (their attractiveness***There are the following evaluation points:**** Gunnell & Ceci (2010) physically less attractive criminals 22% more likely to be convicted and receive sentences 24 months longer than physically attractive people.
* Walster et al (1966) participants liked more attractive and attractiveness as the most important factor in wanting to see someone again. – 6 months later, people were with someone similar.
* Murstein (1972) photographs of real couples and non-real couples rated for attractiveness and actual couples were rated more similarly than the non-real couples.
* When a third party (parents/dating site/friend) finds an ideal match – however research has found that when third parties do this they often use physical attractiveness as an indicator.
* Complex matching is where partners are attracted to someone when they lack physical attractiveness but make up for it in other ways – the Matching hypothesis cannot account for this.
* Taylor et al (2011) found people requested communication from those they viewed as MOST attractive (not equal), but replied more when the individual was like them.
 | **Physical Attractiveness**The degree to which a person's physical features are considered aesthetically pleasing. | **Key AO3:*** Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence.
* Difference between field experiments and lab experiments.
 |  |
| **LO3: Describe and evaluate filter theory of attraction,.** | Choice of partners is affected by factors limiting those available to select from. Series of filters that slim down the field. **Social Demographics:**Those people we are realistically able to meet with and who we have things in common with – geographical proximity. For instance – those who live near and work with us, or those of similar ethnicity, religion, educational background also important as reassures the relationship has potential for longevity. **Attitudinal Similarity:**Those people who share the same beliefs and attitudes and values as us – this is revealed through self-disclosure, which leads to more intimacy/attraction. **Complementarity:**The degree to which another person meets our needs or complements us in some way. Provides something that we are lacking in a way that enhances overall value.***There are the following evaluation points:**** The importance of sociodemographic factors, similarity of attitudes and complementarity in attraction is something that many people experience in their everyday life – giving this theory face validity.
* A longitudinal study of 94 couples who completed questionnaires, for STR (<18 months), similarity of attitudes was most important, but for long-term complementarity was – supports the theory
* Festinger (1950) found that people who lives closest to the stairways in an apartment block had the most friendships with other residents which suggests the theory applies to friendships too.
* Taylor et al (2010) found that 85% of Americans who got married in 2008, married someone of their own ethnic groups.
* The number of inter-racial marriages has risen considerably since the (1960’s) when it was less than 3% suggesting the theory may no longer apply due to greater social mobility – lacks temporal validity.
* Sociodemographic factors are not as important in modern relationship due to the development of technology, (dating websites and apps) suggesting the theory lacks temporal validity.
 | **1. Demography**The study of statistics such as births, deaths, income, or the incidence of disease, which who how populations change. **2. Complement**Something that contributes extra features to something else in a way that improves or emphasises quality. *(not the same as compliment)***3. Filter**A process to assess (items) in order to reject those that are unwanted. | Self-Disclosure is the revealing of personal information about oneself to another.**Key AO3:*** Longitudinal Studies
* Temporal Validity
* Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence.
 |  |
| **Lo4: Discuss evolutionary explanations for partner preferences including the relationship between sexual selection and human reproductive behaviour.** | **Females – Inter-Sexual Selection:** The ovum are few in number, produced at intervals and are rare. Females prefer quality over quantity in their sexual partner. Females make a greater investment of time, effort and resources both during pregnancy and after birth. Women want a long term committed partner and mot short term casual sex. 1. Genetically fit partner – pass on good genes to offspring – (e.g. facial symmetry).2. Provider – ease the cost and burden of pregnancy and child rearing**Males – Intra-Sexual Selection:**Sperm are easily produced continuously. Males prefer quality over quantity. Males provide little investment both before and after birth – lack of post-coital responsibility. Men desire as many short term casual sex partners as possible. 1. Fertile partner – increased chance of becoming pregnant – youth. 2. Body Shape – increased chance of full-term pregnancy (waist to hip ratio).***There are the following evaluation points:**** Dunbar (1995) analysed 900 lonely heart adverts from 4 US newspapers and found 42% of males sought youthfulness compared to 25% of females.
* Toma (2008) found that men were more likely to lie about their education and income than females.
* Langliois & Roggman (1990) used computer imaging to produce faces of varying symmetrical quality and found a preference for greater facial symmetry in both men and women.
* Clark and Hatfield (1989) stranger to proposition an opposite-sex student on campus for casual sex, 75% of males agreed, whereas no females did.
* There are lots of males who are looking for more than short term casual relationships, and there are females who engage in short term casual relationships.
