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Abstract

Children develop attachment relationships with caregivers they trust to care for and protect them, and children's care reflects the interplay of cultural and ecological processes. Central to children's care and relationships is the importance communities place on action that is directed by one's own thoughts and feelings (autonomy) or by the thoughts and feelings of others (social harmony). In the former, attachment relationships are characterized by recurring separation and reunions, and learning centers on exploration; in the latter, by continuous contact and care and accommodation to others and context. This view of attachment represents revised thinking, and this chapter considers cultural differences in conceptions of good care, competent children, and close relationships in light of traditional and revised attachment theory and research. Also considered is current understanding of the ecological circumstances of resource uncertainty during human evolution that likely preferred infants capable of developing multiple, simultaneous attachment relationships.
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Efe forest camp. Eighteen-month-old Maua sits in her aunt’s lap focused intently on the families streaming from the forest into the bright light of the freshly cleared camp. Cheerful greetings and song meet the newcomers as they are helped to ease baskets and infants to the ground. Babies are cuddled by people they do not know or do not remember, and, with a bit of humored coaxing, toddlers shake hands, and older children bring water to the travelers. In time, they sit and share news, and voices blend with the sound of honeybees circling overhead.

Maua’s mother breaks off several small pieces of honey comb and, with a few quiet words, places them in Maua’s hand. Maua walks to a newly arrived young girl and offers her a piece. Gladly accepted, the two watch the animated storytelling of a group of men and women as sweet honey drips down their chins. A boy grins at Maua and breaks from the onlookers to scoop her up. She quiets, not knowing how to respond to this cousin she has never met. Sensing her concern, he carries Maua to a family friend, and, as she settles in his lap, Maua’s mother leaves camp to collect firewood. Maua begins to sway to the musical rhythms of a finger piano, and not long after, a neighbor beckons her to come and see the baby she nurses, a newborn whose mother has not yet returned from gathering. Maua perches on her thigh and plays with the baby’s tiny toes, giggling all the while. But soon she feels very hungry and scans the camp for her mother, who is not there. She slips down to watch a woman spoon wild yams from a pot, and with just a hint of a frown, the woman looks up and gives Maua some to eat.

Soon, Maua’s mother returns. Maua waits as her mother stokes the cooking fire, and once done, she climbs into her mother’s lap and nurses hungrily. When Maua’s sucking slows with sleepiness, she is laid into the arms of an old relative. Draped there also is a small orphaned boy, now in the woman’s care. With a
bit of adjusting, and with legs and arms intertwined, the two children settle comfortably. Maua’s mother and sister join a group of women on the other side of camp to plan for the next day’s foraging expedition.

This vignette describes experiences typical of Efe foragers of the Ituri Forest of the Democratic Republic of Congo. It portrays Efe infancy as intensely social, and it exemplifies the infant’s continuously shifting social landscape and the significant breadth and intensity of cooperation in infant care. More than 25 years have passed since the highly social life of Efe children and the sharing of care by many was first described (Tronick, Morelli, & Winn, 1987). At the time, the Efe pattern of care was considered unusual. But decades of research on hunters and gatherers show that this view is no longer correct. Extensive care of young infants by individuals other than their mothers is a practice common among forager societies (Konner, 2010). With shared developmental assistance (Morelli, Ivey Henry, & Foerster, 2014) and the universal need of mothers for it (Hrdy, 2009), Efe infants, like other forager infants, are part of social and cooperative networks from birth. They develop relationships with the many people who care for them, and many of these relationships develop into close relationships by the time infants are able to walk (e.g., Mechau & Hawks, 2013).

Introduction to Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is concerned with human relationships—the close relationships children develop with the people who are responsible for them and their care—and with the implications of closeness for children’s learning and development. Attachment is part of our human legacy and a species-wide characteristic. It evolved as an adaptation to predator pressure and allows children to balance their need for protection and exploration. As such, it is characterized by children’s recurring separations from and reunions with primary caregivers (Bowlby, 1969; 1982). Children seek proximity to their primary caregivers for comfort and security when conditions are dangerous or their needs compelling, and, once assured of their safety and well-being, they venture away from caregivers to explore the environment.

Attachment theorists have long argued that all children develop attachment relationships in the same way, and all attachment relationships serve the same purpose (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1982; Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). That is, there are regularities across cultures in the type of care that fosters secure attachment relationships and the competencies that develop as a result, in the relation between secure attachment and confident exploration, and in the incidence and form of insecure attachments. According to attachment theorists, decades of research largely confirm these claims (Van IJzendoorn & Sagi-Schwartz, 1999; 2008). Today, attachment theory is psychology’s most influential theory of relatedness, setting standards for what constitutes healthy relationships for humans.

This traditional account of attachment, once unraveled, receives less support than it once did. We better understand now the ecological circumstances associated with the evolution of attachment and the contextual dependency of attachment relationships. Researchers whose views on attachment reflect these developments accept attachment as an evolved behavioral system and acknowledge important similarities in attachment worldwide (e.g., qualities of care and caregiver are important to the close relationships children develop, and attachment relationships relate to children’s learning). Other than this, they argue that attachment relationships are constituted largely by the interplay of cultural and ecological processes (LeVine & Norman, 2001; Otto & Keller, 2014; Quina & Mageo, 2013).

