

Critique of attachment theory: A positive psychology perspective

Parichehr. Mehdi Abadi^{1*} 

¹ MSc Student, School of Psychology, University of East London, London, UK

* Corresponding author email address: Parichehr.ma@aol.com

Article Info

Article type:

Review Article

How to cite this article:

Mehdi Abadi, P. (2023). Critique of attachment theory: A positive psychology perspective. *Journal of Personality and Psychosomatic Research*, 1(2), 1-6.

<https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jppr.1.2.1>



© 2023 the authors. Published by KMAN Publication Inc. (KMANPUB), Ontario, Canada. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to critically examine attachment theory, delving into various aspects where the theory may fall short. By exploring its methodological challenges, cultural biases, potential for oversimplification of complex human behaviors and its deterministic approach to human development, and from the perspective of positive psychology, this critique aims to present a balanced view that acknowledges both the contributions and limitations of attachment theory in the broader landscape of psychological understanding. This critical examination serves as an invitation for continued discourse, fostering the evolution and refinement of attachment theories in the ever-evolving landscape of psychological research and understanding. From a positive psychology perspective, the critique of attachment theory revolves around its potential underestimation of human resilience, adaptability, and the capacity for positive development despite early challenges. By incorporating the strengths and positive adaptation mechanisms that individuals display, particularly in diverse cultural contexts, a more holistic understanding of human development emerges. This approach aligns with the positive psychology's emphasis on growth, resilience, and the potential for flourishing across the lifespan, providing a more comprehensive and optimistic view of human relationships and emotional well-being. To a greater extent, integrating positive psychology principles with attachment theory could lead to a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of human development and relationships.

Keywords: Attachment theory, positive psychology, critique.

1. Introduction

Attachment theory, a seminal framework in developmental psychology, posits that the nature of the early bond formed between a child and their caregiver is pivotal in shaping the individual's future emotional and interpersonal functioning (Swets & Cox, 2023). Originally conceptualized by John Bowlby and later expanded by Mary Ainsworth, this theory has profoundly influenced our

understanding of human development. It suggests that the security and quality of attachment in early life have lasting implications on personal relationships, self-concept, and resilience (Ainsworth, 1978; Bowlby, 1979). However, while the theory has been groundbreaking in many respects, it is not without its critiques and limitations. This study seeks to critically examine attachment theory, delving into various aspects where the theory may fall short. By exploring its methodological challenges, cultural biases, potential for

oversimplification of complex human behaviors and its deterministic approach to human development, and from the perspective of positive psychology, this critique aims to present a balanced view that acknowledges both the contributions and limitations of attachment theory in the broader landscape of psychological understanding.

2. Attachment Theories

2.1. Bowlby's Attachment Theory

John Bowlby, a British psychologist, is considered the father of attachment theory. He proposed that the bonds formed between children and their primary caregivers have an evolutionary basis, helping ensure the child's survival. Bowlby suggested that children are born with an innate drive to form attachments with caregivers because this helps them survive. He identified four stages of attachment development: pre-attachment, indiscriminate attachment, discriminate attachment, and multiple attachments. Bowlby also proposed that children form internal working models of relationships based on their early attachment experiences. These models guide the child's feelings, thoughts, and expectations in later relationships (Bowlby, 1979).

2.2. Ainsworth Attachment Styles

Mary Ainsworth, a developmental psychologist, expanded on Bowlby's work through her research, which led to the identification of different types of attachment styles in children: 1) Secure Attachment: Children who show distress when their caregiver leaves but are able to compose themselves knowing that their caregiver will return. 2) Anxious-Ambivalent (Insecure) Attachment: Children who become extremely distressed when the caregiver leaves and are ambivalent when they return. 3) Avoidant (Insecure) Attachment: Children who avoid their caregiver and show little emotion when the caregiver departs or returns. 4) Disorganized Attachment: A pattern of attachment that is characterized by a lack of clear attachment behavior. Children's behavior in this category is often contradictory, and they often appear confused or apprehensive in the presence of a caregiver (Ainsworth, 1978).