* Individual differences in partner choice means this theory cannot account for all types of relationships (for example homosexual relationships)
 | **Anisogamy:**The differences between male and female sex cells (gametes). | Difference between natural and sexual selection. **Natural Selection:**Psychological characteristics that are not suited to a species’ environment will be weeded out as prevents survival.Over time, only adaptive characteristics remain in future offspring (survival of the fittest)**Sexual Selection:**Psychological characteristics that are preferred in sexual mates will be remain in future offspring. **Key AO3:*** Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence
* Gender Differences
* Individual Differences
 |  |

| **Topic 2 – Theories of Romantic Relationships**  |
| --- |
|  | **Intended Knowledge:***Students will know that…* | **Tiered Vocabulary**  | **Prior Knowledge:***To know this, students, need to already know that…* | **Assessment**  |
| **LO5: Describe and evaluate Social Exchange Theory of Romantic Relationship.**  | * Partners continually give/receive in terms of value i.e. a series of social exchanges.
* Social exchanges are expensive (time, energy, commitment, emotion).
* People are fundamentally selfish and are concerned with ‘what they can get’ out of a relationship.
* Maintained if both partners feel they are getting more out than what they put in – i.e. a profit situation)
* Rewards - Costs = Profit or Loss
* Rewards – friendships, ex, stimulation, affection etc.
* Costs – freedom given up, time wasted etc.
* Notions of rewards and costs are subjective and can change over time.
* The greater the rewards, the lower the costs, the greater the profit and desire to maintain the relationship.

**A person assesses their rewards by making 2 comparisons:**1. Comparison Level – profit from the Current Relationship
2. Comparison Level for Alternatives – potential profit from an alternative relationship.

***There are the following evaluation points:**** Integrated Behavioural Couples Therapy (IBCT), two-thirds of couples reported that their relationships have significantly improved showing practical applications.
* Mills & Clark (1980) distinguished between communal couples who give for one another out of caring and love, and exchange couple who only give to receive.
* Rusbult (1983) asked found that the balance of exchanges was ignored in the early ‘honeymoon’ stage of a relationship.
* The theory struggles to explain why women choose to stay in an abusive relationship despite the significant costs – although some may argue the cost of abuse is subjective.
* Sedikides (2005) believes that people are not fundamentally selfish and are more than capable of doing things for those they love without expecting anything in return (pessimistic view)
* Hatfield (1979) found over benefitted partners felt guilty and under benefitted partners felt resentment.
 | **1. Economic**Relating to economics or the economy, terms such as profit, loss, investment, costs etc. **2. Exchange**The act of giving one thing and receiving another. **3. Fundamental**Forming a necessary base or core; of central importance. | Concepts of profit and loss. * Practical Applications
* Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence
* Individual Differences
 |  |
| **LO6: Describe and evaluate Equity Theory of Romantic Relationship.**  | Equality means the same whereas equity means fairness. Motivated to achieve fairness in relationships and feel dissatisfied when we perceive unfairness or inequity. Possible dissolution of relationship or opportunity to save a relationship by a return to equity. Definitions of inequity can differ between individuals. Relationships can alternate between periods of equity and inequity. **Walster et al (1978) saw equity based on 3 ideas:*** Distribution - compensations are negotiated to achieve fairness in a relationship e.g. one partner may cook and the other may clean.
* Dissatisfaction – the greater the perceived inequity, the greater the dissatisfaction e.g. someone who over benefits in their relationship will feel guilty and one who under benefits will feel angry.
* Realignment – the more unfair the relationship feels, the harder the partner will work to restore equity or revise perceptions of rewards and costs.

***There are the following evaluation points:**** Utne et al. (1984) studied 118 recently married couples (2 years) and found the greater the perceived equity the greater relationship satisfaction.
* It is not possible to quantify equity in loving relationships as much of what we give is emotional which in unquantifiable as it is intangible.
* Aumer-Ryan et al. (2006) found men and women in Jamaica (non- western) were most satisfied when over-benefitting suggesting Cultural differences.
* Hussman et al. (1987) asked participants to give a performance related pay award and found some people are less sensitive to inequity (benevolent) and others are more sensitive (entitled).