We now believe that ecological conditions of resource unpredictability during the Paleolithic period favored psychological and social processes that increased the likelihood of people gaining access to scarce and needed goods and services. These conditions, along with predator pressure, likely favored selection for capacities for attachment. Evidence also suggests the cultural patterning of attachment relationships. It singles out as critical to these relationships the importance communities place on action directed by one’s own thoughts and feelings (i.e., autonomy) or on the thoughts and feelings of others and context (i.e., social harmony). Middle-class European-American families are examples of the former, and, for their children, attachment relationships are characterized by recurring separation and reunions, and learning centers on exploration. Traditional East Asian families are examples of the latter; for their children, attachment relationships are characterized by continuous contact and care, and learning centers on accommodation (Rothbaum, Morelli, & Rusk, 2011).

The chapter is organized in the following way. Attachment theory and research are reviewed first. Then, the ecological circumstances likely prevalent during the Paleolithic period are discussed, and, as a companion to this, the social gathering of the Dembo forest is described. Following this, attachment relationships are examined by case studies of children’s care across a range of cultures and social and historical context.
secure attachment as an evolved and important way to regulate behavioral systems. According to attachment theory, attachment relationships are at risk for developing if attachment is insecure (i.e., resistant, disorganized, or avoidant). Children who are not assured of their caregivers' return and are able to use them as a secure base to explore. Children insecure in their attachment relationships are not able to use their caregiver as a secure base and do not seek contact with their caregivers on return (avoidant), seek and resist contact (resistant), or show no discernible pattern of behavior (disorganized). These children with insecure attachment relationships are at risk for developing later behavioral problems (Thompson, 2006).

The distribution of secure and insecure patterns of attachment in nonclinical populations is assumed to be the same across communities. The secure pattern is regarded by attachment theorists as the typical pattern, with approximately 65% of children within a population securely attached. The avoidant insecure pattern characterizes about 20% of children within a population and the resistant pattern 15%. When the disorganized insecure classification is considered along with the avoidant and resistant classifications, the percentage of children within a population classified, respectively, is about 15%, 9–10%, and 15%.

**Interdisciplinarity of Attachment Theory and Research**

"Attachment theory was born from John Bowlby's insistence that a field must be willing to break from past traditions and be open to new ideas" (Cassidy, 2003, p. 409). Bowlby's thesis on attachment was based in part on his understanding of the environment of evolutionary adaptedness (EEA), which owed much to writings on primate social groups. He and others believed that during the Paleolithic period men cooperated to protect the group from predators and to secure food by hunting, the two assumed primary functions of social groups. While men were well integrated into the Paleolithic human group, women were not. In the Paleolithic, men cooperated to protect the group from predators and to secure food by hunting, the two assumed primary functions of social groups. While men were well integrated into the Paleolithic human group, women were not.
the group, women were not. Women exchanged food with men and functioned in small subgroups made up of their infants and sometimes older children. The cooperation between women was believed different from that between men and was considered less important to women and the group (Patterson, 2003).

The view of hominin women and infants in small mother–young groups largely separate from one another was expanded based on animal behavior research that demonstrated infant maternal preference (Harlow & Zimmermann, 1959; see Schiller, 1957, on Lorenz). This, along with Bowlby’s psychoanalytic leanings, led to Bowlby’s near exclusive attention to the emotional tie between infants and mothers. He assumed the singular importance of this relationship to all others and its lifelong influence on all close relationships. Bowlby’s clinical orientation also gave way to the portrayal of attachment relationships as healthy (secure) or as predicative of disturbed development (insecure) (LeVine, 2014).

Bowlby’s thesis was a theory of human social relationships (Thompson, 2006). The translation of theory to research on the ontogeny of individual relationships is credited largely to the efforts of Ainsworth (Ainsworth et al., 1978). She laid the groundwork for research on secure base, sensitive care, and patterns of attachment based on her in-depth observational studies of mothers and infants in Uganda and later in US homes. The similarities observed between the two communities helped to advance the thesis of the universal nature of attachment relationships. From this were set standards for good parenting, secure attachment, and the study of both. Since Bowlby framed attachment theory, most research has been on individual differences in attachment security and on the relation between attachment security and later competence (Delius, Bovenschen, & Spangler, 2008). The majority of studies are of mothers and infants in middle-class contexts of Western communities because key features of attachment relationships—secure base, distribution of security, sensitive care, and infant competence—are assumed universal.3 The few studies elsewhere largely support these assumptions (e.g., Cassidy, 2008; Van IJzendoorn & Sagi-Schwartz, 2008).

**Human Evolution and Attachment**

**Theory Reconsidered**

Ecosystems during the period of human emergence were highly variable.2 There was significant temporal and spatial unpredictability of foods available to humans, and food was often of low nutritional quality. There was high exposure to disease-producing agents and trauma hazards. For these reasons and others, mortality throughout the hominin lifespan was high. All of this in motion the evolution of biological processes and flexible behavioral strategies to improve security of access to nutritional and social resources. Key to establishing reliable access were social tendencies that made possible cooperative activities, sharing, and social group living. These tendencies co-evolved with a life history that included short interbirth intervals, postweaning dependency, slow juvenile growth, and high fertility, which committed mothers to raising multiple dependent young children at the same time and committed children to competing with their mothers, siblings, and others for scarce resources.