2.3. Adult Attachment Theory

This theory, developed by psychologists including Cindy Hazan and Phillip Shaver, extends attachment concepts to adult relationships. They suggested that the emotional bonds between adults in romantic relationships are partly a function

of the same attachment processes that occur between infants and caregivers. According to Hazan and Shaver, there are three primary attachment styles: secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant. Individuals with a secure attachment style are comfortable with intimacy and are able to form close relationships with others. They believe that others are trustworthy and reliable, and they feel comfortable expressing their emotions. In contrast, individuals with an anxious-ambivalent attachment style are insecure about their relationships and often worry about being abandoned or rejected. They may become overly dependent on their partners and have a hard time trusting others. They tend to be very emotional and may experience intense feelings of jealousy or anxiety in their relationships. Finally, individuals with an avoidant attachment style tend to be emotionally distant and may avoid intimacy altogether. They may have difficulty expressing their emotions and may appear detached or uninterested in their relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

Each of these theories and concepts contributes to our understanding of the fundamental human need for connection and the profound impact that early relationships have on our psychological development and well-being. The field continues to evolve, with ongoing research exploring the complexities of attachment across the lifespan. Attachment theory, while widely influential, has faced various criticisms and challenges over the years. In the following, the study focuses on the primary critiques and critical developments of attachment theory to provide a comprehensive overview.

3. Critiques and Developments of Attachment Theory

3.1. Cultural Bias and Ethnocentrism

Critiques have been raised regarding the Western-centric nature of attachment theory. The norms and practices of child-rearing vary significantly across cultures, yet attachment theory largely reflects Western ideals of parenting and child behavior. For instance, the emphasis on secure attachment reflecting close physical proximity and constant caregiver availability may not align with parenting practices in cultures where communal caregiving or greater child independence is the norm. As a result, the theory risks pathologizing non-Western parenting practices that do not fit its defined attachment styles (Rothbaum et al., 2000). In this regard, researchers like Rothbaum et al. (2001) argue that attachment theory, particularly Ainsworth's classifications, may not be universally applicable due to cultural differences

in child-rearing practices and conceptions of independence and interdependence (Rothbaum et al., 2001). Furthermore, Mesman, et al. (2016) challenge the universality of attachment theory by highlighting significant variations in attachment patterns across different cultures, suggesting that the theory may be limited by its basis in Western norms (Mesman, Van Ijzendoorn, & Sagi-Schwartz, 2016).

Recognizing the cultural biases in classical attachment theory, newer research has begun to explore how attachment manifests in different cultural contexts. Studies like those by Mesman et al. (2016) have highlighted the diversity in attachment practices and norms across cultures, challenging the notion of a universal attachment style and emphasizing the importance of cultural sensitivity in attachment research (Mesman, Van Ijzendoorn, & Sagi-Schwartz, 2016).

3.2. *Overemphasis on Maternal Influence*

Critics like Rutter have pointed out that Bowlby's emphasis on the mother-child bond neglects the role of other caregivers and the broader social context in a child's development (Rutter, 1980). In this regard, the role of fathers and other caregivers in attachment formation has been increasingly recognized, challenging the traditional mother-centric view of attachment theory (Lamb & Bornstein, 2013).

3.3. *Deterministic Views*

A primary criticism of attachment theory is its strong emphasis on early childhood experiences in shaping future behavior and relationships. This perspective can lead to a deterministic view, implying that deviations in early attachment inevitably led to negative outcomes. Such a stance potentially underestimates the plasticity of human development and the capacity for change through later experiences, therapy, and personal growth. In this case, Sroufe et al. (2005) argue for a more nuanced understanding that allows for change and adaptation over time (Sroufe, 2005). While early attachment theory focused primarily on infants and children, recent theories have expanded to include adult attachment styles. Research in this area, like the work of Mikulincer and Shaver (2019), examines how these styles manifest in adult romantic relationships and how they are influenced by earlier life experiences (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2019).

3.4. *Methodological Concerns*

One of the primary critiques of attachment theory is its reliance on limited research methodologies. Ainsworth's "Strange Situation" experiment, a pivotal study in attachment theory, categorized children into secure, avoidant, and anxious attachment styles based on their behavior in a controlled setting. Critics argue that this lab-based approach may not accurately reflect the complexities of real-world parent-child interactions. Furthermore, the interpretation of children's behavior can be subjective and may not account for the myriad of factors influencing a child's response to separation and reunion with their caregiver. Researchers have questioned the reliability and validity of Ainsworth's Strange Situation as a universal tool for assessing attachment, arguing that it may not accurately reflect the child's typical behavior or the quality of the caregiver-child relationship (Main & Solomon, 1990). Further, the subjective nature of assessing attachment, particularly in infants and young children, can lead to inconsistencies and variances in how attachment styles are understood and classified.

