Clue card

Further research has supported Bowlby’s

Maternal Deprivation Theory.



Clue card

However, Bowlby’s findings from the 44

thieves study can be criticised for investigator bias.



Clue card

Research from Lewis (1954) challenges

Bowlby’s findings into maternal deprivation.



Clue card

Bowlby’s research into maternal

Deprivation was a natural experiment



**For example –Goldfarb (1955)** followed up 30 war orphaned children to age 12. Of his original sample, half had been fostered by the age of 4 whilst the other half remained in the orphanage. At the age of 12, the group fostered had an average IQ of 96, the group that wasn’t fostered by age 4 had an average IQ of 68.

**This is a strength because –** What does the research suggest about early separation? Does this support the MDH?

**For example –** Lewis partially replicated Bowlby’s 44 thieves study on a larger scale, looking at 500 young people. In her sample, a history of prolonged separation from the mother did not predict criminality or difficulty in forming close relationships.

**This is a weakness because –** Does this highlight that criminality is always a consequence of separation? What else could impact on the result of separation?

**For example –** Bowlby didn’t interfere with the way each child was raised and merely recorded their subsequent behaviour

**This is a strength because –** What type of behaviour was Bowlby recording? Does this mean the results can be generalised to other real life cases of maternal deprivation?

**For example –** For example Bowlby himself carried out the investigation, the individual assessments for affectionless psychopathy and the family interviews knowing what he hoped to find. Developmental psychologists have suggested that Bowlby may have interpreted the findings in a bias way in order to generate support for his theory.

**This is a weakness because –** Does this indicate that Bowlby’s results may have been influenced by his own expectations? Are Bowlby’s results accurate?