This understanding of hominin life progressed with decades of research on foraging societies, aided by advances in ecology and evolutionary biology, neuroscience, and genetics. The evidence suggests that adaptations to ecological constraints imposed by resource insecurity during the Paleolithic period are manifest best by extant foragers in Africa, many of whom live in evolutionary relevant settings. Bowlby long appreciated the importance of studying modern-day foragers to understand attachment, and the Efe are one of the oldest extant lineages of modern humans and one of the few remaining traditional African pygmy groups. Efe life is marked by high daily variability in resources across the lifespan, influencing well-being and behavior. The sharing and cooperative networks in which Efe participate are the mainstay of their existence and build up over a lifetime of associations. These networks help to reduce variance in resource access, and reliable relationships are valued greatly because they promise a more predictable flow of goods and services.

Efe children are centered within social networks from birth, and their health and survival hinge quite immediately on their ability to secure resources reliably from others, especially as they leave the protective niche of early infancy. Mothers alone are not able to provide for their multiple dependent young. The day-to-day variability in an individual’s hunting or foraging success means inevitably that others must provision the infant on a regular basis. Who is available to do this, however, varies quite a lot. Efe adapt to shifts in resource availability by frequent changes in residency and camp location and by calibrating social networks to individual and group needs, deep in the forest, with strangers passing through, to the road, with few residents passing through. The high and infectious diseases and of the people who have cared enough to do so or have died.

This uncertain access to resources places strong demands to gain broad exposure to develop predictable and with many of them. Their sensibilities that allow them to variable social landscapes, relationships with people who their interests, predict the and develop favorable patterns that minimizing and eliminating infants have many opportunistic competences needed to do.

As shown in the vignette, social, and infants spend in physical contact with networks expand over the fast paced, and variable. Efe infants, on average, an different people, some with They change partners and most of their partners a period of several months. landscape bring Efe babies and allow them to plex behaviors for devel new relationships.

Many of an infant’s relationships, built on social exchange into trusting ones. Efe in securing resources from good moods most of the ers, which is a lot givers are very solicitous to trust, and so for the infant or just a in dense groups and about them. And, infant infants develop multiple, relationships that are significant to them.

The ecological circumstance to infants capable of developing multiple atta
od was often of low as high exposure to trauma hazards. For vitality throughout the life of this set in motion processes and flexible the security of access sources. Key to established tendencies that tivities, sharing, and tendencies co-evolved and social interdependency, slow juvenile illness committed mothers, young children aged children to combings, and others for

Efe infancy is intensely social, and infants spend most of their time near or in physical contact with many people. Infant social networks expand over the first 2 years of life, are fast paced, and variable. Over a 2-hour period, Efe infants, on average, are in contact with 9 to 14 different people, some with as many as 20 people. They change partners about once every 3 minutes, and most of their partners are not the same over a period of several months. These shifts in social landscape bring Efe babies into contact with many people and allow them to learn and practice complex behaviors for developing, sustaining, and renewing relationships.

Many of an infant’s early cooperative relationships, built on social exchange, are likely to develop into trusting ones. Efe infants enjoy great success in securing resources from people, and they are in good moods most of the time they are with others, which is quite a lot, probably because caregivers are very solicitous of them. With so many people to trust, and so many of them in contact with the infant or just a few steps away, Efe babies grow up in dense groupings of people who care for and about them. And, most likely as a result, Efe infants develop multiple, simultaneous attachment relationships that are similar in importance and significance to them.

The ecological circumstances that gave preference to infants capable of participating in diverse and complex cooperative relationships and of developing multiple attachments are very different from what Bowlby envisioned. His understanding of the EEA did not take into account the energetic needs of women and children or the pivotal role cooperative relationships played in their lives. It allowed him to assume the near exclusive role of mothers in the care of their infants and the primacy of the infant’s attachment relationships with her. Attachment relationships with others, although recognized by Bowlby, were different, developed later, and were less strong and consistent.

Cultures and Attachment Relationships Reconsidered

Most culture studies on attachment relationships consider the constitutive role of cultural and ecological processes. Attachment researchers are not indifferent to them. Bowlby’s thesis allows for adaptation to local conditions, and Ainsworth’s procedure accommodates cultural differences between Ugandan and US mothers and infants. But they did not extend contextual considerations much beyond this, and later Bowlby did not see cultural variation in children’s close relationships at odds with attachment theory (LeVine, 2014). Attachment theorists continue in this vein. They appreciate the relevance of context for attachment but in very limited ways. Often, context is taken into account to explain the atypical distribution of insecure classifications or researchers downplay observations ill-fitted to theory. For example, Van Ijzendoorn and Sagi-Schwartz (2008) recognized the contextual components of attachment relationships in their multiculture study of attachment and the need to shift from a dyadic to social network perspective (a sweeping change to attachment theory), but concluded nonetheless that “taken as a whole, the studies are remarkably consistent with the theory” (p. 901).

Even though attachment theorists show great fidelity to attachment theory, some acknowledge considerable flexibility in the attachment system, related to multidetermined influences, capable of accommodating different cultural practices and ecological and material circumstances (e.g., Simpson & Belsky, 2008; Thompson et al., 2006). Honing this view requires several essential avenues of research, including further exploration into how attachment develops in different cultural settings (Thompson et al., 2006). Already, there is impressive documentation on the diverse realities of children’s lives, and there is great interest in the cultural nature of sensitive care, competence, and secure base, and the relational values they represent (e.g.,

Cultural Patterning of Relational Values

The thesis on the cultural nature of attachment relationships rests strongly on well-researched concepts that represent how people function as separate individuals and in relation with others. One representation is the independent self, characterized as self-directed (Kitayama, Duffy, & Uchida, 2007), physically and mentally separate (Raeff, 2006), defined by personal qualities (Suh, 2000), and instrumental in social relations (e.g., promotes own goals; Shwedcr, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997). For this representation, a person's own thoughts, feelings, and actions are used as the primary referent for action (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). A second representation is the interdependent self, characterized as socially responsive, "fundamentally connected with others" (Kitayama et al., 2007, p. 141), and dutiful and obliging (e.g., promotes others' goals; Shwedcr et al., 1997). For this representation, the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others are used as a person's primary referents for action (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). Self-representations co-exist in individual psychologies and cultural philosophies (Keller, 2011a); are inseparable, multiple represented, and mutually constitutive; and are understood in culturally distinctive ways and particularized in everyday practices (Raeff, 2006).