3.5. *Neglect of Genetic and Socioeconomic Factors*

Attachment theory predominantly focuses on environmental factors, particularly the role of the caregiver in shaping attachment styles. However, this focus tends to underplay the role of innate genetic and temperamental factors in a child's development. Critics point out that individual differences in children, such as temperament, can significantly influence their attachment behavior and the parent-child dynamic. By not adequately accounting for these intrinsic factors, the theory may oversimplify the complex interplay between nature and nurture in human development. Critics have noted that attachment theory overlooks the impact of socioeconomic, genetic, and historical factors on attachment and development. This perspective is supported by research emphasizing the influence of broader contextual factors on child development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Contemporary research has begun to explore the interplay between genetic factors, temperament, and attachment styles. As suggested by Fearon et al. (2016), genetic predispositions and inborn temperament traits may significantly influence how children form attachments, thereby introducing a more nuanced understanding of the nature versus nurture debate within the context of attachment (Fearon et al., 2016). Moreover, proposed by Crittenden

(2006), Dynamic-Maturational Model (DMM) offers a more flexible and comprehensive framework for understanding attachment across the lifespan. It emphasizes the adaptive nature of attachment behaviors in response to different environmental and contextual factors (Crittenden, 2006). This model, as outlined by Crittenden and Landini (2011), accommodates a wider variety of familial and cultural backgrounds (Crittenden & Landini, 2011). Notably, recent research has also increasingly focused on the neurobiological underpinnings of attachment. Studies, such as those cited by Schore (2016), have explored how early attachment experiences affect brain development, particularly in areas related to emotion regulation and social interaction (Schore, 2015). This neurobiological perspective helps explain the physiological mechanisms through which early experiences may influence later behaviors and mental health. Finally, with the rise of digital communication, researchers are examining how technology impacts attachment processes. Finally, theories like those proposed by Oldmeadow et al. (2013) explore how online interactions and social media may affect the development and expression of attachment styles, particularly among adolescents and young adults (Oldmeadow, Quinn, & Kowert, 2013).

4. From The Perspective of Positive Psychology

Attachment theory, a foundational framework in understanding emotional and interpersonal development, has significantly influenced psychological thought. However, from a positive psychology standpoint, which emphasizes human strengths, resilience, and the capacity for growth, there are several points of critique. This study also explores the criticisms of attachment theory from a positive psychology perspective, highlighting the potential limitations in acknowledging human adaptability and resilience. Critiques of attachment theory from the perspective of positive psychology often revolve around the potential focus on pathology and the past rather than emphasizing strengths, resilience, and future-oriented aspects of individuals. Positive psychology, as a field, aims to promote well-being, strengths, and positive emotions. Here are some points that have been discussed:

4.1. Overemphasis on Negative Aspects and Pathology

Attachment theory, with its roots in understanding the impact of early relationships on later development, has been criticized for its potential to overly focus on pathology and negative experiences. Positive psychology encourages a

shift towards understanding and fostering positive qualities and strengths in individuals (Wood & Tarrier, 2010).

Attachment theory traditionally concentrates on the risks and deficiencies associated with insecure attachment styles, such as avoidant or anxious attachment. From a positive psychology perspective, this approach might inadvertently overshadow an individual's strengths and capacities. A more balanced view would consider how even those with challenging early experiences can cultivate positive traits such as resilience, empathy, and self-reliance.

4.2. Potential Stigmatization

Positive psychology aims to reduce stigma and promote a more inclusive understanding of human experiences. There are concerns that attachment theory, without a balanced perspective, may inadvertently contribute to stigmatization of individuals who have experienced less-than-optimal early attachments (Lopez & Snyder, 2009).

4.3. Neglect of Individual Differences and Cultural Context

Some argue that attachment theory may oversimplify complex human experiences and neglect individual differences and variations in coping mechanisms. Positive psychology encourages a more personalized and strengths-based approach, recognizing the uniqueness of each individual (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The positive psychology perspective emphasizes the role of cultural context in shaping psychological outcomes. Attachment theory, primarily rooted in Western child-rearing practices, might not fully encapsulate the diverse expressions of attachment and caregiving seen globally. Positive psychology encourages a more inclusive understanding of how different cultural practices can foster healthy psychological development, even if they diverge from traditional Western notions of secure attachment (Seligman, 2001).