* Clark and Mills (2011) meta-analysis found more evidence for the Importance of equity non-romantic relationships, than in romantic partnerships
* DeMaris (2007) studied 1500 couples and found that for women, a sense of inequity let to a risk of divorce, but this was not true for men.
 | **1. Equity:**The quality of fairness (not the same as equality which is the quality of being equal). **2. Distribution:**The act of sharing something out amongst more than one person. **3. Dissatisfaction:**A lack of satisfaction or happiness.**4. Dissolution:**The action of formally ending a partnership/relationship.**5. Realignment:**The action of changing or restoring something to a different or former(previous) state. | Equality and equity are different. * Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence
* Cultural Differences
* Individual Differences
* Gender Differences
 |  |
| **LO7: Describe and evaluate Rusbult’Investment Model of Commitment. Approach**  | Rusbult’s identified 3 factors that determine how committed a relationship is:**1. Satisfaction Level**Determined by the degree to which the other person meets the individuals needs (e.g. sexual, financial or emotional needs). People will have a high level of satisfaction with if they have more rewards (companionship, attention, emotional support) and fewer costs (arguments, time).**2. Comparison with Alternatives:**Perceived desirability of the best alternative to the current relationship. The extent to which an individual’s needs could be met within an alternative relationship or by being on their own.If needs could be better met elsewhere then commitment to the current relationship will be low. **3. Investment Size:**The most important factor. The number of tangible resources (money/possessions) and intangible, (happy memories) that will be lost if relationships ends. The bigger the investment, the more likely people are to stay.***There are the following evaluation points:**** This model helps us to understand why people stay in relationships where there is infidelity – external validity.
* Notion of 'investment' should include previous investments but also planned future investments, suggesting the model may need refining/updating.
* ‘Battered' women study found women were more likely to return to an abusive partner if they investment was high and alternatives were low.
* Le and Agnew’s (2003) meta-analysis of 52 studie and 11,000 participants and found satisfaction, comparison with alternatives and investment greatly contributed to commitment.
* Much of the research investigating this model is heavily reliant on self-report measures such as the Investment Model Scale which is heavily prone to social desirability bias.
* The investment model claims have been shown to be true across many cultures, and in different populations including homosexual couples
 | **1. Investment:**The act of devoting time, effort, or energy to a particular undertaking with the expectation of a worthwhile result.**2. Intrinsic:**From within someone, something closely connected to or inseparable from you.**3. Extrinsic:**Not from within, something that can be separated from you. | **Key AO3:*** External Validity
* Supporting Evidence
* Challenging Evidence
* Cultural Reliability
* Self-Report Data
 |  |
| **LO8: Describe and evaluate Ducks Phase model of relationship breakdown.** | Duck said there are 4 phases of relationship breakdown:**1. Intrapsychic Phase:**Admission that there is dissatisfaction. Time spent thinking about the reasons for this dissatisfaction and possible ways forward. Eventually leads to 'I can't stand this anymore'.**2. Dyadic Phase:**Confrontation with partner and dissatisfaction is shared Common complaints from person initiating break up include level of commitment. **3. Social Phase:**Friends and relatives are made aware and breakdown is made public. They will take sides, intervene in the couple's relationship and offer advice, which makes reconciliation much more problematic. **4. Grave Dressing Phase:**Both sides construct their version of the relationship breakdown, minimising their faults and maximising their partner’s, whilst trying to show themselves as trustworthy and loyal to attract a new partner. In 2006, Duck and his colleague Rollie added: the Resurrection Phase. Suggesting that we move beyond the pain and distress associated with ending the relationship, and experience personal growth.***There are the following evaluation points:**** During couples’ counselling, couples may be advised to use different strategies depending on the phase they are currently in thus helping couples.
* Akert (1992) found that the person who instigates the break up suffers fewer negative consequences than the non-instigator showing the resurrection phase does not apply to all.
* Most of the research is based on retrospective data, using questionnaires or interviews to ask participants about the break-up after it happened.
* There are ethical issues involved such as confidentiality and protection from harm, as participants may experience distress during research.
* Dickson (1995) found friends and relatives tend to see teenagers’ break-ups as less serious and put more effort into reconciling older couples.
* Duck’s four phases are not universal – they do not apply to every case of relationship breakdown – nor do they always occur in the order described.
 | **1. Phase:**A distinct period or stage in a series of events or a process of change**2. Threshold:**The level at which one starts to feel or react to something.3. Dissolution:The act of formally ending a partnership or relationship. | **Key AO3:*** Practical Applications
* Individual Differences
* Self-Report Data
* Retrospective Data
* Ethical Issues
* Age Related Difference
* Universal
 |  |

| **Topic 3 – Virtual and Parasocial Relationships**  |
| --- |
|  | **Intended Knowledge:***Students will know that…* | **Tiered Vocabulary**  | **Prior Knowledge:***To know this, students, need to already know that…* | **Assessment**  |
| **LO9: Describe & evaluate the role of self-disclosure in virtual relationships.**  | There are 2 contrasting theories to explain the role of self-disclosure in VRs.**1. The Hyper-personal Model - Walther (1996, 2011)*** VR can be more personal and involve more self-disclosure than FtF.