Self-representations reflect the relative importance of individual and group needs, goals, and preferences in cultural philosophies on autonomy and social harmony. Autonomous functioning underlies independent self-representations, and the prototype for autonomy is attachment relationships that preference the link between the behavioral systems of attachment and accommodation (Morelli & Rothbaum, 2007; Rothbaum et al., 2011). These close relationships are marked by near continuous union and contact and by accommodative activities typically in close cooperation with others that include conformity, propriety, compliance, responsiveness to social cues, and coordinating one's own and others' needs. Through these and other accommodative supporting practices and activities, children experience themselves as connected to others, as "part of encompassing social relationships" (Markus & Kitayama, 2010, p. 423), and as "defined and made meaningful in respect to such others" (Kitayama et al., 2007, p. 144). For these children, the importance of accommodation for learning is foremost.

Good Care and Competent Children

Attachment theory claims that a history of sensitive care fosters child attachment security. This care is defined by qualities that support the child's need to explore the environment and, related to this, her need for autonomy. It is contingent on the child's explicit signals, synchronized to the child's activities, and follows the child's lead. It is affectionate and affectively engaging, and it encourages expressions of positive emotionality. Cared for in this way, the child is secure in her attachment relationships. She is assured that she is in control and competent, and others are available if needed. She is able to explore her environment with confidence and at a distance from others. And she experiences herself as separate and distinct, with needs and desires of her own. This is considered the gold standard of good care against which all care, worldwide, is compared and evaluated.

All indications suggest that sensitive care is universally important to the close relationships children develop (Rothbaum et al., 2011). But attachment theory's notion of good care, which represents Western standards, is not. Care that controls a child's actions, anticipates her needs, or dampens her emotional expressiveness is sensitive care practiced by people who place importance on social harmony. These features of care, considered next, are some of the ways parents and others teach children to develop a situation-centered view of reality and the ability to accommodate to others and context (Ellis & Petersen, 1992; Morelli & Rothbaum, 2007; Rudy & Grusce, 2006).

Care that controls what children do is representative of a global pattern. Whiting and Edwards (1988) note that, except for Israeli mothers in their 12-community study (Kokwe, Kisa, Kariob, Nyang'a, Kenya; Bubanewsari, India; Juchahuaca, Mexico; Tar and Taira, Japan) ranked highest in training and controlling children. Similar findings are reported for African (Keller, 2003; LeVine & Ye, South Asian (Chao & Tseng, 2006), Middle Eastern (Sharifzadeh, 1998), South and Central, and non-middle-class US children (Rudy et al., 2006) of getting children to act appropriately in the close relationships they develop with their caregivers. Children in Pu & Harwood, 2003) in mostly low-income families in the United States from Puerto Rico (Fracasso, Busch-Rosenthal, & Levenson, 1994), and Mexico (Howes & Park, 2009; Ispa et al., 2004) do not have secure attachment or poor with their controlling and intrusive children are what good parents and parents in other Confucian cultures (Chao & Tseng, 2002) are expected to do. This is to be expected of Ns, which is to govern, can be done by taking control, direct and placing demands on the child (Ta et al., 1988). This may be seen in the way children are taught to be calm, attentive, and placing demands on the child (Ta et al., 1988). This may be seen in the way children are taught to be calm, attentive, and placing demands on the child (Ta et al., 1988). This may be seen in the way children are taught to be calm, attentive, and placing demands on the child (Ta et al., 1988).
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Attachment Theory

Attachment theory posits that secure attachments are critical for a child's development and well-being. According to attachment theory, children form strong bonds with caregivers who provide consistent and responsive care, which helps them feel safe and secure. Conversely, children who experience insecure attachments may struggle with relationships and emotional regulation. The quality of caregiving plays a crucial role in shaping a child's attachment style, with positive care promoting secure attachments, while neglectful or inconsistent care leading to insecure attachments.


t Children have a history of sentience. They support the child's extended and related to is contingent on the invested in the child's d's lead. It is affec- and it encourages naivety. Cared for in her attachment rela- he is in control and lable if needed. She ent with confidence. And she experi- distinct, with needs considered the gold rich all care, world.d.

at sensitive care is close relationships et al., 2011). But t good care, which , is not. Care that ipates her needs, or siveness is sensitive face importance on of care, considered nts and others teach a centered view of immediate to others , 1992; Morelli & usec, 2006). dren do is representa- tizing and Edwards.

attachment standards of contingent responsiveness to children's explicit signals. This practice of meeting a child's needs before or around the time they are expressed is observed in communities around the world. It is reported, for example, among the Efe (Morelli, Ivey Henry, Tronick, & Baldwin, 2002), Nso (Keller et al., 2012; Keller & Otto, 2009), Makassar farmers (Indonesia; Röttger-Rössler, 2014), Sinhala farmers and wage earners (Sri Lanka; Chapin, 2013), Yucatec Maya farmers (de Leon, 1998), and the Japanese (Rothbaum, Nagaoka, & Ponte, 2006). Caregivers rely on situational cues, prior history, and the child's subtle signals—often nonverbal—to do this. For the child, care that consistently anticipates her needs helps to create a reality that blurs her sense of self as distinct and separate from others and accentuates her dependency on them. Her phenomenological experience becomes one of shared selves and shared perspectives and of seeing herself and the world as others see her and the world (Cohen, Hoshin-Brown, & Leung, 2007; Rothbaum, Port, Azuma, Miyake, & Weisz, 2000).