4.4. Focus on the Past

Attachment theory often looks at early childhood experiences and their impact on later life. Critics argue that this backward-looking perspective may not fully capture an individual's capacity for change and growth. Positive psychology emphasizes the importance of focusing on the present and future potential for well-being (Lopez & Snyder, 2009). While attachment theory highlights the importance of early relationships in developmental outcomes, positive

psychology extends this focus to include the potential for growth and flourishing in later life relationships. This perspective suggests that individuals are not solely defined by their early experiences but have the potential to form fulfilling and nurturing relationships throughout their lives, contributing positively to their overall well-being (Seligman, 2001).

4.5. *Underestimation of Resilience and Adaptability*

Attachment theory, particularly in its traditional formulations, often emphasizes the long-lasting impact of early attachment experiences on an individual's future relationships and emotional well-being. From a positive psychology viewpoint, this emphasis may overlook the human capacity for resilience and adaptability. People often demonstrate remarkable ability to overcome early adversities, and a singular focus on early attachment experiences may underestimate this potential for growth and change throughout the lifespan (Ryan, Brown, & Creswell, 2007).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

While attachment theory has been a cornerstone in understanding human development, these criticisms highlight the need for a more nuanced, culturally sensitive, and contextually aware approach. The critiques emphasize the importance of considering a variety of caregivers, cultural norms, and environmental factors in understanding attachment and development. They also suggest that attachment theory should be viewed as a part of a larger developmental system, rather than as a standalone explanation for human behavior and relationships. Recognizing these limitations is essential for a balanced understanding of human development, one that integrates attachment theory with other perspectives and acknowledges the multifaceted nature of human growth and relationships.

Furthermore, this study showed that the foundational work of Bowlby and Ainsworth has been expanded upon in various directions, including adult relationships, neurobiology, and cross-cultural studies. The ongoing research in this field continues to highlight the importance of early attachment experiences in shaping individual development and well-being. New theories and perspectives illustrate the dynamic and evolving nature of attachment theory in psychology. They underscore the importance of considering biological, cultural, technological, and lifespan factors in understanding attachment processes, reflecting the

complexity and diversity of human experiences and relationships.

Finally, from a positive psychology perspective, the critique of attachment theory revolves around its potential underestimation of human resilience, adaptability, and the capacity for positive development despite early challenges. By incorporating the strengths and positive adaptation mechanisms that individuals display, particularly in diverse cultural contexts, a more holistic understanding of human development emerges. This approach aligns with the positive psychology's emphasis on growth, resilience, and the potential for flourishing across the lifespan, providing a more comprehensive and optimistic view of human relationships and emotional well-being. To a greater extent, integrating positive psychology principles with attachment theory could lead to a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of human development and relationships.

In sum, as this study scrutinizes the critiques on attachment theory, it becomes evident that while attachment frameworks have significantly contributed to our understanding of human development and relationships, they are not without their shortcomings. The criticisms shed light on the need for a more nuanced approach that considers the dynamic and diverse nature of human experiences, incorporates cultural perspectives, and acknowledges the complexities of adult relationships. This critical examination serves as an invitation for continued discourse, fostering the evolution and refinement of attachment theories in the ever-evolving landscape of psychological research and understanding.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my professors.

Declaration of Interest

The author of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethics principles

In this research, ethical standards were considered.

Funding

The author declared no funding for this study.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1978). The bowlby-ainsworth attachment theory. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1(3), 436-438. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00075828>

Bowlby, J. (1979). The bowlby-ainsworth attachment theory. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 2(4), 637-638. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00064955>

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard university press. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=OCmbzWka6xUC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=Bronfenbrenner,+U.+\(1979\).+The+ecology+of+human+development:+Experiments+by+na+ture+and+design.+Harvard+university+press.&ots=yAJWK3PQhf&sig=74-NEI9hjEqqVMFKbRs_RiM6dcY#v=onepage&q=Bronfenbrenner%2C%20U.%20\(1979\).%20The%20ecology%20of%20human%20development%203A%20Experiments%20by%20nat+ure%20and%20design.%20Harvard%20university%20press.&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=OCmbzWka6xUC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=Bronfenbrenner,+U.+(1979).+The+ecology+of+human+development:+Experiments+by+na+ture+and+design.+Harvard+university+press.&ots=yAJWK3PQhf&sig=74-NEI9hjEqqVMFKbRs_RiM6dcY#v=onepage&q=Bronfenbrenner%2C%20U.%20(1979).%20The%20ecology%20of%20human%20development%203A%20Experiments%20by%20nat+ure%20and%20design.%20Harvard%20university%20press.&f=false)

