**Example**

For example, in the Van Izendoorn meta-analysis there was a total of nearly 2000 babies and their primary attachment figures.

**Evaluation/Elaboration**

Why is it a weakness if the attachment categories do not reflect cultural differences? Why would this be a problem when it comes to generalising the findings? Are we right to judge other cultures by our own standards?

**Example - For example,** the Strange Situation was developed by Ainsworth (an American researcher) based on Bowlby’s British theory. In the strange situation, the lack of separation and stranger anxiety and a lack of reunion behaviour would indicate an insecure attachment. In Germany, this behaviour would indicate independence rather than avoidance.

**Point**

A strength of combining the results of attachment studies carried out in different countries is that researchers can end up with very large samples of participants.

**Point**

Comparing cultures using the same ‘Strange Situation’ attachment behaviour can lead to attachment behaviour interpretations being ethnocentric.

**Evaluation/Elaboration**

Why does the fact that the research into attachment types and cross cultural differences being conducted in a lab pose a problem when it comes to generalising the findings?

**Example – For example,** the ‘playroom’ environment in which the infant was interacting in was both strange and unfamiliar to the infant’s everyday environment. This means that, because the research was conducted in a laboratory, the environment is artificial.

**Evaluation/Elaboration**

This is a strength because large samples increase internal validity by reducing the impact of anomalous results caused by poor methodology.
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