Care that dampens or discourages negative but also overly positive expressions of emotions helps children learn a style of expressiveness that best maintains their relationships with others by not disrupting social harmony. This is different from care advocated by attachment theorists that responds to children's overt positive and negative signals and preferences positive ones. Among the Chinese and other East Asian peoples, intense emotions are considered immature and socially disruptive (Kitayama, Karasawa, & Mcsuita, 2004; Wang & Young, 2010). Puerto Rican mothers (middle- and working-class) prefer calm, well-behaved children (e.g., Harwood, Miller, & Irizarry, 1995) as do the Gusii farmers of Kenya (LeVine, 2004) and the Nso who believe a calm child fits well into her social group (Keller & Otto, 2009). Whereas caregivers prefer negative signals by responding to them (quickly), they tend to do the opposite with positive signals—and in some communities such as the Gusii, caregivers are relatively unresponsive to them (i.e., to childish babbling).

What caregivers want for children relates to how they care for them, which draws from community models of how individuals should function as separate individuals and in relationship to others. Sensitive care as exemplified by attachment theorists advances the child's individuality in ways that promote autonomy. Important are her abilities, confidence, happiness, and discovery through

AN ATTACHMENT
mature forms of exploration. The competent child acts based on what she thinks and believes, and she changes the environment accordingly. Sensitive care as exemplified in non-Western communities advances the child's sociality in ways that promote social harmony. Important is proper demeanor, obedience, compliance, conformity, respect for elders, remaining calm, sharing, and accepting the care of many others and the advances of strangers (e.g., Harwood et al., 1995; Keller, 2003; Morelli et al., 2014; Otto & Keller, 2014; Quinn & Mageo, 2013). The competent child acts based on what others think and feel, and she changes her behavior accordingly.

**EXPANDING NOTIONS OF GOOD CARE**

Although sensitive care is a keystone of attachment theory, it only modestly predicts attachment security (de Wolff & Van IJzendoorn, 1997). This finding led researchers to consider other aspects of caregiver involvement related to attachment. In line with Western interests is caregiver ability to attribute mental and psychological states to the child and to treat her as an intentional agent (see Sharp & Fonagy, 2008, for a review of research on mind mindedness, reflective functioning, and parental mentalizing). In line with the majority of communities worldwide is interest in child health. But the relation between child care and health, and the role of attachment relationships in both, is of little interest to attachment researchers even though protection from malnutrition may be "the most dramatic demonstration of the adaptive value of attachment security" (Van IJzendoorn & Sagi-Schwartz, 2008, p. 900). The health benefits of breastfeeding are clear (Latham, 1997), but children suckle for reasons other than food. Among foraging and other traditional societies, for example, children suckle when they are frightened or sleepy, and caregivers use the breast to quiet and console children. Suckling is part of the child's experience of her caregiver as a safe haven, source of comfort, and co-regulator of emotions; and for Efe and Aka forager (Central African Republic) children, suckling children is not an exclusively maternal activity (Hrdy, 2009).

Feelings of security likely extend as well to others who regularly give food to children. Observing and participating in food sharing networks similar to those depicted in the vignette at the opening of this chapter are ways Efe infants learn about the trustworthiness of others. These experiences engender feelings of trust, and trust underlies close relationships. Among the Murik foragers (Papua New Guinea) "food is the quintessential expression of relatedness, caring, and belonging" (Barlow, 2013, p. 177). Mothering is defined more by feeding than by giving birth, and children belong to the people who feed them. For them, separation and loss are expressed by going without food.

**Care and Child’s Situation or Self-Centered View of Reality**

There are ways parents and others teach children to develop a situation- or self-centered view of reality in addition to those already considered (e.g., Keller, this volume). Physical closeness, for example, is central to attachment relationships marked by near continuous union and contact and by accommodative activities in close cooperation with others, and it typifies young children’s experiences in non-Western communities. This closeness is usual for infants in hunting and gathering communities. During the day, for example, Efe infants spend most of their time in the arms or on the backs of others, and when in someone’s lap, they are often part of a social knot of interlaced legs and arms. Among Japanese and Koreans, the significance of physical contact between infants and parents (e.g., co-sleeping, co-bathing, breastfeeding) is captured by the terms sukinshippu and seuki (skinship), respectively. There is a tactile quality to this type of care (Rottger-Rössler, 2014) that allows for the subtle and near imperceptible exchanges on which anticipatory responsiveness depends. It enables children and caregivers to rely regularly on nonverbal ways to communicate and, as a result, to coordinate their involvement in nonexclusive and socially nondisruptive ways (e.g., Morelli & Verhoef, in preparation). This paves the way for learning how to manage attention to simultaneous activities (Correa-Chávez, Mangione, & Black, this volume; Rogoff, Mistry, Goncu, & Mosier, 1993).