* SD happens earlier is more intense and intimae - the relationship develops quicker.
* More time to manipulate online image called selective self-presentation. present ourselves a positive and idealised way.
* Sense of anonymity and we disclose more.
* The ‘stranger on the train' phenomenon’

**2. Reduced Cues Theory - Sproull and Kiesler (1986)** * VR are less effective because they lack many of the cues we depend on in in FtF.
* Non-verbal cues such a facial expressions and tone of voice.
* This leads to deindividuation because it reduces people’s sense of individual identity which in turn encourages disinhibition when relating to others.
* This can often lead to blunt and aggressive communication which leads to a reluctance to self-disclose and makes it unlikely that a relationship will form.

***There are the following evaluation points:**** The extent and depth of disclosure depends on the type of virtual relationship, social networking (people you may know) as opposed to online dating (strangers).
* Introverts use VRs to make up for their poor social skills, which leads to more self-disclosure and more intimate VR – suggests there are Individual differences.
* Non-verbal cues are different but not absent in CMC, people in online relationships use other cues such as timing and style of message. Acrostics (LOL) and emoji's can replace non-verbal cues.
* Research conducted in the late 1990s and early 2000s. As technology is changing rapidly, so is the nature of online relationships which Suggests the findings may lack temporal validity.
* Nakanishi (1986) found that, in contrast to American culture, women in Japan preferred lower levels of self-disclosure in close relationships.
* Rosenfeld and Thomas (2012) studied 4,000 participants and found 72% of those with internet access were married or had a romantic partner, compared to only 36% of those without internet access.
 | **Inhibition**The constraint of a behaviour, especially of an impulse or desire.**Deindividuation**Occurs when people who are relatively anonymous and lose their sense of personal identity and consequently their inhibitions. | What a virtual relationship is and how that differs to a face to face relationship. **Key AO3:*** Individual Differences
* Self-Report Data
* Temporal Validity
* Cultural Differences
* Supporting Evidence
 |  |
| **LO10: Describe and evaluate the effects of absence of gating on the nature of virtual relationships.**  | A gate, is any obstacle to the formation of a relationship, e.g. a facial disfigurement, a stammer, or extreme shyness. * Face to Face relationships are often ‘gated’ in the sense that there are many obstacles that could interfere with the early development of a relationship (physical unattractiveness, a stammer, shyness etc.).
* This stops relationships forming.
* A major advantage of virtual relationships is the absence of gating.
* Online relationships remove these gates – physical (not actually present) and psychological people are free to create online identities that they could never manage face to face.
* This focusses the attention on more meaningful rather than superficial features of attraction such as how a person looks.
* Once relationships have progressed onto a deeper stage, revelations about ‘gates’ will not be as damaging as they would have been in the real world.
* When relationships move from virtual to the face-to-face phase, they rarely decrease an already-developed attraction.

***There are the following evaluation points:**** McKenna et al. (2002) found 71% of online relationships lasted more than two years, significantly longer than their offline counterparts.
* Rosenfeld and Thomas (2012) studied 4,000 participants and found 72% of those with internet access were married or had a romantic partner, compared to only 36% of those without internet access.
* Research conducted in the late 1990s and early 2000s. As technology is changing rapidly, so is the nature of online relationships which suggest the findings may lack temporal validity.
* Baker and Oswald (2010) asked 207 participants to complete a questionnaire measuring shyness, internet use quality of their friendships, finding a positive correlation between internet usage and friendship quality for shy people only.
* The absence of gates means that people can create online personas that differ greatly from their true selves. In some cases, this can go as far as catfishing.
* Research investigating virtual relationships tend to be of younger people using one online platform.
 | **1. Gate**Any obstacle to the formation of a relationship – for example, physical such as a facial disfigurement or psychological such as extreme shyness. | **Key AO3:*** Individual Differences
* Self-Report Data
* Temporal Validity
* Supporting Evidence
 |  |
|  | McCuctehon (2002) explains the tendency to form parasocial relationships in terms of deficiencies that people have in their own lives.Celebrity worship compensates for some deficiencies such as difficulty forming intimate relationships, poor psychological adjustment and lack of identity. Provides fulfilment they lack in everyday life and adds a sense of purpose and excitement - ‘escape from reality’. A personal crisis or a stressful life event can trigger a progression through the levels of parasocial relationship.  **1. Absorption:**Seeking fulfilment in a celebrity worship motivates the person to focus their attention as far as possible on the celebrity.They want to become absorbed or pre-occupied in their existence. **2. Addiction:**This sense of fulfilment then becomes addictive for the person.Leads them to engage in more risky behaviour such as stalking, in order to get mentally, and sometimes physically, closer to the celebrity they worship.***There are the following evaluation points:**** Greenwood and Long (2009) found some evidence that people may develop celebrity worships as a way of dealing with a recent loss or loneliness.