Crittenden, P. M. (2006). A Dynamic-Maturational Model of Attachment. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 27(2), 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.2006.tb00704.x>

Crittenden, P. M., & Landini, A. (2011). *Assessing adult attachment: A dynamic-maturational approach to discourse analysis*. WW Norton & Company. https://books.google.com/books/about/Assessing_Adult_Attachment_A_Dynamic_Mat.html?id=sNsUvgAACAAJ

Fearon, R. M. P., Groh, A. M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Roisman, G. I. (2016). Attachment and Developmental Psychopathology. In *Developmental Psychopathology* (pp. 1-60). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119125556.devpsy108>

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Deeper into attachment theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 68-79. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0501_15

Lamb, M. E., & Bornstein, M. H. (2013). *Social and personality development: An advanced textbook*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813386>

Lopez, S. J., & Snyder, C. R. (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.001.0001>

Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research, and intervention*, 1, 121-160. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WzHfCXE8EC&oi=fnd&pg=PA121&dq=Main,+M.,+%26+Solomon,+J.+\(1990\).+Procedures+for+identifying+infants+as+disorganized/disoriented+during+the+Ainsworth+Strange+Situation.+Attachment+in+the+preschool+years:+Theory,+research,+a+nd+intervention,+1,+121-160.&ots=WWndtluoWk&sig=z0Z_6oF_faZm0hANeissUCaqJKg#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WzHfCXE8EC&oi=fnd&pg=PA121&dq=Main,+M.,+%26+Solomon,+J.+(1990).+Procedures+for+identifying+infants+as+disorganized/disoriented+during+the+Ainsworth+Strange+Situation.+Attachment+in+the+preschool+years:+Theory,+research,+a+nd+intervention,+1,+121-160.&ots=WWndtluoWk&sig=z0Z_6oF_faZm0hANeissUCaqJKg#v=onepage&q&f=false)

Mesman, J., Van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Sagi-Schwartz, A. (2016). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment. *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*, 852-877. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/49637071/chapter_han+book_2016-libre.pdf?1476616980=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DCross_cultural_pattern_s_of_attachment_Un.pdf&Expires=1701177333&Signature=YfdcnM1vB3zwNV8bqTC023IEVU2tJ2BFMIXxaSjzU74bc0SNH8HHNAeJFvbnuhX40IKx-9s9s-3Vo~LMK7EAgRktifxHfvmwgmEsajX--

RkMx0q4tTb4J3~Egr0LL1t4zSeB9MZF3U53FHwfW81bw5Zs4OUEitCh0ztonGpPbC4yfBxObuJZe6~AbeGUhwa93Sx0TgWEO~9SIsqSO370hr3gV~aJufcXTs~2AQmn1ClzBr~S84QDVPEFjRVL42z~5T8LduakT3WSSHmAliYspYMkw8Aoo11B1yDwhWTNjHIVzyV~OmSfJxQtrnR3Zqcw5T~ucIPhvnGf8UfdTbQ__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2019). Attachment orientations and emotion regulation. *Current opinion in psychology*, 25, 6-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.02.006>

Oldmeadow, J. A., Quinn, S., & Kowert, R. (2013). Attachment style, social skills, and Facebook use amongst adults. *Computers in human Behavior*, 29(3), 1142-1149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.10.006>

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American psychologist*, 55(10), 1093. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.10.1093>

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2001). Deeper into attachment and culture. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.827>

Rutter, M. (1980). The Long-term Effects of Early Experience. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 22(6), 800-815. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.1980.tb03751.x>

Ryan, R. M., Brown, K. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). How Integrative is Attachment Theory? Unpacking the Meaning and Significance of Felt Security. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(3), 177-182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701512778>

Schore, A. N. (2015). *Affect regulation and the origin of the self: The neurobiology of emotional development*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315680019>

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive psychology: An introduction* (Vol. 55). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>

Seligman, M. E. P. (2001). Positive Psychology, Positive Prevention, and Positive Therapy. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195135336.003.0001>

Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(4), 349-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730500365928>

Swets, J. A., & Cox, C. R. (2023). Insecure attachment and lower preference for romantic relationship nostalgia predict higher acceptance of infidelity. *Personality and individual differences*, 203, 112006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.112006>

Wood, A. M., & Tarrier, N. (2010). Positive Clinical Psychology: A new vision and strategy for integrated research and practice. *Clinical psychology review*, 30(7), 819-829. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.06.003>