Caregivers teach children to see the world as others do and to adjust to their reality. Empathy is the emotion of feeling-with-others (Saarni, 1997), and empathic listening and responding take into account and accommodate to the needs of others. Japanese mothers may foster this by telling children what others are thinking and feeling (Clancy, 1986). Beng (farmers in Côte d’Ivoire; Gottlieb, 2014) and Kaluli caregivers (farmer-foragers in Papua New Guinea; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984) may do the same by speaking for their children, and for the Kaluli, teaching them what to say. Caregivers teach children to attend intensely to others and context. In many settings, children are positioned directed outward when carers draws children’s attention to the environment and to learn how to do the expectation that child is doing. The view from here is that others have a different view of the world and are likely to have different feelings, thoughts, and feelings regarding others, the child intentions clear. She is what she is thinking o
rik foragers (Papua New Guinea), children are positioned so that their gaze is directed outward when carried or sitting, and this draws children’s attention to their surroundings. Does the expectation that children learn by observing and watching, a view shared by Efe and Mayan families (farmers and wage earners in Guatemala; Morelli, Rogoff, & Angelillo, 2002) and common among traditional societies (Correa-Chávez et al., this volume; Rogoff, 2003). Caregivers teach children about social interdependencies by accentuating the social group. Teasing, shaming, and name-calling (Samoans, Samoan Islands, farmer-foragers; Mageo, 2013); abrupt weaning (Pirahã foragers, Brazil; Everett, 2014); and withholding empathic attention (Blubaneswar, India; Seymour, 2013) direct children away from individual relationships and toward the social group as a whole. Care and protection by many others instill in children a sense of dependency on them and the group for meeting their needs (e.g., Everett, 2014; Morelli et al., in press).

Physical separation, in contrast, is central to attachment relationships marked by recurring separations and reunions by exploratory activities at a distance from caregivers, and it typifies children’s experiences in Western communities. This separation provides children with many opportunities to explore the environment away from caregivers, and it lessens social demands on children to accommodate to others and context. Because caregivers often are not physically close to the child, children and caregivers frequently use verbal means to make contact. Caregiver response is often contingent on the child’s explicit signals as a result, and this fosters the child’s sense of herself as a separate agent in control of the environment (Keller, 2011a). Moreover, reliance on sound and the face-to-face and dyadic nature of engagement (Keller, 2011a; Keller et al., 2009) make it difficult and less likely for the child and caregiver to attend to multiple events simultaneously (Correa-Chávez et al., this volume; Rogoff, 2003). What this means is that children may have to disrupt social events to get others to pay attention to them (Morelli & Verhoeff, in preparation). There are other experiences that emphasize the child’s distinctiveness and provide her with opportunities to distinguish herself from others and to act based on her own needs, thoughts, and feelings. For example, when speaking with others, the child is expected to make her intentions clear. She is not to assume others know what she is thinking or share her point of view (Clancy, 1986). A lot of what European-American caregivers talk about with the child is about the child—her activities and options (Morelli, Rogoff et al., 2002). And children are not expected to adapt their speech to take part in conversations; caregivers do this (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). What is more, US and Turkish mothers draw attention to the child by singling out her achievements and praising her accomplishments, sometimes ignoring the contributions of others. Such praise contributes to the child’s notions about herself as self-sufficient, and it is less common in non-Western communities (LeVine, 1980; Rogoff, 2003). And, US parents are less likely to press children to comply with requests that are seemingly unfair. When the child tries to negotiate, parents negotiate with them (Kuczynski, Koscianska, Radke-Yarrow, & Girnus-Brown, 1987). Japanese mothers find this difficult to accept because it goes against the ethos of accommodating to others (Ujile, 1997). And, in many African and East Asian communities, children are expected to obey and comply (Nsamenang, 1992; Yamada, 2004).

**Secure Base Function**

To learn about themselves, others, and the world about them, children preferentially rely on caregivers with whom they have close relationships. These caregivers are able to support the child’s learning because the child trusts them to keep her safe and secure. With the feelings of safety and security these relationships engender, the child is able to engage fully her capacity to learn, even in stressful situations. This is the secure base function of attachment relationships, and there is little doubt that caregivers significant to the child play this role in communities worldwide. What varies across communities is the nature of the secure base and the learning it supports. In attachment theory, the secure base balances tension between the linked systems of exploration and attachment and makes possible competent exploration at a distance from caregivers for gaining knowledge and skills (Grossmann et al., 2008). Revised thinking on attachment sees a second link between attachment and accommodation. This link is likely strong for children in communities that place importance on social harmony. For them, the secure base functions in a second way, as a foundation for learning to accommodate and by accommodating, and it balances tension between children’s ability to cope with threats to accommodation and to fit in socially.7
The proposal that the accommodation and attachment behavioral systems are linked is backed by several strands of research. When asked to respond to vignettes based on their own community's description of desirable and undesirable attachment behaviors, Puerto Rican mothers described as optimal an attachment pattern that balances two ways of relating to people—calm, respectful attentiveness and positive social engagement (Harwood et al., 1995). Anglo-American mothers saw the balance between relating to people and exploring separately from people. The Japanese concept _amae_ also symbolizes the connection between attachment and accommodation. _Amae_ is to depend on and presume another's love and indulgence, and positive _amae_ exemplifies secure attachment relationships that meet the child's _amae_ needs for indulgence and interdependency, not exploration and autonomy (Mizuta, Zahn-Waxler, Cole, & Hiruma, 1996).