* Maltby (2005) found a link between females with poor body image and an intense personal parasocial relationship with a female celebrity whose body shape they admired.
* Meloy (1998) reported that stalkers often have a history of failed sexual relationships and are usually not in a sexual relationship at the time of stalking.
* The model can describe the characteristics of people who develop these parasocial relationships, but doesn’t say why.
* Schiappa et al. (2007) found a significant positive correlation between the degree to which they perceived a TV character as ‘real’ and the level of their parasocial relationship.
* Maltby et al (2003) found that entertainment social level linked to extrovert personalities, whereas neurotic personalities were linked to intense personal level and psychotic linked to borderline pathological
 | **Parasocial Relationship**A one sided, unreciprocated relationships, usually with a celebrity, by which the ‘fan’ expends a lot of emotional energy commitment and time.**Unreciprocated** Not returned. | Parasocial RelationshipA one-sided, unreciprocated relationships, usually with a celebrity, by which the ‘fan’ expends a lot of emotional energy commitment and time.**3 Levels:**Entertainment-Social: Least intense. A source of entertainment and fuel for social interaction. **Intense Personal: Intermediate**A greater sense of personal involvement, involves thoughts and feelings. **Borderline Pathological: Strongest** Uncontrollable fantasies and extreme behaviours. These might include spending huge amounts of money/time or illegal acts.That a positive correlation is a relationship where co-variables increase together. **Key AO3:*** Individual Differences
* Self-Report Data
* Supporting Evidence
* Lacks explanatory power.
 |  |
|  | Various psychologists have suggested that there is a tendency to form parasocial relationships in adolescence and early adulthood because of problems forming attachments in childhood. **Mary Ainsworth Attachment Types** Insecure-resistant attachment types are more likely to form parasocial relationships. They can have a relationship without the fear of criticism and rejection that are a part of real life relationships. When in relationships they can be clingy, possessive and jealous which leads to the relationships failing. Intensive celebrity worship allows them to engage in fantasy about the perfect relationship, without heartbreak and rejection.**John Bowlby – Attachment Theory**Monotropic Attachment leads to an Internal Working Model and thenContinuity. Individuals who didn’t form a monotropic bond with a primary caregiver in early childhood will try to find an attachment substitute as adults.A parasocial relationship provides that.***There are the following evaluation points:**** Cole & Leets (1999) studies celebrity fandom in 115 adolescents and found those with insecure resistant attachment were more likely to develop parasocial relationships than insecure avoidant.
* Much of the research on attachment types and parasocial relationships use self-report methods to collect data.
* Maltby et al (2003) found that entertainment social level linked to extrovert personalities, whereas neurotic personalities were linked to intense personal level and psychotic linked to borderline pathological.
* Kienlen et al (1997) found that more than 50% of stalkers had suffered emotional, physical or sexual abuse by their primarycaregivers during early life.
* McCutcheon (2006) measured attachment types in 299 participants and found those with insecure attachment were no more likely to develop parasocial relationships than those with secure attachments.
* This explanation views parasocial relationships as pathological and is negative in contrast to the positive view which suggests they may help improve relationships, personal skills, and overall well-being.
 | **Pathological**Regarded as an illness.  | There are three different types of attachment. One type is healthy and two types are unhealthy. **Secure Attachments:** The baby is confident that the attachment figure will be available to meet their needs. They use the attachment figure as a safe base to explore the environment. They seek the attachment figure in times of distress. They will show distress at separation and joy when reunited. **Insecure Avoidant Attachment:** The baby no not orientate to their attachment figure while investigating the environment (no safe base). They are very independent of the attachment figure both physically and emotionally. They do not seek contact with the attachment figure when distressed. They will not show distress at separation or joy when reunited.**Insecure Resistant Attachment.** The baby will commonly exhibit clingy and dependent behaviour. Show difficulty moving away from the attachment figure to explore novel surroundings (no safe base). When distressed they are difficult to soothe by interaction with the attachment figure. They will show extreme separation distress and initially show joy at reunion but then resist the attachment figure.**Bowlby’s Theory of Attachment states that:****Monotropy** – the first attachment is unique and qualitatively different to all future attachments (does not have to be the biological mother) . **Internal Working Model** - forms a mental representation of their relationship with their primary caregiver and a template to base all future relationships on. **Continuity Hypothesis** – all future relationships will follow the quality of the first attachment (childhood friendships, parenting and romantic relationships)  |  |