Exploration is important for all children's learning. But exploratory activities often support accommodative learning for non-Western children by taking place close to caregivers who may direct what children do. Children rarely explore at a distance from caregivers in many non-Western communities (Keller et al., 2009). Among traditional societies, this is because children are held or carried most of the time in the first year of life. When children are able to venture forth, caregivers keep them close by. Balinese mothers use fake fear expressions to do this (cited in Bretherton, 1992). Gusii and Hausa caregivers (farmers and shepherds in Nigeria) prevent children from crawling away (LeVine, 2014). And Japanese mothers keep children nearby by staying close to and initiating contact with them (Rothbaum et al., 2000; Ujije & Miyake, 1985). In some places, exploration is less common. Chinese children in families in which parents are wage earners (Chen et al., 1998; Liu et al., 2005; Rubin et al., 2006), Korean children in the United States (Farver, Kim, & Lee, 1995) and South Korea (Rubin et al., 2006), and Japanese children explore less than do Canadian and Caucasian/Anglo children in structured and everyday settings.

Making exploration a part of the social goings-on is another way exploration supports accommodative learning. Japanese mothers are more likely to take advantage of social opportunities to direct their child’s attention to the environment and to use toys for social engagement than are Caucasian-American mothers (Bornstein, Azuma, Tamis-LeMonda, & Ogino, 1990). !Kung foragers (Botswana; Bakeman, Adamson, Konner, & Barr, 1990), Wolof farmers (Senegal), and Soninke and Toucouleur (Senegal, Mali, Mauritania) immigrants to Paris (Rabain-Jamin, 1994) are more likely to respond to children when they are engaged socially than with objects. For these African immigrant children, activities are structured around people; for Parisian children, activities are centered on exploration of inanimate objects.

Conundrums for Attachment Researchers Secure Attachment Relationships

Notwithstanding the diverse realities of children's lives, there are many studies that back attachment theorists' views on sensitive care and the normative distribution of secure attachment relationships (Van IJzendoorn & Sagi-Schwartz, 2008). There are others who counter these claims by arguing that attachment constructs and research practices make it easy to disregard or not notice significant differences in close relationships. The maternal sensitivity scale, for example, relies heavily on interpretation of appropriateness (Carlson & Harwood, 2014), making it easy to fit observations to the measures provided. And the secure attachment classification is defined broadly and assigned to children who act very differently in the Strange Situation—from children who interact at a distance from their mothers (B1) to children who approach, cling, and resist release (B4) (Ainsworth et al., 1978). The latter characterizes Japanese children. Compared to US children, Japanese children strenuously resist and are upset more by separations, initiate more contact, and explore less in the Strange Situation procedure (Rothbaum et al., 2000). Given this and social experiences related to their care, it is hard to know if Japanese and US children actually experience security in the same way.

Attachment research practice also makes it difficult to consider alternative interpretations of close relationships. Reclassifying children originally classified as disorganized (e.g., Behrens, Hesse, & Main, 2007) ignores the possibility that their behavior may be organized and meaningful by local standards (Keller, 2008). Modifying the Strange Situation protocol to suit community practices ignores the possibility that the procedure is not an appropriate assessment of attachment security and that close relationships may serve different functions. Korean mothers, for example, were allowed to initiate contact and remain close to their children in the Strange Situation protocol to suit community practices ignoring the possibility that the procedure is not an appropriate assessment of attachment security and that close relationships may serve different functions. Korean mothers, for example, were allowed to initiate contact and remain close to their children in the Strange Situation protocol to suit community practices ignoring the possibility that the procedure is not an appropriate assessment of attachment security and that close relationships may serve different functions. Korean mothers, for example, were allowed to initiate contact and remain close

Insecure Attachment Relationships

At the start, attachment theory and attachment patterns and the same for all children in all though attachment theory has say on the matter (Waters & Mountain, 1985). For similarities across attachment and the process of attachment relationships, this view of attachment relationships, by Early on in the days of attachment research, insecure attachment and non-Western commun distribution standards exist for middle-class US children (lower- and middle-class of children (~69%) were their attachment relationships children were avoidant (~5%); Gottfried, Gerhard, & in Israel, approximately ~33% were classified as insecure (~12%); kibbutzim were classified as insecure (~33%); in Japan ~32% of infants (Takahashi, 1986). Rath back for universal claim children were at risk for (LeVine, 2014), attachment cultural and ecological
to their children in the Strange Situation because physical closeness is important to them. This, and knowledge of the importance of social harmony for Koreans in general, did not influence judgment that the Strange Situation is a valid assessment of security for Korean children, and attachment classification has the same meaning in Korea as it does in the United States (Jin, Jacobvitz, & Hazen, 2010; Jin, Jacobvitz, Hazen, & Jung, 2012). Finally, relying on urban, well-educated, materially secure families in non-Western communities to study attachment relationships ignores the possibility of Western influences on children and their families (Heinicke, 1995; Keller, 2014; Posada, Gao, & Wu, 1995).

**Insecure Attachment Relationships**

At the start, attachment theorists believed that attachment patterns and their distribution were the same for all children in all communities, even though attachment theory had little if anything to say on the matter (Waters & Beauchaine, 2003). Cultural studies, for the most part, support this supposition for secure attachment relationships, maybe for the reasons noted already (for examples of exceptions, see Jin et al., 2012; Tomlinson, Cooper, & Murray, 2005). Few explanations are offered for similarities across communities in distribution of secure attachments because secure attachment and the processes underlying them are presumed by attachment theorists to have deep biological roots. This view should extend to insecure attachment relationships, but it does not.

Early on in the days of attachment research, attachment researchers observed that the distribution of insecure attachment patterns for Western and non-Western communities veered greatly from distribution standards established by research on middle-class US children. In North Germany (lower- and middle-class families), the majority of children (~66%) were classified as insecure in their attachment relationships, and most of these children were avoidant (Grossmann, Grossmann, Gottfried, Gerhard, & Unzer, 1985). Similarly, in Israel, approximately 41% of children living in kibbutzim were classified as insecure, but many of them were resistant (~33%). And, in Japan, approximately 32% of infants were classified as resistant (Takahashi, 1986). Rather than seeing this as a setback for universal claims or accepting that these children were at risk for mental health problems (LeVine, 2014), attachment theorists argued that cultural and ecological processes best explained the child’s behavior in the Strange Situation—not their attachment relationships. North German children acted in the independent manner lauded by parents; Israeli and Japanese children were overly stressed by the procedure because of their limited experience with strangers, and, for Japanese children, infrequent separation from mothers.

Attachment researchers by and large accept the account that insecure, but not secure, attachment relationships are mediated by contextual factors in nonclinical populations. Even though scholars outside of the field point to conceptual difficulties with this stance (e.g., LeVine & Norman, 2001), it gained ground, and nowadays it is taken for granted and attachment researchers rely on cultural practices and philosophies to predict the incidence of insecure (not secure) attachment patterns (e.g., Jin et al., 2010). The reasoning first put forth by attachment theorists was that insecure attachments are “secondary strategies that could be adaptive under certain conditions for a certain period of time” (LeVine & Norman, 2001, p. 96). This way of thinking was in part a reaction to critiques by animal behavior researchers that resisted the view on evolutionary grounds that one pattern of attachment—the secure pattern—was the species’ optimal pattern (e.g., Hinde, 1987). A companion, evolution-based, explanation was advanced. Insecure patterns are adaptive under certain conditions, such as when parents are unable or unwilling to invest in children—often as a result of living in ecologically risky environments. In these instances, children adapt by avoiding disinterested parents and secure resources elsewhere (avoidant classification) or by being demanding and overly vigilant (anxious/resistant classification) so that they can secure resources from parents at the most opportune times (Chisholm, 1996; Simpson & Belsky, 2008).

The explanations offered are in line with attachment theory and endorse the validity of attachment classifications. This is a testament to the sway attachment theory has on conceptualizing the evolutionary and cultural bases of attachment relationships. It makes it difficult to consider alternative ways to describe children’s behaviors in their close relationships and to think differently about child security and close relationships.

**Describing Attachment Relationships**

[T]hat so many attachment researchers have gone on to do research with the Strange Situation rather than looking at what happens
in the home or in other natural settings . . . marks a turning away from "field work," and I don't think it's wise.

—(Ainsworth, 1995, p. 12)

One of the great challenges for attachment research is to develop assessments informed by cultural standards of good care, competent children, and close relationships. The allure of maintaining the current course, with small analytic and philosophical adjustments to theory and research, is strong—not surprisingly, given a research tradition that spans decades and extends to communities worldwide (Solomon & George, 2008). But attachment theory risks much if it continues to side-step the diverse realities of children's lives. How best to proceed may be answered by returning to Bowlby's and Ainsworth's initial interests on the secure base function of attachment relationships and individual differences in children's ability to use caregivers as a secure base across time and contexts in everyday settings (Waters & Beauchaine, 2003). These interests draw attention to the importance of recording, hypothesizing, and testing variability in children's close relationships in the full range of communities and ecologies in which they live. Progress along these lines is under way.

Rich ethnographic accounts and analyses point to different secure base function and to different social and contextual circumstances that are likely to threaten the child and activate the attachment system. They show us how little sense it makes to consider close relationships in isolation from one another or from either the perspective of the child or the people who care for her. And they suggest that attachment theorists' exemplars of good patterns of care are derivative and developed historically as households split into smaller units characterized by nuclear families. This formation reduced attachment relationships to a few and isolated the psychological importance of the mother—with one or two others. The trend towards less socially dense families combined with an ethos of decision making based on one's needs (along with other considerations) co-acted to lay groundwork for children's learning to explore and by exploring at a social distance from others are less common for children and research have to offer.

Notes

1. The Paleolithic period is marked by the appearance of hominids, the immediate ancestors of modern humans, and distinguished by the development of stone tools and the grouping of humans into small bands.

2. I use Rothbaum and Troseth's (2007) definition of Western as primarily middle-class North American, Western- and Northern-European communities; and non-Western as primarily describing the rest of the world. And I, like them, do not believe there is homogeneity within these groupings or within individual countries or societies.

3. Please refer to Morelli et al. (2014) for research cited in this section.

4. In this section, Chinese, Canadian, German, Israeli, Japanese, Korean, Puerto Rican, Turkish, and US families are from middle-class communities, unless otherwise noted. The mode of living for all other communities is provided. For a few studies, this information is not available. The term "children" refers to youngsters 5 years and younger, unless otherwise noted.

5. In all communities, farming predominated, except in Kariobangi, Bihunawasr, and the United States.


7. An accommodation behavioral is consistent with theorizing that selective pressures favored biological and psychological processes to allow people to maintain good relationships and the integrity of the group (e.g., Pliner, Neumann, Maehlen, & Ponzi, 2011; Funag, Gergely, & Target, 2007). This likely includes abilities associated with awareness of and alignment with important other people and situation-based expectations.
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